# **PUBLIC DOCUMENT**

## Security Services LLC v Republic of Colombia

ICSID Case No ARB 20/7	Final	Wednesday, 29 Ma	1011, 2023
Pages 410 - 482 INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR SETTLEMENT OF INVESTIVENT DISPUTES ICSID Case No ARB/20/7 between Security Services (LC d/b/a Neustar Security Services (formerly Neustar, Inc) Claimant -v- Republic of Colombia Respondent The Arbitral Tribunal Professor Julian DM Lew KC - President Professor Yves Derains - Arbitrator Professor Kaj Hobér - Arbitrator ORAL HEARING Wednesday, 29 March 2023	410	<text><text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text></text>	411
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS Cn behalf of Claimant: In person: Counsel:	412	<section-header><section-header><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text></text></text></text></text></text></text></text></section-header></section-header>	413

0030 1	IN AND 2011	1 116	ai	Wearlesday,	25 March, 2020
	On behalf of Non-Disputing Party	414		INDEX	415
	On behalf of Non-Disputing Party:		(		16
	US Department of State. Office of the Legal Adviser, Office of International Claims and Investment Disputes:			Session for Tribunal Questions	
	Remote:			Cosing Statement by Claimant	
					18
	MR DAVID M BIGGE MR ALVARO J PERALTA				29
				,	32
				Closing Statement by Respondent 4	_
	Court Reporters:				39
	MS DIANA BURDEN, Diana Burden Ltd MS ANN LLOYD			,	47
				-	51
	Interpreters:			-	61
	MS ANA SOPHIA CHAPMAN MS AMALIA DE KLEMM				
	-				
		44.0			447
1	(10.03 am, Wednesday 29 March 2023)	416	1 (	Okay?	<b>417</b> 10:05
2	Closing Statements		2	But before we do that, is there any o	other
3	Session for Tribunal Questions		3 i:	ssue that either side wishes to raise? Claima	ant's
4	PRESIDENT: Good morning, ladies and		4 s	side?	
5	gentlemen. This is the third day and the last day		5	MR BALDWN: There is nothing f	from
6	of our hearing on this matter between			Daimant's side, Mr President.	
	-		7	PRESIDENT: Respondent's side?	
7	Security Services and the government of Colombia.				mina
8	We are here to hear closing arguments		8	MR GONZÁLEZ: Thank you, and good mo	
9	THE INTERPRETER: We have a crackle on the		_	members of the Tribunal. Welcomeall to the	
10	channel.			and final day of this hearing. It does feel lo	-
11	(Technical issue)			than three days, I must say, no matter how	long
12	<b>PRESIDENT:</b> We are here for the last day		12 ł	nearings are.	
13	of our hearing largely to hear from counsel in		13	We do have one housekeeping ma	itter,
14	response to questions the Tribunal has posed, and if		14	think we have been promising and we forgot t	to do
15	there are any other additional matters that either		15 i	t yesterday, which was the point of clarific	ation
16	party wants to raise at this final hour of this			that was asked for and the Tribunal asked tha	
	hearing.			come back with that clarification, so we can	
18	We have seen the exchange of emails			with that separately. It was a point of	
19	between the sides which have come through to us in			clarification on the two slides from the ope	ning
	C			•	0
20	the last 20 minutes or so. I think that we will			presentation, and my partner, Melissa Ordoñez	∠, VVIII
	just proceed on the basis that you will have			deal with that.	
	opportunities, if you wish, to cover things in		22	PRESIDENT: Shall we do that la	ater,
	Post-Hearing Briefs anyway, so what we suggest is we		•	please?	
24	turn, as we did previously, to Claimant to put his		24	MR GONZÁLEZ: If you like, of cours	se.
25	position, and then we will hear from Respondent.		25	Mr Chairman, based on the rulings, we	were

1	supposed, according to PO4, have received the 10:06	1	419 The first question is is there a hierarchy 10:08
2	presentation from Claimant 15 minutes before. We		n the jurisdictional objections or are they
3	still have not received it, and we are now into the		Iternative?
4	hearing.	4	I think as an initial matter, as
5	<b>PRESIDENT:</b> Are we ready to proceed?	5 N	/s Ordoñez stated yesterday, there are 7
6	MR BALDWIN: Yes. Thank you.		urisdictional objections from Respondent. And
7	PRESIDENT: Do you have a paper	-	would just, as an initial matter, talk about proof
8	presentation?		nd how much proof those things that common law
9	. MR BALDWIN: I am sorry, just one moment,		awyers get into and civil law lawyers don't as
10	if I could, Mr President. (Pause)		nuch. I am not going to talk about that, but I will
11	Yes, we will distribute the paper copies.		ay that the burden of proof, that the idea toprove
12	Please. (Same handed)	12 tł	hese jurisdictional objections come on behalf of
13	Closing Statement by Claimant	13 R	espondent, and that means typically we would be
14	by Mr Baldwin		eard, you know, second, after they present those,
15	MR BALDWIN: Good morning, members of the		ut more importantly, each of them has to be proven,
16	tribunal, counsel, parties. It is good to be here	16 e	ach of them has to be demonstrated, and it is their
17	on the third day, and as the President says, the	17 b	urden to do that. It is our view, and we know of
18	final day. So I think 30 minutes is not a lot of	18 n	othing to the contrary, to state that these are
19	time, particularly to lawyers, to do argument like	<b>19</b> a	umulative somehow.
20	this, so we are going to focus mainly on the	20	There are some that might share the same
21	Tribunal's questions, which we feel is the most	21 fa	actual scenarios, but in terms of the cumulative
22	important part, and we may have time to get to some	22 n	ature, we don't think there is one We think each
23	other issues, but certainly in our post-hearing	23 o	f these has to be examined on their own, and of
24	brief we will cover more of the events that occurred	24 ca	ourse it is our view that an examination wouldn't
25	at the hearing.	25 a	ause the Tribunal to uphold any of these, and you
	420		421
1	have seen that in our presentation, we will also $10:09$	1 a	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It $_{10:11}$
1 2	have seen that in our presentation, we will also $10:09$ address it in our post-hearing brief.		an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It $10:11$ ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner
	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09	2 sa	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11
2	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief.	2 sa 3 ai	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner
2 3	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much	2 sa 3 ai 4 th 5 th	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term
2 3 4	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half	2 sa 3 an 4 th 5 th 6 in	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at he time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term hitially agreed []".
2 3 4 5	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see	2 sa 3 ai 4 th 5 th	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term
2 3 4 5 6	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way	2 sa 3 ai 4 th 5 th 6 ir 7 8 is	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a
2 3 4 5 6 7	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we	2 sa 3 ai 4 tř 5 tř 6 ir 7 8 is 9 tě	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a term of ten years which will run from the date of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind	2 sa 3 ai 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 8 is 9 te 10 th	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a erm of ten years which will run from the date of he authorisation given by ICANN to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties	2 sa 3 an 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 8 is 9 ta 10 th 11 a	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a term of ten years which will run from the date of he authorisation given by ICANIN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009	2 sa 3 an 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 8 is 9 ta 10 th 11 ca 12 th	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a term of ten years which will run from the date of he authorisation given by ICANN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of ne domain". It goes on with something that is not
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009 contract "may be renewed" is affected by the	2 sa 3 an 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 8 is 9 ta 10 th 11 ca 12 th 13 a	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a term of ten years which will run from the date of he authorisation given by ICANN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of ne domain". It goes on with something that is not is relevant to this conversation.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009 contract "may be renewed" is affected by the reference to "the legislation in force at the time	2 sa 3 an 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 8 is 9 ta 10 th 11 ca 12 th 13 a 14	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a erm of ten years which will run from the date of he authorisation given by ICANN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of ne domain". It goes on with something that is not is relevant to this conversation. So the lead-in paragraph of article 4
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009 contract "may be renewed" is affected by the reference to "the legislation in force at the time of the renewal"?	2 sa 3 au 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 8 is 9 ta 10 th 11 au 12 th 13 au 14 15 m	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a term of ten years which will run from the date of he authorisation given by ICANN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of ne domain". It goes on with something that is not is relevant to this conversation. So the lead-in paragraph of article 4 memorialises an obligation on the part of both
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009 contract "may be renewed" is affected by the reference to "the legislation in force at the time of the renewal"? This is the language from Law 1065 of 2006	2 sa 3 au 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 8 is 9 ta 10 th 11 α 12 th 13 a 14 15 m 16 p	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a term of ten years which will run from the date of he authorisation given by ICANN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of ne domain". It goes on with something that is not is relevant to this conversation. So the lead-in paragraph of article 4 nemorialises an obligation on the part of both arties: a concession contract for ten years.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009 contract "may be renewed" is affected by the reference to "the legislation in force at the time of the renewal"? This is the language from Law 1065 of 2006 which was the legislation in place at the time the	2 sa 3 au 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 8 is 9 ta 10 th 11 α 12 th 13 au 14 15 n 16 p 17	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a erm of ten years which will run from the date of he authorisation given by ICANN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of ne domain". It goes on with something that is not is relevant to this conversation. So the lead-in paragraph of article 4 nemorialises an obligation on the part of both arties: a concession contract for ten years. The obligation in the second paragraph of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009 contract "may be renewed" is affected by the reference to "the legislation in force at the time of the renewal"? This is the language from Law 1065 of 2006 which was the legislation in place at the time the concession was entered into and the 2009 concession	2 sa 3 au 4 th 5 th 6 ir 7 8 is 9 ta 10 th 11 au 12 th 13 au 14 15 n 16 p 17 18 au	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a erm of ten years which will run from the date of he authorisation given by ICANN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of ne domain". It goes on with something that is not is relevant to this conversation. So the lead-in paragraph of article 4 nemorialises an obligation on the part of both arties: a concession contract for ten years. The obligation in the second paragraph of rticle 4 denotes an ability or power. And we are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009 contract "may be renewed" is affected by the reference to "the legislation in force at the time of the renewal"? This is the language from Law 1065 of 2006 which was the legislation in place at the time the concession was entered into and the 2009 concession was entered into, and as you will see the	2 sa 3 au 4 th 5 th 6 ir 7 8 is 9 ta 10 th 11 α 12 th 13 au 14 n 15 n 16 p 17 18 au 19 g	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a erm of ten years which will run from the date of he authorisation given by ICANN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of ne domain". It goes on with something that is not is relevant to this conversation. So the lead-in paragraph of article 4 memorialises an obligation on the part of both arties: a concession contract for ten years. The obligation in the second paragraph of rticle 4 denotes an ability or power. And we are oing to get to this automatic renewal issue in a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009 contract "may be renewed" is affected by the reference to "the legislation in force at the time of the renewal"? This is the language from Law 1065 of 2006 which was the legislation in place at the time the concession was entered into and the 2009 concession was entered into, and as you will see the highlighted portion here, it says: "In this case,	2 sa 3 an 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 8 is 9 ta 10 th 11 a 12 th 13 a 14 15 n 16 p 17 18 an 19 g 20 m	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a term of ten years which will run from the date of he authorisation given by ICANIN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of ne domain". It goes on with something that is not is relevant to this conversation. So the lead-in paragraph of article 4 nemorialises an obligation on the part of both arties: a concession contract for ten years. The obligation in the second paragraph of rticle 4 denotes an ability or power. And we are oing to get to this automatic renewal issue in a noment that the Respondent has repeated, but it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009 contract "may be renewed" is affected by the reference to "the legislation in force at the time of the renewal"? This is the language from Law 1065 of 2006 which was the legislation in place at the time the concession was entered into and the 2009 concession was entered into, and as you will see the highlighted portion here, it says: "In this case, the duration of the agreement may be for up to 10	2 sa 3 an 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 sis 9 ta 10 th 11 ca 12 th 13 a 14 n 15 n 16 p 17 18 an 19 g <sup>o</sup> 20 m 21 an	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a term of ten years which will run from the date of he authorisation given by ICANIN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of ne domain". It goes on with something that is not is relevant to this conversation. So the lead-in paragraph of article 4 nemorialises an obligation on the part of both arties: a concession contract for ten years. The obligation in the second paragraph of rticle 4 denotes an ability or power. And we are oing to get to this automatic renewal issue in a noment that the Respondent has repeated, but it is n ability or power to do it in the manner and terms
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009 contract "may be renewed" is affected by the reference to "the legislation in force at the time of the renewal"? This is the language from Law 1065 of 2006 which was the legislation in place at the time the concession was entered into and the 2009 concession was entered into, and as you will see the highlighted portion here, it says: "In this case, the duration of the agreement may be for up to 10 years, renewable on one occasion only, for a term	2 sa 3 au 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 8 is 9 ta 10 th 11 a 12 th 13 a 14 15 n 16 p 17 18 au 19 g 20 n 21 au 22 e	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner nd terms established by the legislation in force at ne time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of he renewal] may not be inferior to the term nitially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a erm of ten years which will run from the date of he authorisation given by ICANIN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of ne domain". It goes on with something that is not is relevant to this conversation. So the lead-in paragraph of article 4 nemorialises an obligation on the part of both arties: a concession contract for ten years. The obligation in the second paragraph of rticle 4 denotes an ability or power. And we are oing to get to this automatic renewal issue in a noment that the Respondent has repeated, but it is n ability or power to do it in the manner and terms stablished by the legislation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009 contract "may be renewed" is affected by the reference to "the legislation in force at the time of the renewal"? This is the language from Law 1065 of 2006 which was the legislation in place at the time the concession was entered into and the 2009 concession was entered into, and as you will see the highlighted portion here, it says: "In this case, the duration of the agreement may be for up to 10 years, renewable on one occasion only, for a term equal to the original term".	2 sa 3 au 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 8 is 9 ta 10 th 11 au 12 th 13 au 14 15 m 16 p 17 18 au 19 g 20 m 21 au 22 eu 23	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner ind terms established by the legislation in force at the time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of the renewal] may not be inferior to the term initially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a term of ten years which will run from the date of the authorisation given by ICANN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of the domain". It goes on with something that is not is relevant to this conversation. So the lead-in paragraph of article 4 memorialises an obligation on the part of both arties: a concession contract for ten years. The obligation in the second paragraph of rticle 4 denotes an ability or power. And we are oing to get to this automatic renewal issue in a moment that the Respondent has repeated, but it is n ability or power to do it in the manner and terms stablished by the legislation. If the only thing that mattered was the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009 contract "may be renewed" is affected by the reference to "the legislation in force at the time of the renewal"? This is the language from Law 1065 of 2006 which was the legislation in place at the time the concession was entered into and the 2009 concession was entered into, and as you will see the highlighted portion here, it says: "In this case, the duration of the agreement may be for up to 10 years, renewable on one occasion only, for a term equal to the original term". And then if you go to the concession, and	2 sc 3 au 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 8 is 9 te 10 th 11 au 12 th 13 au 14 15 n 16 p 17 18 au 19 ge 20 m 21 au 22 eu 23 24 le	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner ind terms established by the legislation in force at the time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of the renewal] may not be inferior to the term initially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a term of ten years which will run from the date of the authorisation given by ICANN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of the domain". It goes on with something that is not is relevant to this conversation. So the lead-in paragraph of article 4 memorialises an obligation on the part of both arties: a concession contract for ten years. The obligation in the second paragraph of rticle 4 denotes an ability or power. And we are oing to get to this automatic renewal issue in a noment that the Respondent has repeated, but it is in ability or power to do it in the manner and terms stablished by the legislation. If the only thing that mattered was the egislation, this contract clause, the dause in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009 contract "may be renewed" is affected by the reference to "the legislation in force at the time of the renewal"? This is the language from Law 1065 of 2006 which was the legislation in place at the time the concession was entered into and the 2009 concession was entered into, and as you will see the highlighted portion here, it says: "In this case, the duration of the agreement may be for up to 10 years, renewable on one occasion only, for a term equal to the original term".	2 sc 3 au 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 8 is 9 te 10 th 11 au 12 th 13 au 14 15 n 16 p 17 18 au 19 ge 20 m 21 au 22 eu 23 24 le	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner ind terms established by the legislation in force at the time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of the renewal] may not be inferior to the term initially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a term of ten years which will run from the date of the authorisation given by ICANN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of the domain". It goes on with something that is not is relevant to this conversation. So the lead-in paragraph of article 4 memorialises an obligation on the part of both arties: a concession contract for ten years. The obligation in the second paragraph of rticle 4 denotes an ability or power. And we are oing to get to this automatic renewal issue in a moment that the Respondent has repeated, but it is n ability or power to do it in the manner and terms stablished by the legislation. If the only thing that mattered was the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have seen that in our presentation, we will also 10:09 address it in our post-hearing brief. Because the parties have given so much attention to the jurisdictional objections they have become half of this proceeding, and you can even see that from today. You will see that they occupy half of these, so we think they have been given an outsized part to this proceeding, because of the way Respondent has pled them and argued them, so we would just ask the Tribunal to keep that in mind Question 2. How do the parties respectively consider that the language of the 2009 contract "may be renewed" is affected by the reference to "the legislation in force at the time of the renewal"? This is the language from Law 1065 of 2006 which was the legislation in place at the time the concession was entered into and the 2009 concession was entered into, and as you will see the highlighted portion here, it says: "In this case, the duration of the agreement may be for up to 10 years, renewable on one occasion only, for a term equal to the original term". And then if you go to the concession, and	2 sc 3 au 4 th 5 th 6 in 7 8 is 9 te 10 th 11 au 12 th 13 au 14 15 n 16 p 17 18 au 19 ge 20 m 21 au 22 eu 23 24 le	an see the paragraph that is underlined here. It 10:11 ays: "the agreed term may be renewed in the manner ind terms established by the legislation in force at the time of the renewal". And then: "The term [of the renewal] may not be inferior to the term initially agreed []". The lead-in paragraph of validity and term s: "The present concession contract will have a term of ten years which will run from the date of the authorisation given by ICANN to the oncessionaire for the carrying out of activities of the domain". It goes on with something that is not is relevant to this conversation. So the lead-in paragraph of article 4 memorialises an obligation on the part of both arties: a concession contract for ten years. The obligation in the second paragraph of rticle 4 denotes an ability or power. And we are oing to get to this automatic renewal issue in a noment that the Respondent has repeated, but it is in ability or power to do it in the manner and terms stablished by the legislation. If the only thing that mattered was the egislation, this contract clause, the dause in the

1	is meant to have meaning that is outside of the law	<b>422</b>	1	obviously we have the minimum standard of treatment, 10:1	23
2	because otherwise the law would be what the law is.	10.12	2	but we also have national treatment and those other	
3	Everyone knows that the law applies if it applies.		3	provisions which aren't relevant to an analysis of	
4	There is nothing about article 4 in the concession		4	law in Colombia.	
5	that would make the law apply. If the law applies		5	And we saw that with the witnesses,	
6	it applies, so there is nothing about that part that		6	particularly yesterday. Ms Trujillo, former	
7	says anything distinct.		7	Minister Constaín, when asked about what they looked	
8	Therefore we think that article 4 promises		8	at in terms of the renewal, it was what does	
9	something reasonably concrete. It doesn't promise		9	Colombian law say? And neither of them talked about	
10	an automatic extension we have not said it did		10	•	
-	but it promises a one-time term extension of ten			to get to a little of that.	
	years and implies a means to get it, and subject to		12	So, as you see from article 2, going to	
	the limitation that it has exercised in accordance			the law now for a moment, the language of article 2	
14	with the legislation.		14		
15	And that means to get it is something that		15	on one occasion "for a term equal to the original	
	arises both under Colombian law and Colombian			term", and then this also reflects, as I said, the	
17	practice, and Colombian customs, the way they treat		17	standard practice in Colombian law as recognised by	
18	other investors. We are not before the		18	the advisory committee on 18-19 March, where it	
19	constitutional court in Colombia arguing for a		19	says: "The Chief of the Legal Advisory Office,	
	renewal. If we were, the rights that are afforded			Dr Ricardo Arias, stated that 'although the legal	
	to other investors, the treatment that Colombia			and conventional norms have opened the possibility	
	routinely gives investors would not be relevant			of extending or renewing"	
	before the constitutional court. But it is		23	And I have hinted at this before but, just	
	certainly relevant to this Tribunal under the TPA in			to be clear, we have never asked for an automatic	
25	terms of how other investors are treated, and		25	renewal. There has been a lot of discussion about	
1	automatic ropound and accortions, statements by	424	1	not what the Tribural in this case door. You have 1	25
1	automatic renewal and assertions, statements by	<b>424</b> 10:15	1	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1	<b>25</b>
2	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the	<b>424</b> 10:15	2	to look at other factors, because the claims, the	<b>25</b>
2 3	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer	<b>424</b> 10:15	2 3	to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely	<b>25</b> 17
2 3 4	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an	<b>424</b> 10:15	2 3 4	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different.	<b>25</b> 17
2 3 4 5	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she	<b>424</b> 10:15	2 3 4 5	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law	<b>25</b> 17
2 3 4 5 6	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not	<b>424</b> 10:15	2 3 4 5 6	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the	25 17
2 3 4 5 6 7	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant.	<b>424</b> 10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration?	<b>25</b> 17
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to	<b>25</b> 17
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc?	25
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v	<b>25</b>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is	25 17
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis of its law in a hearing under the TPA in which they	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is fairly non-objectionable jurisdiction is	25
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis of its law in a hearing under the TPA in which they can argue that.	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is fairly non-objectionable jurisdiction is determined by international law whether there is	<b>25</b> <sup>17</sup>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis of its law in a hearing under the TPA in which they can argue that.	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is fairly non-objectionable jurisdiction is	<b>25</b> 17
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis of its law in a hearing under the TPA in which they can argue that. And I make this point, and I briefly made it the first day, but I think it bears repeating:	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is fairly non-objectionable jurisdiction is determined by international law whether there is jurisdiction in this case, whether this Tribunal is competent to hear these claims. This is CL-106 in	25
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis of its law in a hearing under the TPA in which they can argue that. And I make this point, and I briefly made	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is fairly non-objectionable jurisdiction is determined by international law whether there is jurisdiction in this case, whether this Tribunal is	25
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis of its law in a hearing under the TPA in which they can argue that. And I make this point, and I briefly made it the first day, but I think it bears repeating: Even when a state applies its law in a manner, let's	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is fairly non-objectionable jurisdiction is determined by international law whether there is jurisdiction in this case, whether this Tribunal is competent to hear these claims. This is CL-106 in the record, quote from Daimler.	25
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis of its law in a hearing under the TPA in which they can argue that. And I make this point, and I briefly made it the first day, but I think it bears repeating: Even when a state applies its law in a manner, let's say, as written, and we don't agree that they have	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is fairly non-objectionable jurisdiction is determined by international law whether there is jurisdiction in this case, whether this Tribunal is competent to hear these claims. This is CL-106 in the record, quote from Daimler. The TPA is rather clear about the	25
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis of its law in a hearing under the TPA in which they can argue that. And I make this point, and I briefly made it the first day, but I think it bears repeating: Even when a state applies its law in a manner, let's say, as written, and we don't agree that they have even done that, but even if Colombia were to say the	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is fairly non-objectionable jurisdiction is determined by international law whether there is jurisdiction in this case, whether this Tribunal is competent to hear these claims. This is CL-106 in the record, quote from Daimler. The TPA is rather clear about the jurisdiction both the TPA at article 10.28 and	25
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis of its law in a hearing under the TPA in which they can argue that. And I make this point, and I briefly made it the first day, but I think it bears repeating: Even when a state applies its law in a manner, let's say, as written, and we don't agree that they have even done that, but even if Colombia were to say the law says this, the concession says this, and so	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is fairly non-objectionable jurisdiction is determined by international law whether there is jurisdiction in this case, whether this Tribunal is competent to hear these claims. This is CL-106 in the record, quote from Daimler. The TPA is rather clear about the jurisdiction both the TPA at article 10.28 and article 25 of the ICSID Convention both are clear	25
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis of its law in a hearing under the TPA in which they can argue that. And I make this point, and I briefly made it the first day, but I think it bears repeating: Even when a state applies its law in a manner, let's say, as written, and we don't agree that they have even done that, but even if Colombia were to say the law says this, the concession says this, and so therefore we have a right to apply it that way, that	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is fairly non-objectionable jurisdiction is determined by international law whether there is jurisdiction in this case, whether this Tribunal is competent to hear these claims. This is CL-106 in the record, quote from Daimler. The TPA is rather clear about the jurisdiction both the TPA at article 10.28 and article 25 of the ICSID Convention both are clear in terms of "the jurisdiction of the Centre shall	25
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis of its law in a hearing under the TPA in which they can argue that. And I make this point, and I briefly made it the first day, but I think it bears repeating: Even when a state applies its law in a manner, let's say, as written, and we don't agree that they have even done that, but even if Colombia were to say the law says this, the concession says this, and so therefore we have a right to apply it that way, that might be the beginning of the analysis, even if they	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is fairly non-objectionable jurisdiction is determined by international law whether there is jurisdiction in this case, whether this Tribunal is competent to hear these claims. This is CL-106 in the record, quote from Daimler. The TPA is rather clear about the jurisdiction both the TPA at article 10.28 and article 25 of the ICSID Convention both are clear in terms of "the jurisdiction of the Centre shall extend to any legal dispute arising directly out of	25
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis of its law in a hearing under the TPA in which they can argue that. And I make this point, and I briefly made it the first day, but I think it bears repeating: Even when a state applies its law in a manner, let's say, as written, and we don't agree that they have even done that, but even if Colombia were to say the law says this, the concession says this, and so therefore we have a right to apply it that way, that might be the beginning of the analysis, even if they were correct, but it is certainly not the end of the analysis.	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is fairly non-objectionable jurisdiction is determined by international law whether there is jurisdiction in this case, whether this Tribunal is competent to hear these claims. This is CL-106 in the record, quote from Daimler. The TPA is rather clear about the jurisdiction both the TPA at article 10.28 and article 25 of the ICSID Convention both are clear in terms of "the jurisdiction of the Centre shall extend to any legal dispute arising directly out of an investment." There is a requirement. We don't	25
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis of its law in a hearing under the TPA in which they can argue that. And I make this point, and I briefly made it the first day, but I think it bears repeating: Even when a state applies its law in a manner, let's say, as written, and we don't agree that they have even done that, but even if Colombia were to say the law says this, the concession says this, and so therefore we have a right to apply it that way, that might be the beginning of the analysis, even if they were correct, but it is certainly not the end of the analysis.	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is fairly non-objectionable jurisdiction is determined by international law whether there is jurisdiction in this case, whether this Tribunal is competent to hear these claims. This is CL-106 in the record, quote from Daimler. The TPA is rather clear about the jurisdiction both the TPA at article 10.28 and article 25 of the ICSID Convention both are clear in terms of "the jurisdiction of the Centre shall extend to any legal dispute arising directly out of an investment." There is a requirement. We don't think there is a big question that this requirement	25
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Respondent that automatic renewals are against the law, and as you can see from Ms Trujillo's answer yesterday, I asked, "Was .CO Internet asking for an automatic renewal of the 2009 corcession?" and she said "No." So that is a red herring, it is not relevant. The question is what is Colombian practice? How does it treat – the question for this Tribunal is what is Colombia's practice, how does it administer this law, not a post-hoc analysis of its law in a hearing under the TPA in which they can argue that. And I make this point, and I briefly made it the first day, but I think it bears repeating: Even when a state applies its law in a manner, let's say, as written, and we don't agree that they have even done that, but even if Colombia were to say the law says this, the concession says this, and so therefore we have a right to apply it that way, that might be the beginning of the analysis, even if they were correct, but it is certainly not the end of the analysis. Again, that might be what the	10:15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	not what the Tribunal in this case does. You have 10:1 to look at other factors, because the claims, the law, the way the law is applied, is completely different. Question No 3: What is the applicable law to determine who is the proper Claimant in the arbitration? Does the Tribunal have jurisdiction to make an award against Neustar Inc? We have this quote up here from Daimler v Argentina making clear that jurisdiction this is fairly non-objectionable jurisdiction is determined by international law whether there is jurisdiction in this case, whether this Tribunal is competent to hear these claims. This is CL-106 in the record, quote from Daimler. The TPA is rather clear about the jurisdiction both the TPA at article 10.28 and article 25 of the ICSID Convention both are clear in terms of "the jurisdiction of the Centre shall extend to any legal dispute arising directly out of an investment." There is a requirement. We don't think there is a big question that this requirement has been met. So jurisdiction is determined by	25

0000				Weakeday, 20 March, 202
1	The question of the effect of the unit	426	1	427 assets, and if we look at Annex 1 it talks about 10:20
2	purchase agreement and how that might affect the	10:18	2	this daim.
2	international law jurisdictional analysis we believe		3	Now this is really a matter of law
4	is governed by the laws of Delaware, which is the		4	question, and the question is does the Tribunal have
5	state in the United States in which both Neustar Inc		5	power to issue an award against Neustar Inc?
6	and Security Services LLC are both headquartered, as		6	I don't believe they do, and we are not arguing that
7	well as plenty of other US corporations. It is a		7	as how dare they or anything else. It is a legal
8	very common place for US corporations to be		8	question that has been asked. I am giving you a
9	domiciled, to be incorporated.		9	legal answer and the legal answer is that I do not
10	We believe that the Delaware law would		10	believe the Tribunal has power to issue an award
	govern the effect of the UPA, much like the		11	against Neustar Inc.
	existence of an entity. There was a question		12	The owners of the Claimant, Golden Gate
	whether or not a corporation or a corporate entity		13	Capital, they owned Neustar Inc in the same
14				percentage that they owned Security Services. Sold
15	proceeding, the question of its existence would			Neustar Inc and its fraud marketing and
16	likely go to the domestic law, the law of the			communication businesses, including the rights to
17	incorporation of the entity.			the name Neustar to TransUnion, and this comes
18	And you can see from the Unit Purchase		18	directly out of our letters here, the first one
19	Agreement, which the Respondent has had for many			
20	months now, it says "Neustar Security Services	5	20	Although TransUnion now holds the rights
	retained the rights to this arbitration as		21	to the name, Neustar is currently formulated as an
22	Claimant". You can look at the transferred security		22	independent, third party company. This is from our
23	assets in the definitions and it says that Neustar's		23	letter of 15 September 2022, and we included a link
24	group retains title to things and then it lists the		24	to SEC filings that reflect and talk about this
25	items listed under Annex 1 of transferred security		25	sale.
1	Neustar has no rights and/or obligations	<b>428</b>	1	429 I am going to turn this over, you have 10:23
2	in this proceeding, unlike Neustar Security Services		2	heard from me too much the last three days, so I am
3	which retained the rights to the arbitration, which		3	going to turn this next question over to my
4	are the same owners, and therefore we don't believe	2	4	colleague, Ms Baldwin.
5	that the Tribunal has competence to issue an award		5	by Ms Baldwin
6	against Neustar. Again, this is an answer to a		6	MS BALDWIN: Thank you. Good morning,
7	legal question and I do believe that is the correct		7	everyone.
8	answer.		8	So I went through a couple of days ago the
9	In any event, Respondent's request for		9	background of some of these issues in detail so
10	costs against Neustar, made for the first time at		10	I don't want to repeat myself, but I have just put a
	this hearing, we think are untimely, and you can see		11	couple of slides up here so it is easier to
12	the relief requested from Respondent's Rejoinder.		12	reference.
13	Remember, Respondent had a full opportunity to brief		13	The first is, as we discussed on Monday,
14	this in their Rejoinder, and that relief asked to		14	article 10.18(3) deals with interim injunctive
15	order Claimant to pay all costs. And Claimant in		15	relief, and it specifies that the nature of the
16	the Rejoinder is defined, when you look at the	•	16	available relief is determined by domestic law,
17	capital C for the Claimant, and you look up in the	!	17	first and foremost, and as we mentioned, this is
18	Rejoinder, it lists Neustar Security Services or		18	confirmed by the United States in their
19			19	non-disputing party submission. And I apologise, it
20	Security Services LLC d/b/a Neustar		20	has just been pointed out that I didn't state that
	Security Services LLC d/b/a Neustar Security Services, that is the Claimant.			
21	Security Services, that is the Claimant. And recall this letter from ICSID,			we are on Question 4 for the record. So my
21 22	Security Services, that is the Claimant. And recall this letter from ICSID, 8 August 2022, saying: "Unless we hear otherwise		22	apologies, but we are on Question 4.
21 22 23	Security Services, that is the Claimant. And recall this letter from ICSID, 8 August 2022, saying: "Unless we hear otherwise from the parties by 15 August 2022", they were going		22 23	apologies, but we are on Question 4. So in looking at domestic law, you will
21 22 23 24	Security Services, that is the Claimant. And recall this letter from ICSID, 8 August 2022, saying: "Unless we hear otherwise from the parties by 15 August 2022', they were going to proceed to update the record of the arbitration.		22 23 24	apologies, but we are on Question 4. So in looking at domestic law, you will recall that we looked at Chapter Eleven of the
21 22 23 24	Security Services, that is the Claimant. And recall this letter from ICSID, 8 August 2022, saying: "Unless we hear otherwise from the parties by 15 August 2022", they were going		22 23 24	apologies, but we are on Question 4. So in looking at domestic law, you will
21 22 23 24	Security Services, that is the Claimant. And recall this letter from ICSID, 8 August 2022, saying: "Unless we hear otherwise from the parties by 15 August 2022', they were going to proceed to update the record of the arbitration.		22 23 24	apologies, but we are on Question 4. So in looking at domestic law, you will recall that we looked at ChapterEleven of the
21 22 23 24	Security Services, that is the Claimant. And recall this letter from ICSID, 8 August 2022, saying: "Unless we hear otherwise from the parties by 15 August 2022', they were going to proceed to update the record of the arbitration.		22 23 24	apologies, but we are on Question 4. So in looking at domestic law, you will recall that we looked at ChapterEleven of the

		1 IIIdi		weullesday, 29 Mai Cil, 2023
-		430	-	the Martin Deviction of Coloration to formation the 431
1	expressly provides for interim relief, and sets out	10:24		the MinTIC-Republic of Colombia to formalise the 10:26
2	the types of interim relief that may be available,		2	extension. And the reason for this was to preserve
3	including, in subsection 4 to: "order the adoption		3	the Claimant's rights during the pendency of the
4	of an administrative decision to avoid or		4	arbitration.
5	prevent aggravation of its effects", and subsection		5	As you can imagine, Claimant's rights
6	5, to "issue orders to impose obligations to take		6	would not be effectively preserved if Respondent
7	action or not take action".		7	were able to tender the concessionto another entity
8	And as we discussed, the Claimant		8	during the pendency of the arbitration Ms Trujillo
9	formulated its request for interim measures,		9	in her witness statement talks about the complexity
10	including request 5, which is the subject of the		10	of the tender process in Colombia and unwindinga
11	Tribunal's Question 4 here today, in line with these		11	concession tendered to another entity would be
12	domestic provisions. As you will see, the request		12	extremely difficult, and perhaps impossible, whereas
13	specified that the Council of State order the		13	Neustar's request or the Claimant's request to
14	Colombian State sorry, the request asked the		14	preserve its investment pending the outcome of the
15	Council of State my apologies I want to make		15	arbitration could be revisited in light of the final
16	clear that I am not saying the court found this, so		16	award, and that is because interim measures ordered
17	I will start again.		17	under Chapter Eleven of the CCAP are not permanent
18	The request on behalf of the Claimant			and may be revoked or modified. That is under
19	asked the Colombian Council of State to order the			article 235 of the CCAP, which is exhibit C-113
20	Colombian State not to aggravate the international		20	In that respect, if the Claimant really
	investment dispute to preserve the concession until			were making an election of a fork in the road
	the end of the international investment dispute			provision, it would make little sense to use that
	under section B of the FTA.			mechanism as a final means of relief when it could
24	It is within that context that the			be revoked or modified at any time, as the
	Claimant asked for request No 5, which was to order			Respondent suggests.
25	call talk as to request the s, which was to order		25	hespondent suggests.
1	Finally, in any event, request 5 is	<b>432</b> 10:27	1	433 the Respondent – whether their actions are wrongful 10:28
2	separate from the claims in issue in these		2	we can debate – but the actions that were
3	proceedings. Contractual claims, as we also		3	challenging commenced in late 2018, 18 months prior
4	discussed on Monday, are different from treaty		4	to the Award of the 2020 concession. Contrary to
5	claims, meaning that even if there had been or there		5	one of Respondent's jurisdictional arguments that
6	currently was a recourse to the local courts for a		6	this was brought too early, once Respondent stated
7	breach of contract, which to be clear there is not,		7	that it was not going to renew the concession, and
8	this would not prevent the submission of treaty		8	it was proceeding with the tender, putting aside all
9	claims to arbitration under a fork in the road		9	the deprivations of due process, the lack of candour
10	clause, being annex 10-G of the TPA.		10	and the administrative tribunal, all the other
11	Just to confirm, the Claimant has not		11	issues that we are talking about, the daims were
12	requested that this Tribunal order the Respondent to		12	finalised and concrete, so all this happened prior
13	formalise the concession or any other relief		13	to the Award of the 2020 concession.
14	relating to that document. Instead, the Claimant		14	I point out one aspect of this,
15	asked for compensation and damages for the		15	I mentioned the other day, is that the new tender
16	Respondent's violation of the TPA and principles of		16	pardon, my apologies to KIA, the car company, and
17	customary international law.		17	I hope no one in our firm represents them, but a KIA
18	I will hand you back to Mr Baldwin.		18	and a Lamborghini are not the same car. If you
19	by Mr Baldwin		19	promise someone a Lamborghini and you deliver them a
20	MR BALDWIN: Thank you.		20	used KIA, and you say "I told you I'd give you a
21	Now we are on Question 5, which is what is		21	car", it is just not the same. This is I think a
22	the effect on the parties' positions of .CO Internet		22	most basic concept: a ten-year concession versus a
23	SAS having been assigned a new contract on		23	five-year contract, economic terms that are
24				
24	3 April 2020?		24	drastically different. This is not the same thing.
24 25			24 25	drastically different. This is not the same thing. Now, is there some relevancy to it? Yes.
	3 April 2020?			

	1	When we are back here in a year and a half in the $10:30$	1	here but that can happen. 435
	2	damages phase, I think that this becomes relevant at	2	So this issue is a question of damages and
	3	that point. This is a set-off. This is what you	3	not a question of whether or not they are doing it,
	4	have, when your damages experts look at the	4	and I will point out that Neustar and .CO Internet
	5	profitability and they say this is what the	5	were trying to mitigate these damages.
	6	profitability of this 5-year contract is, and this	6	Had they not bid on that tender, even
	7	is the economics of this, this is what the	7	though the tender was in a much worse position for
	8	profitability would have been under the 10-year	8	them, I have no doubt that the Respondent would be
	9	concession.	9	here stating well, they had an opportunity to bid on
	10	We can argue about that, and yes of	10	the tender but didn't, therefore they have waived
		course, to the extent that profit is shown from this	11	the right to complain that they should have won the
		5-year concession, that reduces the amount of	12	tender or they should have had the concession. That
		damages. But it doesn't and it can't reduce the	13	argument would have been made, so there was really
		claim. Even when you have situations where some		no choice here, for reasons we have laid out in the
		mining licences are wrongfully terminated or some	15	pleading, for .CO Internet to bid on this. But they
		permit is wrongfully denied in violation of these	16	bid on a KIA and not a Lamborghini.
		international obligations. And even if later that	17	Please, Mr President?
		permit or that licence is granted, or returned, that	18	PRESIDENT: Go ahead.
		doesn't erase the wrongful conduct of the actions.	19	<b>MR BALDWIN:</b> I have five minutes left and
	20	Now it might erase damages, and there are	20	I will go through a few of these slides. As
		cases my friend, José Alberro, a damages expert,		I mentioned, in our post-hearing brief we will lay
		probably known to you all, had a case where he was		out the full events that happened at this hearing,
		representing the Respondent and the Respondent was	23	but the Respondent has given basically two reasons
		found liable, meaning they had wrongful acts, but	24	
		the damages were zero. Now that is not the case	25	Respondent has given two reasons why they
	25	the damages were zero. Now that is not the case	25	Respondent has given two reasons why they
		436		437
		felt they had to do to a concession, two or three, $10:33$	1	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution. 437
	2	felt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they	2	And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit
	2 3	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you	2 3	And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says:
	2 3 4	felt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's	2 3 4	And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: ''The Ministry of Communications: entity
	2 3 4 5	felt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total	2 3 4 5	And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co
	2 3 4 5 6	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what	2 3 4 5 6	And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry
	2 3 4 5 6 7	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO	2 3 4 5	And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry of Communications is responsible for defining and
	2 3 4 5 7 8	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry of Communications is responsible for defining and approving the policy for the delegation of domain
	2 4 5 7 8 9	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so	2 3 5 6 7 8 9	And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry of Communications is responsible for defining and approving the policy for the delegation of domain names under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercising
:	2 4 5 7 8 9	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution.       10:35         And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit       R-25, it says:         "The Ministry of Communications: entity         known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co         ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry         of Communications is responsible for defining and         approving the policy for the delegation of domain         names under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercising         control and supervision over the entire model,
	2 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution. 10:35 And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry of Communications is responsible for defining and approving the policy for the delegation of domain names under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercising control and supervision over the entire model, including the approval of procedures and registrars
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution. 10:35 And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry of Communications is responsible for defining and approving the policy for the delegation of domain names under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercising control and supervision over the entire model, including the approval of procedures and registrars for their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry must
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia. Well, and this is noted from Respondent's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution. 10:35 And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry of Communications is responsible for defining and approving the policy for the delegation of domain names under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercising control and supervision over the entire model, including the approval of procedures and registrars for their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry must lead the representation of the government of the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia. Well, and this is noted from Respondent's opening presentation, slide 10, this is their slide	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution. 10:35 And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry of Communications is responsible for defining and approving the policy for the delegation of domain names under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercising control and supervision over the entire model, including the approval of procedures and registrars for their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry must lead the representation of the government of the Republic of Colombia before the ICANN Government
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia. Well, and this is noted from Respondent's opening presentation, slide 10, this is their slide on the screen here, and they say the 2009 contract	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution. 10:35 And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry of Communications is responsible for defining and approving the policy for the delegation of domain names under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercising control and supervision over the entire model, including the approval of procedures and registrars for their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry must lead the representation of the government of the Republic of Colombia before the ICANN Government Advisory Committee".
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia. Well, and this is noted from Respondent's opening presentation, slide 10, this is their slide on the screen here, and they say the 2009 contract and accompanying documents granted .CO Internet	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry of Communications is responsible for defining and approving the policy for the delegation of domain names under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercising control and supervision over the entire model, including the approval of procedures and registrars for their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry must lead the representation of the government of the Republic of Colombia before the ICANN Government Advisory Committee". So the concession doesn't say look, the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia. Well, and this is noted from Respondent's opening presentation, slide 10, this is their slide on the screen here, and they say the 2009 contract and accompanying documents granted .CO Internet extensive freedom of operation, and they list here	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution.10:35And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibitR-25, it says:"The Ministry of Communications: entityknown as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .coccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministryof Communications is responsible for defining andapproving the policy for the delegation of domainnames under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercisingcontrol and supervision over the entire model,including the approval of procedures and registrarsfor their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry mustlead the representation of the government of theRepublic of Colombia before the ICANN GovernmentAdvisory Committee".So the concession doesn't say look, theconcessionaire gets all the rights to talk with
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia. Well, and this is noted from Respondent's opening presentation, slide 10, this is their slide on the screen here, and they say the 2009 contract and accompanying documents granted .CO Internet extensive freedom of operation, and they list here that .CO Internet even responsible for managing the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution. 10:35 And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry of Communications is responsible for defining and approving the policy for the delegation of domain names under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercising control and supervision over the entire model, including the approval of procedures and registrars for their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry must lead the representation of the government of the Republic of Colombia before the ICANN Government Advisory Committee". So the concession doesn't say look, the concessionaire gets all the rights to talk with ICANN, and we have shown previously the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 17 17 16 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia. Well, and this is noted from Respondent's opening presentation, slide 10, this is their slide on the screen here, and they say the 2009 contract and accompanying documents granted .CO Internet extensive freedom of operation, and they list here that .CO Internet even responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution.       10:35         And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit       R-25, it says:         "The Ministry of Communications: entity       known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co         ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry       of communications is responsible for defining and         approving the policy for the delegation of domain       names under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercising         control and supervision over the entire model,       including the approval of procedures and registrars         for their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry must       lead the representation of the government of the         Republic of Colombia before the ICANN Government       Advisory Committee".         So the concession doesn't say look, the       concessionaire gets all the rights to talk with         ICANN, and we have shown previously – the       testimony, for example, of Mr Castaño – that he
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \end{array}$	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia. Well, and this is noted from Respondent's opening presentation, slide 10, this is their slide on the screen here, and they say the 2009 contract and accompanying documents granted .CO Internet extensive freedom of operation, and they list here that .CO Internet even responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia. But, if you look at the cite for that, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution.       10:35         And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit       R-25, it says:         "The Ministry of Communications: entity       known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co         ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry       of communications is responsible for defining and         approving the policy for the delegation of domain       names under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercising         control and supervision over the entire model,       including the approval of procedures and registrars         for their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry must       lead the representation of the government of the         Republic of Colombia before the ICANN Government       Actvisory Committee".         So the concession doesn't say look, the       concessionaire gets all the rights to talk with         ICANN, and we have shown previously the       testimony, for example, of Mr Castaño that he
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 1 \end{array}$	felt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia. Well, and this is noted from Respondent's opening presentation, slide 10, this is their slide on the screen here, and they say the 2009 contract and accompanying documents granted .CO Internet extensive freedom of operation, and they list here that .CO Internet even responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia. But, if you look at the cite for that, it is a resolution. 1652 passed in July 2008, before	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry of Communications is responsible for defining and approving the policy for the delegation of domain names under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercising control and supervision over the entire model, including the approval of procedures and registrars for their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry must lead the representation of the government of the Republic of Colombia before the ICANN Government Advisory Committee". So the concession doesn't say look, the concessionaire gets all the rights to talk with ICANN, and we have shown previously – the testimony, for example, of Mr Castaño that he went to an ICANN meeting, the Respondent had the rights to do that. So this idea of ICANN and how
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 112 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 12 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22$	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia. Well, and this is noted from Respondent's opening presentation, slide 10, this is their slide on the screen here, and they say the 2009 contract and accompanying documents granted .CO Internet extensive freedom of operation, and they list here that .CO Internet even responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia. But, if you look at the cite for that, it is a resolution. 1652 passed in July 2008, before the 2009 concession even started I believe that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution.10:35And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibitR-25, it says:''The Ministry of Communications: entityknown as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .coccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministryof Communications is responsible for defining andapproving the policy for the delegation of domainnames under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercisingcontrol and supervision over the entire model,including the approval of procedures and registrarsfor their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry mustlead the representation of the government of theRepublic of Colombia before the ICANN GovernmentActvisory Committee''.So the concession doesn't say look, theconcessionaire gets all the rights to talk withICANN, and we have shown previously thetestimony, for example, of Mr Castaño that hewent to an ICANN meeting, the Respondent had therights to do that. So this idea of ICANN and howthey were blocked out of it is fiction.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 7 18 9 20 1 22 23	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia. Well, and this is noted from Respondent's opening presentation, slide 10, this is their slide on the screen here, and they say the 2009 contract and accompanying documents granted .CO Internet extensive freedom of operation, and they list here that .CO Internet even responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia. But, if you look at the cite for that, it is a resolution. 1652 passed in July 2008, before the 2009 concession even started I believe that was even before .CO Internet had a bid on it. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution. 10:35 And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry of Communications is responsible for defining and approving the policy for the delegation of domain names under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercising control and supervision over the entire model, including the approval of procedures and registrars for their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry must lead the representation of the government of the Republic of Colombia before the ICANN Government Advisory Committee". So the concession doesn't say look, the concessionaire gets all the rights to talk with ICANN, and we have shown previously the testimony, for example, of Mr Castaño that he went to an ICANN meeting, the Respondent had the rights to do that. So this idea of ICANN and how they were blocked out of it is fiction. Probably just to talk about this one last
	$2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24$	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia. Well, and this is noted from Respondent's opening presentation, slide 10, this is their slide on the screen here, and they say the 2009 contract and accompanying documents granted .CO Internet extensive freedom of operation, and they list here that .CO Internet even responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia. But, if you look at the cite for that, it is a resolution. 1652 passed in July 2008, before the 2009 concession even started I believe that was even before .CO Internet had a bid on it. So the managing the relationship with ICANN that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution.10:35And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibitR-25, it says:"The Ministry of Communications: entityknown as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .coccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministryof Communications is responsible for defining andapproving the policy for the delegation of domainnames under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercisingcontrol and supervision over the entire model,including the approval of procedures and registrarsfor their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry mustlead the representation of the government of theRepublic of Colombia before the ICANN GovernmentAdvisory Committee".So the concession doesn't say look, theconcessionaire gets all the rights to talk withICANN, and we have shown previously – thetestimony, for example, of Mr Castaño that hewent to an ICANN meeting, the Respondent had therights to do that. So this idea of ICANN and howthey were blocked out of it is fiction.Probably just to talk about this one lastissue, the contingency payment. This is slide 11
	$2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24$	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia. Well, and this is noted from Respondent's opening presentation, slide 10, this is their slide on the screen here, and they say the 2009 contract and accompanying documents granted .CO Internet extensive freedom of operation, and they list here that .CO Internet even responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia. But, if you look at the cite for that, it is a resolution. 1652 passed in July 2008, before the 2009 concession even started I believe that was even before .CO Internet had a bid on it. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution. 10:35 And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibit R-25, it says: "The Ministry of Communications: entity known as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .co ccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministry of Communications is responsible for defining and approving the policy for the delegation of domain names under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercising control and supervision over the entire model, including the approval of procedures and registrars for their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry must lead the representation of the government of the Republic of Colombia before the ICANN Government Advisory Committee". So the concession doesn't say look, the concessionaire gets all the rights to talk with ICANN, and we have shown previously the testimony, for example, of Mr Castaño that he went to an ICANN meeting, the Respondent had the rights to do that. So this idea of ICANN and how they were blocked out of it is fiction. Probably just to talk about this one last
	$2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24$	telt they had to do to a concession, two or three, 10:33 but one of those repeatedly was ICANN, that they were excluded from participating in ICANN, and you can see this transcript here where Respondent's counsel was saying this is in line with the total outsourcing model which I described before and what in many respect is quite extraordinaryCO Internet even was responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia, so you had an American company who was actually sitting at the ICANN international organisation on behalf of Colombia. Well, and this is noted from Respondent's opening presentation, slide 10, this is their slide on the screen here, and they say the 2009 contract and accompanying documents granted .CO Internet extensive freedom of operation, and they list here that .CO Internet even responsible for managing the relationship with ICANN on behalf of Colombia. But, if you look at the cite for that, it is a resolution. 1652 passed in July 2008, before the 2009 concession even started I believe that was even before .CO Internet had a bid on it. So the managing the relationship with ICANN that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	old concession wasn't any good was a resolution.10:35And we can see from this resolution, this is exhibitR-25, it says:"The Ministry of Communications: entityknown as 'Sponsoring Organisation' for the .coccTLDs before ICANN. This means that the Ministryof Communications is responsible for defining andapproving the policy for the delegation of domainnames under the .CO ccTLDas well as exercisingcontrol and supervision over the entire model,including the approval of procedures and registrarsfor their accreditation. Finally, the Ministry mustlead the representation of the government of theRepublic of Colombia before the ICANN GovernmentAdvisory Committee".So the concession doesn't say look, theconcessionaire gets all the rights to talk withICANN, and we have shown previously – thetestimony, for example, of Mr Castaño that hewent to an ICANN meeting, the Respondent had therights to do that. So this idea of ICANN and howthey were blocked out of it is fiction.Probably just to talk about this one lastissue, the contingency payment. This is slide 11

1 this contingency no mont. Now I know it is the end	439
1 this contingency payment. Now I know it is the end 10:36	1 But the fact is this was viewed what 10:38 2 this document shows this was viewed as such a
<ul><li>2 of the hearing and it is still morning, but I am</li><li>3 going to do a little bit of math here. We can all</li></ul>	<ul> <li>3 small likelihood that the concession wouldn't be</li> </ul>
4 do it in our heads, we don't have to calculate too	4 had, that that risk which was a small risk, was
	5 priced in, and with that, and you checking your
<ul> <li>5 much, but Neustar was buying 99 per cent of the</li> <li>6 shares of .CO Internet, so essentially the whole</li> </ul>	6 watch, Mr President –
<ul> <li>7 company. They bought essentially – because they</li> </ul>	7 <b>PRESIDENT:</b> I amjust telling you I am
<ul> <li>8 had owned one percent already – they bought the</li> </ul>	8 watching my watch!
<ul> <li>9 whole company for 113 plus million, 114 million,</li> </ul>	9 <b>MR BALDWN:</b> I will take that cue and we
10 they bought halfway through the concession, which	10 will conclude with these concluding remarks.
11 means under the original concession there was half	11 <b>PRESIDENT:</b> I do have a couple of
12 the life of that concession, and it was for	12 questions for you, but to keep the momentum I am
13 113 million.	13 going to turn to Respondent to make his
14 This USD 6 million payment cannot be met	14 presentation, and then what questions I and my
15 to be compensation for not having a renewal of the	15 colleagues might have we will raise with you then.
16 contract. That math just does not work. If the	16 Thank you very much, Mr Baldwin and
17 value of the company is 114 for the remaining part	17 Ms Baldwin. We turn now to Respondent.
18 of a 5-year concession, you can't value 10 years of	18 <b>Closing Statement</b> by Respondent
19 a renewal of that concession at USD 6 million. So	19 by Mr Gouiffès
20 to say that was a contingency payment that was meant	20 MR GOUIFFÈS: So, we proceed
21 to show that Neustar didn't think they would win it	21 Our presentation will be in three parts
22 is exactly the opposite. If you didn't think you	22 and of course we will be short on each with the time
23 would win it, you would have had an amount upwards	23 we have. We will respond to the Tribunal questions
24 of USD 50 million, USD 60-70 million as a clawback	24 first for 10, 15 minutes. Then we make comments on
25 if you didn't get the concession.	25 the hearing for the same amount of time roughly and
140	444
1 then there will be closing remarks of the Republic 10:41	441 1 just a change of name. That is what has been 10:42
2 of Colombia for two minutes max.	2 alleged. Then we were told, you have two documents
3 I will deal with the Tribunal questions,	3 showing this, C-135 and C-136. C-135 is a press
4 the first three, and my colleague, Melissa, will do	4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is
5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the	<ul><li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li><li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li></ul>
<ul><li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li><li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li></ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> <li>8 Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> <li>8 Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>9 it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> <li>10 Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>claim.</li> <li>Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>document production process we asked a document</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> <li>10 Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> <li>11 The first one is we have seven jurisdictional</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>claim.</li> <li>Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>document production process we asked a document</li> <li>request to the Tribunal in September which you</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> <li>10 Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> <li>11 The first one is we have seven jurisdictional</li> <li>12 objections, as you know, which are grouped in five</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>claim.</li> <li>Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>document production process we asked a document</li> <li>request to the Tribunal in September which you</li> <li>dismissed, but saying that the burden of proof would</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> <li>10 Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> <li>11 The first one is we have seven jurisdictional</li> <li>12 objections, as you know, which are grouped in five</li> <li>13 categories. You can see here on the slide we put</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> <li>8 Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>9 it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>10 document production process we asked a document</li> <li>11 request to the Tribunal in September which you</li> <li>12 dismissed, but saying that the burden of proof would</li> <li>13 be entirely be on that question on the Claimant at</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> <li>10 Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> <li>11 The first one is we have seven jurisdictional</li> <li>12 objections, as you know, which are grouped in five</li> <li>13 categories. You can see here on the slide we put</li> <li>14 them again as they are and four points.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> <li>8 Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>9 it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>10 document production process we asked a document</li> <li>11 request to the Tribunal in September which you</li> <li>12 dismissed, but saying that the burden of proof would</li> <li>13 be entirely be on that question on the Claimant at</li> <li>14 this hearing and I would submit you have heard</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> <li>10 Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> <li>11 The first one is we have seven jurisdictional</li> <li>12 objections, as you know, which are grouped in five</li> <li>13 categories. You can see here on the slide we put</li> <li>14 them again as they are and four points.</li> <li>15 The first one is yes, from a legal point</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> <li>8 Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>9 it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>10 document production process we asked a document</li> <li>11 request to the Tribunal in September which you</li> <li>12 dismissed, but saying that the burden of proof would</li> <li>13 be entirely be on that question on the Claimant at</li> <li>14 this hearing and I would submit you have heard</li> <li>15 absolutely nothing in that regard. That is my first</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> <li>10 Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> <li>11 The first one is we have seven jurisdictional</li> <li>12 objections, as you know, which are grouped in five</li> <li>13 categories. You can see here on the slide we put</li> <li>14 them again as they are and four points.</li> <li>15 The first one is yes, from a legal point</li> <li>16 of view there is a hierarchy, and the first one,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> <li>8 Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>9 it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>10 document production process we asked a document</li> <li>11 request to the Tribunal in September which you</li> <li>12 dismissed, but saying that the burden of proof would</li> <li>13 be entirely be on that question on the Claimant at</li> <li>14 this hearing and I would submit you have heard</li> <li>15 absolutely nothing in that regard. That is my first</li> <li>16 point.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> <li>10 Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> <li>11 The first one is we have seven jurisdictional</li> <li>12 objections, as you know, which are grouped in five</li> <li>13 categories. You can see here on the slide we put</li> <li>14 them again as they are and four points.</li> <li>15 The first one is yes, from a legal point</li> <li>16 of view there is a hierarchy, and the first one,</li> <li>17 that there is no jurisdiction following the change</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> <li>8 Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>9 it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>10 document production process we asked a document</li> <li>11 request to the Tribunal in September which you</li> <li>12 dismissed, but saying that the burden of proof would</li> <li>13 be entirely be on that question on the Claimant at</li> <li>14 this hearing and I would submit you have heard</li> <li>15 absolutely nothing in that regard. That is my first</li> <li>16 point.</li> <li>17 My second point is all the other</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> <li>10 Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> <li>11 The first one is we have seven jurisdictional</li> <li>12 objections, as you know, which are grouped in five</li> <li>13 categories. You can see here on the slide we put</li> <li>14 them again as they are and four points.</li> <li>15 The first one is yes, from a legal point</li> <li>16 of view there is a hierarchy, and the first one,</li> <li>17 that there is no jurisdiction following the change</li> <li>18 of Claimant, is undoubtedly the main question. This</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> <li>8 Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>9 it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>10 document production process we asked a document</li> <li>11 request to the Tribunal in September which you</li> <li>12 dismissed, but saying that the burden of proof would</li> <li>13 be entirely be on that question on the Claimant at</li> <li>14 this hearing and I would submit you have heard</li> <li>15 absolutely nothing in that regard. That is my first</li> <li>16 point.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> <li>10 Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> <li>11 The first one is we have seven jurisdictional</li> <li>12 objections, as you know, which are grouped in five</li> <li>13 categories. You can see here on the slide we put</li> <li>14 them again as they are and four points.</li> <li>15 The first one is yes, from a legal point</li> <li>16 of view there is a hierarchy, and the first one,</li> <li>17 that there is no jurisdiction following the change</li> <li>18 of Claimant, is undoubtedly the main question. This</li> <li>19 is because this is linked to the integrity of the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> <li>8 Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>9 it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>10 document production process we asked a document</li> <li>11 request to the Tribunal in September which you</li> <li>12 dismissed, but saying that the burden of proof would</li> <li>13 be entirely be on that question on the Claimant at</li> <li>14 this hearing and I would submit you have heard</li> <li>15 absolutely nothing in that regard. That is my first</li> <li>16 point.</li> <li>17 My second point is all the other</li> <li>18 jurisdictional objection are alternatives. So you</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> <li>10 Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> <li>11 The first one is we have seven jurisdictional</li> <li>12 objections, as you know, which are grouped in five</li> <li>13 categories. You can see here on the slide we put</li> <li>14 them again as they are and four points.</li> <li>15 The first one is yes, from a legal point</li> <li>16 of view there is a hierarchy, and the first one,</li> <li>17 that there is no jurisdiction following the change</li> <li>18 of Claimant, is undoubtedly the main question. This</li> <li>19 is because this is linked to the integrity of the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> <li>8 Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>9 it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>10 document production process we asked a document</li> <li>11 request to the Tribunal in September which you</li> <li>12 dismissed, but saying that the burden of proof would</li> <li>13 be entirely be on that question on the Claimant at</li> <li>14 this hearing and I would submit you have heard</li> <li>15 absolutely nothing in that regard. That is my first</li> <li>16 point.</li> <li>17 My second point is all the other</li> <li>18 jurisdictional objection are alternatives. So you</li> <li>19 have seven of them. So the six others are grouped</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> <li>10 Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> <li>11 The first one is we have seven jurisdictional</li> <li>12 objections, as you know, which are grouped in five</li> <li>13 categories. You can see here on the slide we put</li> <li>14 them again as they are and four points.</li> <li>15 The first one is yes, from a legal point</li> <li>16 of view there is a hierarchy, and the first one,</li> <li>17 that there is no jurisdiction following the change</li> <li>18 of Claimant, is undoubtedly the main question. This</li> <li>19 is because this is linked to the integrity of the</li> <li>20 proceedings, this is in limine litis, and this is a</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> <li>8 Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>9 it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>10 document production process we asked a document</li> <li>11 request to the Tribunal in September which you</li> <li>12 dismissed, but saying that the burden of proof would</li> <li>13 be entirely be on that question on the Claimant at</li> <li>14 this hearing and I would submit you have heard</li> <li>15 absolutely nothing in that regard. That is my first</li> <li>16 point.</li> <li>17 My second point is all the other</li> <li>18 jurisdictional objection are alternatives. So you</li> <li>19 have seven of them. So the six others are grouped</li> <li>20 in five but are alternative and each of them</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> <li>10 Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> <li>11 The first one is we have seven jurisdictional</li> <li>12 objections, as you know, which are grouped in five</li> <li>13 categories. You can see here on the slide we put</li> <li>14 them again as they are and four points.</li> <li>15 The first one is yes, from a legal point</li> <li>16 of view there is a hierarchy, and the first one,</li> <li>17 that there is no jurisdiction following the change</li> <li>18 of Claimant, is undoubtedly the main question. This</li> <li>19 is because this is linked to the integrity of the</li> <li>20 proceedings, this is in limine litis, and this is a</li> <li>21 very important question in itself.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> <li>8 Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>9 it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>10 document production process we asked a document</li> <li>11 request to the Tribunal in September which you</li> <li>12 dismissed, but saying that the burden of proof would</li> <li>13 be entirely be on that question on the Claimant at</li> <li>14 this hearing and I would submit you have heard</li> <li>15 absolutely nothing in that regard. That is my first</li> <li>16 point.</li> <li>17 My second point is all the other</li> <li>18 jurisdictional objection are alternatives. So you</li> <li>19 have seven of them. So the six others are grouped</li> <li>20 in five but are alternative and each of them</li> <li>21 dispositive of the entirety of the case. So that is</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>objections. Are there any?</li> <li>Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> <li>The first one is we have seven jurisdictional</li> <li>objections, as you know, which are grouped in five</li> <li>categories. You can see here on the slide we put</li> <li>therm again as they are and four points.</li> <li>The first one is a hierarchy, and the first one,</li> <li>that there is no jurisdiction following the change</li> <li>of Claimant, is undoubtedly the main question. This</li> <li>is because this is linked to the integrity of the</li> <li>proceedings, this is in limine litis, and this is a</li> <li>very important question in itself.</li> <li>Remember, I won't get to that, you have</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> <li>8 Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>9 it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>10 document production process we asked a document</li> <li>11 request to the Tribunal in September which you</li> <li>12 dismissed, but saying that the burden of proof would</li> <li>13 be entirely be on that question on the Claimant at</li> <li>14 this hearing and I would submit you have heard</li> <li>15 absolutely nothing in that regard. That is my first</li> <li>16 point.</li> <li>17 My second point is all the other</li> <li>18 jurisdictional objection are alternatives. So you</li> <li>19 have seven of them So the six others are grouped</li> <li>20 in five but are alternative and each of them</li> <li>21 dispositive of the entirety of the case. So that is</li> <li>22 it for the second point.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5 the two others and then my colleague Dan will do the</li> <li>6 comments on the hearing, which is the second part.</li> <li>7 So I go straight to the first questions</li> <li>8 which is the hierarchy of the jurisdictional</li> <li>9 objections. Are there any?</li> <li>10 Four points I would mention here briefly.</li> <li>11 The first one is we have seven jurisdictional</li> <li>12 objections, as you know, which are grouped in five</li> <li>13 categories. You can see here on the slide we put</li> <li>14 them again as they are and four points.</li> <li>15 The first one is yes, from a legal point</li> <li>16 of view there is a hierarchy, and the first one,</li> <li>17 that there is no jurisdiction following the change</li> <li>18 of Claimant, is undoubtedly the main question. This</li> <li>19 is because this is linked to the integrity of the</li> <li>20 proceedings, this is in limine litis, and this is a</li> <li>21 very important question in itself.</li> <li>22 Remember, I won't get to that, you have</li> <li>23 heard us just two days ago. We heard for the first</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4 release, which is absolutely nothing, and C-136 is</li> <li>5 the UPA which does not say anything on the transfer</li> <li>6 of the claim or who is the actual owner of that</li> <li>7 claim.</li> <li>8 Now, you remember, because it was after,</li> <li>9 it was engineered we would say to be after the</li> <li>10 document production process we asked a document</li> <li>11 request to the Tribunal in September which you</li> <li>12 dismissed, but saying that the burden of proof would</li> <li>13 be entirely be on that question on the Claimant at</li> <li>14 this hearing and I would submit you have heard</li> <li>15 absolutely nothing in that regard. That is my first</li> <li>16 point.</li> <li>17 My second point is all the other</li> <li>18 jurisdictional objection are alternatives. So you</li> <li>19 have seven of them So the six others are grouped</li> <li>20 in five but are alternative and each of them</li> <li>21 dispositive of the entirety of the case. So that is</li> <li>22 it for the second point.</li> <li>23 The third point is, we would suggest, and</li> </ul>

1	442 link here between the merits and the jurisdiction $10:44$	1	heard, and I think that would answer your questions, $10$	143
2	that these claims are contractual in nature and	2	you had no pleadings on this question in the	:45
3	therefore this Tribunal is not the proper forum.	3	pleadings or yesterday, or the day before yesterday	
4	More interestingly perhaps in this case is	4	on Monday from the other side, but even more, if you	
5	that there is an obvious abuse of process. Now that	5	look at slide 10 of what they just presented, they	
6	is what my colleague, Dan González, will present	6	agree it is a possibility of a renewal according to	
7	later, but there is an abuse of process, and in a	7	that law. So they agree. There is no disagreement	
8	case like this one that would be perhaps the first	8	that there is only a possibility. The law does not	
9	one in investment arbitration, but we would submit	9	say "shall", it does not say "automatically", of	
10	that is probably what it is today. But each of them		course. And the reason for that is you know	
11	again are dispositive.		already, the Constitutional Court decision of 2001	
12	My fourth point is we put here what		which you have heard already here and which we have	
13	Mr Bigge has said on behalf of the United States, is		put again highlighted "may not exceed ten years",	
	of course a state's consent is a paramount question		which may be automatically renewed. Then it is	
15	and it has to be an unconditional consent and we		illegal if that is what has happened here in the	
16	submit here that article 10.17 of the TPA has not		telecommunication sector in 2001.	
17	been respected. That is the answer to the first	17	What we have done here is gone a bit more	
18			further, and we will do it in post-hearing briefs in	
19	The second question from the Tribunal is		more detail, but you have the reference here to R-2,	
20	on the language of article 4 of the 2009 Contract		R-35 and R-92. R-2 is a decree which says exactly	
21	and the law. So of course you know article 4,		the same thing, there is no automatic renewal R-92	
22			is a decision from the Council of State, so the	
23	put up again as you have just seen from the Claimant		Conseil d'Etât in Colombia, of 2022, and I would	
24			suggest R-35 is something interesting for the	
25	What is interesting in what you have		Tribunal to look at.	
	2 .			
1	$\frac{444}{1000}$	1	ICSID Arbitration Puloe"	145
1	What is R-35? This is a document from CO 10:46	1	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10	145 :48
2	What is R-35? This is a document from CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo	2	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on	
2 3	What is R-35? This is a document from CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on	2 3	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question	
2 3 4	What is R-35? This is a document from CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that	2 3 4	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a	
2 3 4 5	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in	2 3 4 5	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this	
2 3 4 5 6	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision	2 3 4 5 6	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise	
2 3 4 5 6 7	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 – this is page 7 of that	2 3 4 5 6 7	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 – this is page 7 of that opinion – but if you read the entirety of that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so	
2 3 4 5 6 7	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 – this is page 7 of that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 this is page 7 of that opinion but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 this is page 7 of that opinion but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't know. We absolutely don't know	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 this is page 7 of that opinion but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the Tribunal.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't know. We absolutely don't know Now if the Tribunal were to think that	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 this is page 7 of that opinion but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the Tribunal. On the third question, which is the	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't know. We absolutely don't know Now if the Tribunal were to think that this is an issue on the merits, actually here the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 this is page 7 of that opinion but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the Tribunal. On the third question, which is the question of the proper Claimant and jurisdiction	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't know. We absolutely don't know Now if the Tribunal were to think that this is an issue on the merits, actually here the TPA is very clear, 10.22, and we just highlighted	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 this is page 7 of that opinion but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the Tribunal. On the third question, which is the question of the proper Claimant and jurisdiction over Neustar Inc, I think there are two questions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't know. We absolutely don't know Now if the Tribunal were to think that this is an issue on the merits, actually here the TPA is very clear, 10.22, and we just highlighted that: "The tribunal shall decide the issues in	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 – this is page 7 of that opinion but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the Tribunal. On the third question, which is the question of the proper Claimant and jurisdiction over Neustar Inc, I think there are two questions here. The first question: what is the law	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't know. We absolutely don't know Now if the Tribunal were to think that this is an issue on the merits actually here the TPA is very clear, 10.22, and we just highlighted that: "The tribunal shall decide the issues in dispute in accordance with this Agreement (TPA) and	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 this is page 7 of that opinion but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the Tribunal. On the third question, which is the question of the proper Claimant and jurisdiction over Neustar Inc, I think there are two questions here. The first question: what is the law applicable to the determination of the proper	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't know. We absolutely don't know Now if the Tribunal were to think that this is an issue on the merits actually here the TPA is very clear, 10.22, and we just highlighted that: "The tribunal shall decide the issues in dispute in accordance with this Agreement (TPA) and applicable rules of international law."	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 – this is page 7 of that opinion but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the Tribunal. On the third question, which is the question of the proper Claimant and jurisdiction over Neustar Inc, I think there are two questions here. The first question: what is the law applicable to the determination of the proper Claimant? I won't spend too much time. I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't know. We absolutely don't know Now if the Tribunal were to think that this is an issue on the merits actually here the TPA is very clear, 10.22, and we just highlighted that: "The tribunal shall decide the issues in dispute in accordance with this Agreement (TPA) and applicable rules of international law."	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 – this is page 7 of that opinion – but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the Tribunal. On the third question, which is the question of the proper Claimant and jurisdiction over Neustar Inc, I think there are two questions here. The first question: what is the law applicable to the determination of the proper Claimant? I won't spend too much time. I think there seems to be an agreement here, but we would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't know. We absolutely don't know Now if the Tribunal were to think that this is an issue on the merits actually here the TPA is very clear, 10.22, and we just highlighted that: "The tribunal shall decide the issues in dispute in accordance with this Agreement (TPA) and applicable rules of international law." So the answer to that first question is quite clear.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 – this is page 7 of that opinion – but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the Tribunal. On the third question, which is the question of the proper Claimant and jurisdiction over Neustar Inc, I think there are two questions here. The first question: what is the law applicable to the determination of the proper Claimant? I won't spend too much time. I think there seems to be an agreement here, but we would say it is a procedural issue. This is of course	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't know. We absolutely don't know Now if the Tribunal were to think that this is an issue on the merits actually here the TPA is very clear, 10.22, and we just highlighted that: "The tribunal shall decide the issues in dispute in accordance with this Agreement (TPA) and applicable rules of international law." So the answer to that first question is quite clear. Now the question on the jurisdiction to	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 – this is page 7 of that opinion but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the Tribunal. On the third question, which is the question of the proper Claimant and jurisdiction over Neustar Inc, I think there are two questions here. The first question: what is the law applicable to the determination of the proper Claimant? I won't spend too much time. I think there seems to be an agreement here, but we would say it is a procedural issue. This is of course governed by international law here, ICSID Convention	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't know. We absolutely don't know Now if the Tribunal were to think that this is an issue on the merits actually here the TPA is very clear, 10.22, and we just highlighted that: "The tribunal shall decide the issues in dispute in accordance with this Agreement (TPA) and applicable rules of international law." So the answer to that first question is quite clear. Now the question on the jurisdiction to render an award against Neustar Inc, here it is very	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 – this is page 7 of that opinion but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the Tribunal. On the third question, which is the question of the proper Claimant and jurisdiction over Neustar Inc, I think there are two questions here. The first question: what is the law applicable to the determination of the proper Claimant? I won't spend too much time. I think there seems to be an agreement here, but we would say it is a procedural issue. This is of course governed by international law here, ICSID Convention and the TPA. It is quite a common question. We have put just an ICSID case from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't know. We absolutely don't know Now if the Tribunal were to think that this is an issue on the merits actually here the TPA is very clear, 10.22, and we just highlighted that: "The tribunal shall decide the issues in dispute in accordance with this Agreement (TPA) and applicable rules of international law." So the answer to that first question is quite clear. Now the question on the jurisdiction to render an award against Neustar Inc, here it is very clear too. There is no request in this arbitration	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so thisis their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 this is page 7 of that opinion but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the Tribunal. On the third question, which is the question of the proper Claimant and jurisdiction over Neustar Inc, I think there are two questions here. The first question: what is the law applicable to the determination of the proper Claimant? I won't spend too much time. I think there seems to be an agreement here, but we would say it is a procedural issue. This is of course governed by international law here, ICSID Convention and the TPA. It is quite a common question. We have put just an ICSID case from Sumrain 2020: "The rules of municipal laws have no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't know. We absolutely don't know Now if the Tribunal were to think that this is an issue on the merits actually here the TPA is very clear, 10.22, and we just highlighted that: "The tribunal shall decide the issues in dispute in accordance with this Agreement (TPA) and applicable rules of international law." So the answer to that first question is quite clear. Now the question on the jurisdiction to render an award against Neustar Inc, here it is very clear too. There is no request in this arbitration to withdraw Neustar Inc from these proceedings.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	What is R-35? This is a document from .CO 10:46 which attached itself a legal opinion of Ricardo Hoyos Duque and so this is their lawyer answering on these questions which explains exactly that question, and in particular you have a reference in that opinion to a Council of State decision of 2 December 2015 this is page 7 of that opinion but if you read the entirety of that opinion, it says exactly what we are saying in this case in relation to the question asked by the Tribunal. On the third question, which is the question of the proper Claimant and jurisdiction over Neustar Inc, I think there are two questions here. The first question: what is the law applicable to the determination of the proper Claimant? I won't spend too much time. I think there seems to be an agreement here, but we would say it is a procedural issue. This is of course governed by international law here, ICSID Convention and the TPA. It is quite a common question. We have put just an ICSID case from Sumrain 2020. "The rules of municipal laws have no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ICSID Arbitration Rules". 10 Now you had a few things here before on what has happened in the US, but that is a question of fact, and of course there should have been a document put forward and things explained to this Tribunal, part of the document production exercise or spontaneously because they have the burden of proof to show this, and they haven't at all, so whether this has been done properlyor not, we don't know. We absolutely don't know Now if the Tribunal were to think that this is an issue on the merits actually here the TPA is very clear, 10.22, and we just highlighted that: "The tribunal shall decide the issues in dispute in accordance with this Agreement (TPA) and applicable rules of international law." So the answer to that first question is quite clear. Now the question on the jurisdiction to render an award against Neustar Inc, here it is very clear too. There is no request in this arbitration to withdraw Neustar Inc from these proceedings. Again, it is important, they say it is just a change	

1	have given their consent, no party may withdraw its	446	1	months or few weeks, and certainly even in the 1	447
2	consent unilaterally."	10:49	2	presentation on Monday, as an alternative we have	10:50
2	And of course you remember when the		3	asked for the security for costs applications which	
4	Request for Arbitration was filed by Neustar Inc of		4	we are going to deal with and present to you on	
5	course there were three months of tos and fros		5	14 April. But this is only an alternative. The	
6	between the ICSID and Neustar, because their claim		6	award on costs will be against Neustar Inc.	
7	was defective in many aspect, but what's important		7	I pass the floor to my colleague,	
8	is then when this really started and this Tribunal		8	Melissa Ordoñez.	
9	was constituted under that request forarbitration,		9	by Ms Ordoñez	
10	it is clearly Neustar Inc and it has not changed		10	MS MELISSA ORDOÑEZ: Thank you, Laurent.	
10	since.		_	I will now address the fourth question of the	
12	Now, the Tribunal, I put it simply,			Tribunal which is what is the consequence of	
	retained certain jurisdiction to render an award on			Neustar's request to formalise the extension of the	
	costs against Neustar Inc, and we have put here a			2009 Contract until 2030 in its request before the	
15				Council of State proceedings.	
	when you say you do not have jurisdiction, then		16	So the consequence is actually very	
17			10	simple. The consequence is that this Council of	
18	tribunal, and this is very clear: "The Tribunal		18	State proceedings do not fall within the exception	
19	must dismiss jurisdiction vis-à-vis these Claimants				
20	[this is for this case] except with regard to any		20		
21	potential costs award against them".		21	local courts in very limited conditions.	
22	This is very clear that you have power to		22	What are these limited conditions? Well,	
23	do so against Neustar Inc.			according to this exception, it is possible to	
24	I will finish with this, because of the			continue if the action seeks injunctive relief, does	
	uncertainties of what we have had over the past few			not involve the payment of monetary damages, but	
		448			449
1	also, and this is very important and we have put it	<b>448</b> 10:52	1	unwind.	<b>449</b>
2	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the	<b>448</b> 10:52	2	All of this has two further legal	<b>449</b> 10:53
2 3	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this	<b>449</b> 10 : 53
2 3 4	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration".	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver	<b>449</b> 10 : 53
2 3 4 5	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall	<b>449</b> 10 : 53
2 3 4 5 6	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing	448 10:52	2 3 4 5 6	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should	<b>449</b> 00:53
2 3 4 5	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this	448 10:52	2 3 4 5	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the	448 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the	<b>449</b> 00:53
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this	448 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings	<b>449</b> 00:53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out".	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the	<b>449</b> 0:53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached.	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote,	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote, and you can see it here in the slide, that it	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this constitutes a definitive forum selection because	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote, and you can see it here in the slide, that it formalise the extension of concession 019 of 2009	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this constitutes a definitive forum selection because annex 10-G of the TPA, in order to be triggered,	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote, and you can see it here in the slide, that it formalise the extension of concession 019 of 2009 until 2030 clearly exceeds the permitted scope of	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this constitutes a definitive forum selection because annex 10-G of the TPA, in order to be triggered, only requires that the investor has alleged the	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote, and you can see it here in the slide, that it formalise the extension of concession 019 of 2009 until 2030 clearly exceeds the permitted scope of this article and this is because you can see that	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this constitutes a definitive forum selection because annex 10-G of the TPA, in order to be triggered, only requires that the investor has alleged the breach of the TPA before any court, and this is	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote, and you can see it here in the slide, that it formalise the extension of concession 019 of 2009 until 2030 clearly exceeds the permitted scope of this article and this is because you can see that they are asking for the contract to be extended	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this constitutes a definitive forum selection because annex 10-G of the TPA, in order to be triggered, only requires that the investor has alleged the breach of the TPA before any court, and this is exactly what happened here. They just allege	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote, and you can see it here in the slide, that it formalise the extension of concession 019 of 2009 until 2030 clearly exceeds the permitted scope of this article and this is because you can see that they are asking for the contract to be extended until 2030.	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this constitutes a definitive forum selection because annex 10-G of the TPA in order to be triggered, only requires that the investor has alleged the breach of the TPA before any court, and this is exactly what happened here. They just allege breaches of the TPA before the Council of State and	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote, and you can see it here in the slide, that it formalise the extension of concession 019 of 2009 until 2030 clearly exceeds the permitted scope of this article and this is because you can see that they are asking for the contract to be extended until 2030. So this is not just about preserving the	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this constitutes a definitive forum selection because annex 10-G of the TPA in order to be triggered, only requires that the investor has alleged the breach of the TPA before any court, and this is exactly what happened here. They just allege breaches of the TPA before the Council of State and therefore the clause has been triggered, and you can	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote, and you can see it here in the slide, that it formalise the extension of concession 019 of 2009 until 2030 clearly exceeds the permitted scope of this article and this is because you can see that they are asking for the contract to be extended until 2030. So this is not just about preserving the status quo during the pendency of the arbitration.	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this constitutes a definitive forum selection because annex 10-G of the TPA, in order to be triggered, only requires that the investor has alleged the breach of the TPA before any court, and this is exactly what happened here. They just allege breaches of the TPA before the Council of State and therefore the clause has been triggered, and you can see that they have alleged this at R-80, pages	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote, and you can see it here in the slide, that it formalise the extension of concession 019 of 2009 until 2030 clearly exceeds the permitted scope of this article and this is because you can see that they are asking for the contract to be extended until 2030. So this is not just about preserving the status quo during the pendency of the arbitration. They are going beyond this and it goes far beyond	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this constitutes a definitive forum selection because annex 10-G of the TPA in order to be triggered, only requires that the investor has alleged the breach of the TPA before any court, and this is exactly what happened here. They just allege breaches of the TPA before the Council of State and therefore the clause has been triggered, and you can see that they have alleged this at R-80, pages 11-17.	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote, and you can see it here in the slide, that it formalise the extension of concession 019 of 2009 until 2030 clearly exceeds the permitted scope of this article and this is because you can see that they are asking for the contract to be extended until 2030. So this is not just about preserving the status quo during the pendency of the arbitration. They are going beyond this and it goes far beyond the sole purpose of preserving the rights, the	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this constitutes a definitive forum selection because annex 10-G of the TPA in order to be triggered, only requires that the investor has alleged the breach of the TPA before any court, and this is exactly what happened here. They just allege breaches of the TPA before the Council of State and therefore the clause has been triggered, and you can see that they have alleged this at R-80, pages 11-17. Wth this, I conclude this question.	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote, and you can see it here in the slide, that it formalise the extension of concession 019 of 2009 until 2030 clearly exceeds the permitted scope of this article and this is because you can see that they are asking for the contract to be extended until 2030. So this is not just about preserving the status quo during the pendency of the arbitration. They are going beyond this and it goes far beyond the sole purpose of preserving the rights, the investor's rights, because of course they were	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this constitutes a definitive forum selection because annex 10-G of the TPA in order to be triggered, only requires that the investor has alleged the breach of the TPA before any court, and this is exactly what happened here. They just allege breaches of the TPA before the Council of State and therefore the clause has been triggered, and you can see that they have alleged this at R-80, pages 11-17. With this, I conclude this question. So, moving now to the next one, what is	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote, and you can see it here in the slide, that it formalise the extension of concession 019 of 2009 until 2030 clearly exceeds the permitted scope of this article and this is because you can see that they are asking for the contract to be extended until 2030. So this is not just about preserving the status quo during the pendency of the arbitration. They are going beyond this and it goes far beyond the sole purpose of preserving the rights, the investor's rights, because of course they were trying to force a renewal of the 2009 contract and	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this constitutes a definitive forum selection because annex 10-G of the TPA, in order to be triggered, only requires that the investor has alleged the breach of the TPA before any court, and this is exactly what happened here. They just allege breaches of the TPA before the Council of State and therefore the clause has been triggered, and you can see that they have alleged this at R-80, pages 11-17. With this, I conclude this question. So, moving now to the next one, what is the effect on the parties' positions of .CO Internet	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote, and you can see it here in the slide, that it formalise the extension of concession 019 of 2009 until 2030 clearly exceeds the permitted scope of this article and this is because you can see that they are asking for the contract to be extended until 2030. So this is not just about preserving the status quo during the pendency of the arbitration. They are going beyond this and it goes far beyond the sole purpose of preserving the rights, the investor's rights, because of course they were	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this constitutes a definitive forum selection because annex 10-G of the TPA in order to be triggered, only requires that the investor has alleged the breach of the TPA before any court, and this is exactly what happened here. They just allege breaches of the TPA before the Council of State and therefore the clause has been triggered, and you can see that they have alleged this at R-80, pages 11-17. With this, I conclude this question. So, moving now to the next one, what is	<b>449</b> .0:53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	in the slide, the action has to be brought "for the sole purpose of preserving the investor's rights [] During the pendency of the arbitration". So it has to have the sole purpose of preserving rights and it should be limited to doing so during the pendency of the arbitration, and this exception is particularly restrictive as put by the US in their NDPS where they say clearly that this was a "very narrow carve-out". So against this background, Neustar's request No 5 to the Council of State, and I quote, and you can see it here in the slide, that it formalise the extension of concession 019 of 2009 until 2030 clearly exceeds the permitted scope of this article and this is because you can see that they are asking for the contract to be extended until 2030. So this is not just about preserving the status quo during the pendency of the arbitration. They are going beyond this and it goes far beyond the sole purpose of preserving the rights, the investor's rights, because of course they were trying to force a renewal of the 2009 contract and	<b>448</b> 10:52	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	All of this has two further legal consequences. The first one is that this constitutes logically a breach of the waiver requirement. If these proceedings do not fall within the exception of article 10.18(3) they should have been waived under article 10.18(2) prior to the initiation of the proceedings, but this was not the case. Neustar actually continued these proceedings after initiating the present arbitration, so the waiver requirement was breached. The second consequence is that this constitutes a definitive forum selection because annex 10-G of the TPA, in order to be triggered, only requires that the investor has alleged the breach of the TPA before any court, and this is exactly what happened here. They just allege breaches of the TPA before the Council of State and therefore the clause has been triggered, and you can see that they have alleged this at R-80, pages 11-17. With this, I conclude this question. So, moving now to the next one, what is the effect on the parties' positions of .CO Internet	<b>449</b> .0:53

Case N	lo ARB 20/7	Final	Wednesday, 29 March, 2023
1	3 April 2020?	450 10:55 1	Second, in relation to the merits, well $10:57$
2	The award of the 2020 Contract has several	2	the attribution of the 2020 Contract confirms that
3	consequences in this arbitration. They won the	3	Neustar's discrimination, arbitrariness and
4	tender, right? From a jurisdictional perspective	4	corruption allegations are nothing more than a
5	we submit that this confirms that when Neustar filed	5	smokescreen. There can be no discrimination against
6	its notice of intent on 6 September 2019, its	6	them because they were actually chosen for the 2020
7	Request for Arbitration on 23 December 2019, or when	7	Contract, and there can be no favouritism from
8	its RfA was registered on 9 March 2020, it had not	8	Colombia seeking to favour Afilias because Afilias
9	incurred any certain damage as the 2020 tender	9	did not even participate in the tender process and
10	process had not yet even been put in motion or was	10	.CO Internet was selected for the 2020 contract.
11		11	And third, regarding quantum, and this is
12	And this is problematic for them because		related to the jurisdictional point before, Neustar
13	article 10.16 of the TPA, which relates to consent		has not incurred any certain damage, and so actually
14	actually, requires that the notice requires,		Neustar has incurred no damage at all because they
15	sorry, I am quoting actually article 10.16(1) of AA	15	got the contract and at the outset they actually
16	of the TPA. It requires that the investor has	16	
17	incurred loss or damage at the time of submitting		compensation package, and in the circumstances we
18	the Request for Arbitration, and therefore, as put		
19	by the US in its NDPS in AmecFoster, there can be no	19	PRESIDENT: Mr González.
20	daim under article 10.16(1) until an investor has	_	by Mr González
	suffered harm from an alleged breach. "No claim	21	MR GONZÁLEZ: Thank you. In addition to
22	based solely on speculation as to future breaches or	22	the questions of the Tribunal, we were really left
23	future loss may be submitted". And so the	23	with our own questions as well, and we think we
24	consequence is that Neustar failed to comply with		should at least address some of those this morning.
25	this preliminary requirement.	25	Of course we will address them further in our
1	post-closing brief.	452 10:59 1	what did we hear? We had an empty chair. There $11:00$
2	It really is à propos that during the	2	were no Claimant's witnesses as well we know. And
3	Claimant's presentation this morning we went into	3	what we heard with regards to Claimant's counsel,
4	the dark, because we are really are in the dark with	4	they said, and it is another one of many outrageous
5	regards to how this Claimant believes it has carried	5	comments made without any support at all for, but
6	its burden in this case.	6	they said they basically didn't bring any witnesses
7	You see in front of you what I am going to	7	because they were worried about the pressure on
8	talk about, and I know we were reminded by this	8	them, or that there would be reprisals or
9	Tribunal that we are not in a court of law, but	9	recriminations. That is what they said to you. Not
10	frankly the proceedings here are referred to as a	10	any support of that whatsoever.
11		11	Let's assume for the moment that this
12		12	amazing allegation of why they didn't bring any
13	that it is the moment in time when the parties are		witnesses to this case were true. Well, why didn't
			they bring Nicolai? Nicolai has been Neustar's
15	tribunal, or a court, or a jury, to support their		Senior Vice-President since 2014, throughout all the
16	burden of proof, and that burden of proof again	16	relevant time period. He is certainly beyond
17	doesn't come through argument of counsel; it comes		reproach. He certainly could have been brought here
18	through either documents or witness testimony.		to testify. Neustar had no problem bringing a
19	That is the simple truth of how our system	19	
20		20	a witness chair, they could have brought him. He is
	fact that a lawyer puts their argument into a letter		not subject to that.
22	and then attaches it to a memorial, that doesn't	22	They could have brought Charlie
23	make it evidence either. So let's talk about what	23	Gottdiener, Neustar's President and CEO since 2018.
24	was the evidence that we heard in the last two days	24	We would have loved to have talked to him and had
25	With regards to the Claimant's witnesses,	25	cross-examination with regards the corporate

				rioancoady, zo mai c	511, 2020
1	structures and all the other upanes and questions we	454	1	of boomoved on the apply Moll Latic bo frank	455
1	structures and all the other unanswered questions we had.	11:01	1	of hearsay don't apply. Well, let's be frank. 1 Those rules exist for a reason. Out-of-court	1:02
2 3	And at least we could have had		3	statements are not admissible in courtfor the	
	Kevin Hughes, who has sat here throughout these			reason that they are suspect, and likewise this sort	
4			4		
5	hearings, and still sitting here in front of us		5	of statement of the basis how I am carrying my case	
6	today, but he didn't take the chair. They didn't		6	is very suspect.	
7	take the chair not because of any concern of		7	Let's go further. They also had the	
8	reprisal. They didn't take the chair because they		8	opportunity to present documentary evidence. If	
9	didn't want to be subjected to cross-examination,		9	they didn't feel the need, the desire or the fear	
10				that they had to present witness, they could have	
11				presented documentary evidence. And you have heard	
12	that. We are entitled to cross-examine those who			throughout these proceedings that we don't have it.	
13	are putting forward evidence against our client.			We don't have the evidence on the GoDaddy transfer.	
14	That is what the rules provide in this proceeding as			We don't have the evidence on Security Services Inc,	
15	in any other proceeding, and we were not given that			the lack of due process and the other factors. All	
16	opportunity because they are afraid to do that			of these things they could have presented and they	
17	because they don't have the evidence			didn't. In fact, on the reliance documentation we	
18	Now, what did Mr Baldwin tell you? Well,			asked for it. It was asked for in Request No 2 and	
19	instead of providing you with witness testimony,			they refused to produce it. So this Tribunal, not	
20	I am going to provide you with people in Colombia.			only should they recognise they didn't provide	
21				information, but they are entitled to give us an	
	assured me that these extensions are always granted.			adverse inference with regards to that	
23	Well, again, the formal rules, and I know		23	More dramatic yet is the fact that they	
	the Tribunal will always remind me, the formal rules			also made allegations of corruption in this case.	
25	that I grew up with in terms of a court proceeding		25	You heard that in the opening where they outright	
1		456	1	cross overprination. What are you going toth / to do a	457
1	accused my client of corruption, and yet they put	11:03	1	cross-examination. What are you going to try to do 1	<b>457</b> 1:04
2	forward no single shred of evidence of any such	11:03	2	cross-examination. What are you going to try to do us with that cross-examination?	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case.	11:03	2 3	cross-examination. What are you going to try to do 13 with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just	11:03	2 3 4	cross-examination. What are you going to try to do 13 with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left.	11:03	2 3 4 5	cross-examination. What are you going to try to do is with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present	11:03	2 3 4 5 6	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy?	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know,	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our dient. You heard the	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real story, not the Neustar story. We brought you	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our client. You heard the Minister say that she got a full briefing of what	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real story, not the Neustar story. We brought you Iván Castaño, the MinTIC's director,	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our client. You heard the Minister say that she got a full briefing of what had happened even before her time as Minister. Did	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real story, not the Neustar story. We brought you Iván Castaño, the MinTIC's director, Sylvia Constaín, the actual Minister in charge at	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our client. You heard the Minister say that she got a full briefing of what had happened even before her time as Minister. Did you hear any questions about whether at any of those	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real story, not the Neustar story. We brought you Iván Castaño, the MinTIC's director, Sylvia Constaín, the actual Minister in charge at the time, and Luisa Trujillo, MinTIC's	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our client. You heard the Minister say that she got a full briefing of what had happened even before her time as Minister. Did you hear any questions about whether at any of those briefings she inquired as to whether there had been	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real story, not the Neustar story. We brought you Iván Castaño, the MinTIC's director, Sylvia Constaín, the actual Minister in charge at the time, and Luisa Trujillo, MinTIC's Secretary-General. They weren't afraid to take the	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our client. You heard the Minister say that she got a full briefing of what had happened even before her time as Minister. Did you hear any questions about whether at any of those briefings she inquired as to whether there had been any prior representations to Neustar different from	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real story, not the Neustar story. We brought you Iván Castaño, the MinTIC's director, Sylvia Constaín, the actual Minister in charge at the time, and Luisa Trujillo, MinTIC's Secretary-General. They weren't afraid to take the chair. They sat in that chair. They were open to	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our client. You heard the Minister say that she got a full briefing of what had happened even before her time as Minister. Did you hear any questions about whether at any of those briefings she inquired as to whether there had been any prior representations to Neustar different from what was in the Contract that they were provided?	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real story, not the Neustar story. We brought you Iván Castaño, the MinTIC's director, Sylvia Constaín, the actual Minister in charge at the time, and Luisa Trujillo, MinTIC's Secretary-General. They weren't afraid to take the chair. They sat in that chair. They were open to cross-examination and they were cross-examined for	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our dient. You heard the Minister say that she got a full briefing of what had happened even before her time as Minister. Did you hear any questions about whether at any of those briefings she inquired as to whether there had been any prior representations to Neustar different from what was in the Contract that they were provided? Not a single question with regards to that.	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real story, not the Neustar story. We brought you Iván Castaño, the MinTIC's director, Sylvia Constaín, the actual Minister in charge at the time, and Luisa Trujillo, MinTIC's Secretary-General. They weren't afraid to take the chair. They sat in that chair. They were open to cross-examination and they were cross-examined for over three hours and 32 minutes.	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our dient. You heard the Minister say that she got a full briefing of what had happened even before her time as Minister. Did you hear any questions about whether at any of those briefings she inquired as to whether there had been any prior representations to Neustar different from what was in the Contract that they were provided? Not a single question with regards to that. Now, with regards to Neustar, there may be	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real story, not the Neustar story. We brought you Iván Castaño, the MinTIC's director, Sylvia Constaín, the actual Minister in charge at the time, and Luisa Trujillo, MinTIC's Secretary-General. They weren't afraid to take the chair. They sat in that chair. They were open to cross-examination and they were cross-examined for over three hours and 32 minutes. Now, I will tell you that I have trained	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our dient. You heard the Minister say that she got a full briefing of what had happened even before her time as Minister. Did you hear any questions about whether at any of those briefings she inquired as to whether there had been any prior representations to Neustar different from what was in the Contract that they were provided? Not a single question with regards to that. Now, with regards to Neustar, there may be an allegation of corruption, like I said. It is not	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real story, not the Neustar story. We brought you Iván Castaño, the MinTIC's director, Sylvia Constaín, the actual Minister in charge at the time, and Luisa Trujillo, MinTIC's Secretary-General. They weren't afraid to take the chair. They sat in that chair. They were open to cross-examination and they were cross-examined for over three hours and 32 minutes. Now, I will tell you that I have trained every associate that has ever worked with me, and	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our dient. You heard the Minister say that she got a full briefing of what had happened even before her time as Minister. Did you hear any questions about whether at any of those briefings she inquired as to whether there had been any prior representations to Neustar different from what was in the Contract that they were provided? Not a single question with regards to that. Now, with regards to Neustar, there may be an allegation of corruption, like I said. It is not anything we have to prove, he says, but we certainly	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real story, not the Neustar story. We brought you Iván Castaño, the MinTIC's director, Sylvia Constaín, the actual Minister in charge at the time, and Luisa Trujillo, MinTIC's Secretary-General. They weren't afraid to take the chair. They sat in that chair. They were open to cross-examination and they were cross-examined for over three hours and 32 minutes. Now, I will tell you that I have trained every associate that has ever worked with me, and now I train as a professor at the university	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our client. You heard the Minister say that she got a full briefing of what had happened even before her time as Minister. Did you hear any questions about whether at any of those briefings she inquired as to whether there had been any prior representations to Neustar different from what was in the Contract that they were provided? Not a single question with regards to that. Now, with regards to Neustar, there may be an allegation of corruption, like I said. It is not anything we have to prove, he says, but we certainly think there is cause for concern about corruption or	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real story, not the Neustar story. We brought you Iván Castaño, the MinTIC's director, Sylvia Constaín, the actual Minister in charge at the time, and Luisa Trujillo, MinTIC's Secretary-General. They weren't afraid to take the chair. They sat in that chair. They were open to cross-examination and they were cross-examined for over three hours and 32 minutes. Now, I will tell you that I have trained every associate that has ever worked with me, and now I train as a professor at the university students that when you are doing cross-examination	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our client. You heard the Minister say that she got a full briefing of what had happened even before her time as Minister. Did you hear any questions about whether at any of those briefings she inquired as to whether there had been any prior representations to Neustar different from what was in the Contract that they were provided? Not a single question with regards to that. Now, with regards to Neustar, there may be an allegation of corruption, like I said. It is not anything we have to prove, he says, but we certainly think there is cause for concern about corruption or nefarious reasons. That is what he said in opening	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real story, not the Neustar story. We brought you Iván Castaño, the MinTIC's director, Sylvia Constaín, the actual Minister in charge at the time, and Luisa Trujillo, MinTIC's Secretary-General. They weren't afraid to take the chair. They sat in that chair. They were open to cross-examination and they were cross-examined for over three hours and 32 minutes. Now, I will tell you that I have trained every associate that has ever worked with me, and now I train as a professor at the university students that when you are doing cross-examination the first thing you have to do is figure out what	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our client. You heard the Minister say that she got a full briefing of what had happened even before her time as Minister. Did you hear any questions about whether at any of those briefings she inquired as to whether there had been any prior representations to Neustar different from what was in the Contract that they were provided? Not a single question with regards to that. Now, with regards to Neustar, there may be an allegation of corruption, like I said. It is not anything we have to prove, he says, but we certainly think there is cause for concern about corruption or nefarious reasons. That is what he said in opening to you, gentlemen, but did he ask a single question	<b>457</b> 1:04
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	forward no single shred of evidence of any such corruption in this case So what do we have? We are left with just a lawyer's argument. That is all we have left. Now, on the witness side, we did present three witness. We brought, and you will hear from Colombia about this, but we brought three of the highest level officials involved directly with this matter. Not individuals who didn't know, individuals who knew the whole story, the real story, not the Neustar story. We brought you Iván Castaño, the MinTIC's director, Sylvia Constaín, the actual Minister in charge at the time, and Luisa Trujillo, MinTIC's Secretary-General. They weren't afraid to take the chair. They sat in that chair. They were open to cross-examination and they were cross-examined for over three hours and 32 minutes. Now, I will tell you that I have trained every associate that has ever worked with me, and now I train as a professor at the university students that when you are doing cross-examination	11:03	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	cross-examination. What are you going totry to do as with that cross-examination? And here they had three of the highest officials to question about all of these allegations that they have made in this case. Now, did we hear them question them about lack of legitimate policy? No. Did we hear about discrimination? No. Bad faith? Due process violations? Government representations? Did you hear a single question saying this is a fact, did you know representations were made at any time to our client. You heard the Minister say that she got a full briefing of what had happened even before her time as Minister. Did you hear any questions about whether at any of those briefings she inquired as to whether there had been any prior representations to Neustar different from what was in the Contract that they were provided? Not a single question with regards to that. Now, with regards to Neustar, there may be an allegation of corruption, like I said. It is not anything we have to prove, he says, but we certainly think there is cause for concern about corruption or nefarious reasons. That is what he said in opening	<b>457</b> 1:04

www.dianaburden.com

		-	
1	458 any corruption before, during or after their time 11:06	1	have been the investment treaty case that they would $11:07$
2	serving for Colombia? Not a single question. They	2	have brought. But instead now they accuse us of
3	didn't dare ask those questions but they certainly	3	doing everything right to try to protect them and
4	dared to make those allegations to you	4	somehow that is our fault and that somehow should be
5	What did Mr Baldwin ask? Mr Baldwin asked	5	an action for claim. It is not. It is their abuse
6	repeatedly to all the witnesses whether in their	6	of process in this.
7	view it was appropriate to exclude .CO Internet from	7	What you heard the witnesses, and I won't
8	the previous advisory meetings. That was the theme.	8	belabour this point because you will have it from
9	That was the one objective, I guess, if you can ask	9	the transcripts is you will hear the witnesses tell
10		10	
	cross-examinations that was asked of the witnesses.		how they didn't actarbitrarily. You heard that
	But what you heard in response from each of the		from Ms Constaín, you heard it from Mr Castaño and
	witnesses you'll see is each witness explained and		you also heard it from Ms Trujillo. All three
	justified why there was very good reasons in order		witnesses told you that.
15		15	So let's get to the third part of my
16		16	
17		17	
	include them in that process and to keep them out of	18	The Tribunal already asked specific
	that process for their very protection.	19	questions about this, and so I don't need to repeat
20		20	
-	would have had had we allowed them into those early		fact that, first of all, Mr Baldwin told youagain
22			at the outset that he was going to come back to this
23			issue about that language and the Respondent seeks
-	sorry, you can't participate because now you are		to read this clause that would render this clause
	disqualified for conflict of interest. That would		meaningless.
23			
	460		
1	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:08	1	applied at the time, and they knew that it needed to 11:09
2	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:08 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has	2	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without
2 3	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and	2 3	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and
2 3 4	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking,	2 3 4	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019 that existed in
2 3 4 5	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are	2 3 4 5	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019 that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this
2 3 4 5 6	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to	2 3 4 5 6	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019 that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion
2 3 4 5 6 7	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed.	2 3 4 5 6 7	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019 that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here today that it is not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here today that it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here today that it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here today that it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here today that it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here today that it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you explain if you receive the new concession, how do	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to award fees and costs in this case to Colombia as
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here today that it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you explain if you receive the new concession, how do you explain whether you have an actual claim, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to award fees and costs in this case to Colombia as a result of this completely frivolous case brought
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here today that it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you explain if you receive the new concession, how do you explain whether you have an actual claim, and what they say to you is well, we do, because now it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to award fees and costs in this case to Colombia as a result of this completely frivolous case brought against them and truly an abuse of process.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here todaythat it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you explain if you receive the new concession, how do you explain whether you have an actual claim, and what they say to you is well, we do, because now it is only five years instead of ten years and now we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to award fees and costs in this case to Colombia as a result of this completely frivolous case brought against them and truly an abuse of process. Thank you. I will now turn the word over
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here todaythat it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you explain if you receive the new concession, how do you explain whether you have an actual claim, and what they say to you is well, we do, because now it is only five years instead of ten years and now we don't have all the same economic conditions we had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to award fees and costs in this case to Colombia as a result of this completely frivolous case brought against them and truly an abuse of process. Thank you. I will now turn the word over to Colombia.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall"be renewed. He says here todaythat it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you explain if you receive the new concession, how do you explain whether you have an actual claim, and what they say to you is well, we do, because now it is only five years instead of ten years and now we don't have all the same economic conditions we had in the original concession.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to award fees and costs in this case to Colombia as a result of this completely frivolous case brought against them and truly an abuse of process. Thank you. I will now turn the word over to Colombia. by Ms Ordoñez Puenes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall"be renewed. He says here today that it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you explain if you receive the new concession, how do you explain whether you have an actual claim, and what they say to you is well, we do, because now it is only five years instead of ten years and now we don't have all the same economic conditions we had in the original concession. Well, exactly. That is what they wanted.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to award fees and costs in this case to Colombia as a result of this completely frivolous case brought against them and truly an abuse of process. Thank you. I will now turn the word over to Colombia.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here today that it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you explain if you receive the new concession, how do you explain whether you have an actual claim, and what they say to you is well, we do, because now it is only five years instead of ten years and now we don't have all the same economic conditions we had in the original concession. Well, exactly. That is what they wanted. They wanted it to be automatic, meaning the same	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to award fees and costs in this case to Colombia as a result of this completely frivolous case brought against them and truly an abuse of process. Thank you. I will now turn the word over to Colombia. by Ms Ordoñez Puentes MS ORDOÑEZ PUENTES: Thank you, Dan. Mr Chairman and members of the Tribunal,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here today that it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you explain if you receive the new concession, how do you explain whether you have an actual claim, and what they say to you is well, we do, because now it is only five years instead of ten years and now we don't have all the same economic conditions we had in the original concession. Well, exactly. That is what they wanted. They wanted it to be automatic, meaning the same terms. But the language was clear. The language	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to award fees and costs in this case to Colombia as a result of this completely frivolous case brought against them and truly an abuse of process. Thank you. I will now turn the word over to Colombia. by Ms Ordoñez Puentes MS ORDONEZ PUENTES: Thank you, Dan. Mr Chairman and members of the Tribunal,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here today that it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you explain if you receive the new concession, how do you explain whether you have an actual claim, and what they say to you is well, we do, because now it is only five years instead of ten years and now we don't have all the same economic conditions we had in the original concession. Well, exactly. That is what they wanted. They wanted it to be automatic, meaning the same terms. But the language was clear. The language didn't say "shall", the language said "may", and it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to award fees and costs in this case to Colombia as a result of this completely frivolous case brought against them and truly an abuse of process. Thank you. I will now turn the word over to Colombia. by Ms Ordoñez Puentes MS ORDOÑEZ PUENTES: Thank you, Dan. Mr Chairman and members of the Tribunal, despite the fact that we are convinced of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here today that it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you explain if you receive the new concession, how do you explain whether you have an actual claim, and what they say to you is well, we do, because now it is only five years instead of ten years and now we don't have all the same economic conditions we had in the original concession. Well, exactly. That is what they wanted. They wanted it to be automatic, meaning the same terms. But the language was clear. The language didn't say "shall", the language said "may", and it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to award fees and costs in this case to Colombia as a result of this completely frivolous case brought against them and truly an abuse of process. Thank you. I will now turn the word over to Colombia. by Ms Ordoñez Puentes MS ORDOÑEZ PUENTES: Thank you, Dan. Mr Chairman and members of the Tribunal, despite the fact that we are convinced of the frivolous nature of the claims brought before this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here todaythat it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you explain if you receive the new concession, how do you explain whether you have an actual claim, and what they say to you is well, we do, because now it is only five years instead of ten years and now we don't have all the same economic conditions we had in the original concession. Well, exactly. That is what they wanted. They wanted it to be automatic, meaning the same terms. But the language was clear. The language didn't say "shall", the language said "may", and it said "may" for a very particular reason. Because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to award fees and costs in this case to Colombia as a result of this completely frivolous case brought against them and truly an abuse of process. Thank you. I will now turn the word over to Colombia. by Ms Ordoñez Puentes <b>MS ORDOÑEZ PUENTES:</b> Thank you, Dan. Mr Chairman and members of the Tribunal, despite the fact that we are convinced of the frivolous nature of the claims brought before this Tribunal and that this case should not have gotten
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here todaythat it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you explain if you receive the new concession, how do you explain whether you have an actual claim, and what they say to you is well, we do, because now it is only five years instead of ten years and now we don't have all the same economic conditions we had in the original concession. Well, exactly. That is what they wanted. They wanted it to be automatic, meaning the same terms. But the language was clear. The language didn't say "shall", the language said "may", and it said "may" for a very particular reason. Because Colombia had grabbed up, collected the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to award fees and costs in this case to Colombia as a result of this completely frivolous case brought against them and truly an abuse of process. Thank you. I will now turn the word over to Colombia. by Ms Ordoñez Puentes <b>MS ORDOÑEZ PUENTES:</b> Thank you, Dan. Mr Chairman and members of the Tribunal, despite the fact that we are convinced of the frivolous nature of the claims brought before this Tribunal and that this case should not have gotten this far, at this point the Tribunal would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	That is simply not true. We do not read 11:00 it meaninglessly. It does have meaning and it has the rightful meaning which is clear on its face and it is not to be re-interpreted as they are seeking, because what Claimants are trying to do is they are trying to take Article 4 and they are trying to re-interpret that clause as "shall" be renewed. He says here todaythat it is not automatic, that they are not seeking automatic. But they are. Even this morning, members of the Tribunal, if you look at their slide 29, where they answer your question as to about well, how do you explain if you receive the new concession, how do you explain whether you have an actual claim, and what they say to you is well, we do, because now it is only five years instead of ten years and now we don't have all the same economic conditions we had in the original concession. Well, exactly. That is what they wanted. They wanted it to be automatic, meaning the same terms. But the language was clear. The language didn't say "shall", the language said "may", and it said "may" for a very particular reason. Because Colombia had grabbed up, collected the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	applied at the time, and they knewthat it needed to 11:09 say "may". Now, by the way, it is not left without meaning because if in fact we had gotten to 2019 and the same conditions existed in 2019that existed in 2009 in the market place and otherwise, this contract could have been renewed at the discretion of Colombia for another ten years, but that was not to be because things had dramatically changed So, why are we still here? We are still here because you do need to make an important decision in this case. It is at the discretion of the Tribunal, for sure, but it is the decision to award fees and costs in this case to Colombia as a result of this completely frivolous case brought against them and truly an abuse of process. Thank you. I will now turn the word over to Colombia. by Ms Ordoñez Puentes <b>MS ORDOÑEZ PUENTES:</b> Thank you, Dan. Mr Chairman and members of the Tribunal, despite the fact that we are convinced of the frivolous nature of the claims brought before this Tribunal and that this case should not have gotten this far, at this point the Tribunal would

				wearlesday, 25 Marc	, =•=•
1		462	1		463
1	also significant resources in this process and to	11:10	1	encourages the proper use of investment arbitration 11	1:11
2	attend this hearing in London alongside three high		2	and prevents opportunistic claims unfairly impacting	
3	profile witnesses to make sure that you could		3	a state's reputation.	
4	confirm first hand that Colombia is a state that abides by the rule of law, highly committed to		4	Members of the Tribunal, thank you for	
5	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		5	your attention and your time these past few days.	
6	complying with its international obligations, and		6	Before I finish, I would also like to extend my	
7	actually convinced of the value and importance of		7	gratitude to the ICSID team, our translators and	
8	the international arbitration system.		8	court reporters, without whom this hearing would not	
9	In fact, it is very satisfactory to see		9	have been possible, and also to our colleagues on	
10				the other side. Thank you.	
	because each of themevidenced how transparent,		11	PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. I am	
	diligent, technical and informed were the decisions			going to suggest we have a short break, let's say 20	
13	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			minutes, so that everybody can have a coffee and	
	I respectfully request to you not only to dismiss			then we will come back. I think we may have a few	
	this case and grant this Respondent's full costs,			questions and of course there is one other matter	
16	but also to make of this decision a lesson to			that you wanted to raise, and we will hear about	
17	prevent the irresponsible use of international			that later.	
	investment arbitration.		18	Let's take 20 minutes.	
19	States encounter a lot of difficulties		19	(Short break from 11.12 am to 11.47 am)	
20	5 1		20	PRESIDENT: Very well. May we proceed?	
21	one before us, so it is just fair that investors			Thank you.	
	also pay the price when this happens.		22	We have decided that we don't have	
23	I always say that arbitrators are			questions. We think that the various issues that	
	the guardians of the system, so I respectfully			have been raised by the parties have been very well	
25	request that you render an exemplary decision that		25	briefed and argued, and we appreciate that, so we	
1	are not going to pose any specific questions at this	<b>464</b> 11:48	1	will be a month after the transcript. You are able	465 1:49
1	are not going to pose any specific questions at this stage.	<b>464</b> 11:48	1 2	will be a month after the transcript. You are able 11 to work on the transcript because I would expect	<b>465</b> 1:49
		<b>464</b> 11:48		will be a month after the transcript. You are able 11	<b>465</b> 1:49
2	stage.	<b>464</b> 11:48	2	to work on the transcript because I would expect	<b>465</b> 1:49
2 3	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and	<b>464</b> 11:48	2 3	will be a month after the transcript. You are able 11 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that	<b>465</b> 1:49
2 3 4	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want	464 11:48	2 3 4	will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there	<b>465</b> 1:49
2 3 4 5	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the	464 11:48	2 3 4 5	will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything	<b>465</b> 1:49
2 3 4 5 6	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules	464 11:48	2 3 4 5 6 7	will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there	465 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration	464 11:48	2 3 4 5 6 7	will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there <b>MR GOUIFFES:</b> So you mean 28 April for the	465 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to	464 11:48	2 3 5 6 7 8 9	will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there <b>MR GOUIFFÈS:</b> So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the	465 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we	464 11:48	2 3 5 6 7 8 9	will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there <b>MR GOUIFFES:</b> So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the second? I am sorry, I am just asking for	<b>465</b> 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we have 28 days from now, from the end of today, for the agreement of the transcript, and then, as was	<b>464</b> 11:48	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there <b>MR GOUIFFES:</b> So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the second? I am sorry, I am just asking for clarification.	<b>465</b> 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we have 28 days from now, from the end of today, for the agreement of the transcript, and then, as was	11:48	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the second? I am sorry, I am just asking for clarification.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: The 26 May. Are you happy with 26 May?</li> <li>MR BALDWIN: Yes.</li> </ul>	465 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we have 28 days from now, from the end of today, for the agreement of the transcript, and then, as was agreed yesterday, we are going to have one round of	11:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there <b>MR GOUIFFÈS:</b> So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the second? I am sorry, I am just asking for clarification. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> The 26 May. Are you happy with 26 May?	465 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we have 28 days from now, from the end of today, for the agreement of the transcript, and then, as was agreed yesterday, we are going to have one round of post-hearing briefs, and we ruled on that, and then we have the notice that we have been given on security for costs –	11:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the second? I am sorry, I am just asking for clarification.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: The 26 May. Are you happy with 26 May?</li> <li>MR BALDWIN: Yes.</li> </ul>	<b>465</b> 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we have 28 days from now, from the end of today, for the agreement of the transcript, and then, as was agreed yesterday, we are going to have one round of post-hearing briefs, and we ruled on that, and then we have the notice that we have been given on	11:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there MR GOUIFFES: So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the second? I am sorry, I am just asking for clarification. PRESIDENT: The 26 May. Are you happy with 26 May? MR BALDWIN: Yes. PRESIDENT: It is better for the members</li></ul>	<b>465</b> 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we have 28 days from now, from the end of today, for the agreement of the transcript, and then, as was agreed yesterday, we are going to have one round of post-hearing briefs, and we ruled on that, and then we have the notice that we have been given on security for costs –	11:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there</li> <li>MR GOUIFFES: So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the second? I am sorry, I am just asking for clarification.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: The 26 May. Are you happy with 26 May?</li> <li>MR BALDWIN: Yes.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: It is better for the members of your team, because if you have to file on a</li> </ul>	<b>465</b> 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we have 28 days from now, from the end of today, for the agreement of the transcript, and then, as was agreed yesterday, we are going to have one round of post-hearing briefs, and we ruled on that, and then we have the notice that we have been given on security for costs <b>MR GOUIFFÈS:</b> Sorry, Mr Chairman, on these dates, are they specific dates you have or you put this in an order afterwards?	11:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect</li> <li>whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the second? I am sorry, I am just asking for clarification.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: The 26 May. Are you happy with 26 May?</li> <li>MR BALDWIN: Yes.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: It is better for the members of your team, because if you have to file on a Friday they get a weekend. If you are filing ona Monday then the probability is they will all have to work the weekend.</li> </ul>	<b>465</b> 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration. And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we have 28 days from now, from the end of today, for the agreement of the transcript, and then, as was agreed yesterday, we are going to have one round of post-hearing briefs, and we ruled on that, and then we have the notice that we have been given on security for costs <b>MR GOUIFFÈS:</b> Sorry, Mr Chairman, on these dates, are they specific dates you have or you put this in an order afterwards? <b>PRESIDENT:</b> On the post-hearing brief?	11:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect</li> <li>whilst there may be a little bit of things that</li> <li>might need some finessing, it is not as if something</li> <li>is going to be hopefully not anything</li> <li>significant, that won't be there</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: So you mean 28 April for the</li> <li>first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the</li> <li>second? I am sorry, I am just asking for</li> <li>clarification.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: The 26 May. Are you happy</li> <li>with 26 May?</li> <li>MR BALDWIN: Yes.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: It is better for the members</li> <li>of your team, because if you have to file on a</li> <li>Friday they get a weekend. If you are filing ona</li> <li>Monday then the probability is they will all have to</li> </ul>	<b>465</b> 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we have 28 days from now, from the end of today, for the agreement of the transcript, and then, as was agreed yesterday, we are going to have one round of post-hearing briefs, and we ruled on that, and then we have the notice that we have been given on security for costs <b>MR GOUIFFÈS:</b> Sorry, Mr Chairman, on these dates, are they specific dates you have or you put this in an order afterwards?	11:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the second? I am sorry, I am just asking for clarification.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: The 26 May. Are you happy with 26 May?</li> <li>MR BALDWN: Yes.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: It is better for the members of your team, because if you have to file on a Friday they get a weekend. If you are filing ona Monday then the probability is they will all have to work the weekend.</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: And this is a long weekend too. I am sorry, I shouldn't have said this</li> </ul>	465
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we have 28 days from now, from the end of today, for the agreement of the transcript, and then, as was agreed yesterday, we are going to have one round of post-hearing briefs, and we ruled on that, and then we have the notice that we have been given on security for costs <b>MR GOUIFFÈS:</b> Sorry, Mr Chairman, on these dates, are they specific dates you have or you put this in an order afterwards? <b>PRESIDENT:</b> On the post-hearing brief? <b>MR GOUIFFÈS:</b> Yes. When do we need to agree?	11:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the second? I am sorry, I am just asking for darification.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: The 26 May. Are you happy with 26 May?</li> <li>MR BALDWIN: Yes.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: It is better for the members of your team, because if you have to file on a Friday they get a weekend. If you are filing ona Monday then the probability is they will all have to work the weekend.</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: And this is a long weekend too. I am sorry, I shouldn't have said this PRESIDENT: So we will go for the 26th</li> </ul>	465 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we have 28 days from now, from the end of today, for the agreement of the transcript, and then, as was agreed yesterday, we are going to have one round of post-hearing briefs, and we ruled on that, and then we have the notice that we have been given on security for costs – MR GOUIFFES: Sorry, Mr Chairman, on these dates, are they specific dates you have or you put this in an order afterwards? PRESIDENT: On the post-hearing brief? MR GOUIFFES: Yes. When do we need to agree? PRESIDENT: That is going to be 29 May.	11:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there</li> <li>MR GOUIFFES: So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the second? I am sorry, I am just asking for darification.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: The 26 May. Are you happy with 26 May?</li> <li>MR BALDWIN: Yes.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: It is better for the members of your team, because if you have to file on a Friday they get a weekend. If you are filing ona Monday then the probability is they will all have to work the weekend.</li> <li>MR GOUIFFES: And this is a long weekend too. I am sorry, I shouldn't have said this PRESIDENT: So we will go for the 26th MR BALDWIN: Yes, please.</li> </ul>	465 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we have 28 days from now, from the end of today, for the agreement of the transcript, and then, as was agreed yesterday, we are going to have one round of post-hearing briefs, and we ruled on that, and then we have the notice that we have been given on security for costs MR GOUIFFÈS: Sorry, Mr Chairman, on these dates, are they specific dates you have or you put this in an order afterwards? PRESIDENT: On the post-hearing brief? MR GOUIFFÈS: Yes. When do we need to agree? PRESIDENT: That is going to be 29 May. MR GOUIFFÈS: Thank you.	11:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the second? I am sorry, I am just asking for clarification.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: The 26 May. Are you happy with 26 May?</li> <li>MR BALDWIN: Yes.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: It is better for the members of your team, because if you have to file on a Friday they get a weekend. If you are filing ona Monday then the probability is they will all have to work the weekend.</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: And this is a long weekend too. I am sorry, I shouldn't have said this PRESIDENT: So we will go for the 26th MR BALDWIN: Yes, please.</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: Thank you, Mr Chairman.</li> </ul>	<b>465</b> 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we have 28 days from now, from the end of today, for the agreement of the transcript, and then, as was agreed yesterday, we are going to have one round of post-hearing briefs, and we ruled on that, and then we have the notice that we have been given on security for costs <b>MR GOUIFFES:</b> Sorry, Mr Chairman, on these dates, are they specific dates you have or you put this in an order afterwards? <b>PRESIDENT:</b> On the post-hearing brief? <b>MR GOUIFFES:</b> That is going to be 29 May. <b>MR GOUIFFES:</b> Thank you. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> And on the post-hearing	11:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect</li> <li>whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything</li> <li>significant, that won't be there</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the second? I am sorry, I am just asking for clarification.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: The 26 May. Are you happy with 26 May?</li> <li>MR BALDWIN: Yes.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: It is better for the members of your team, because if you have to file on a Friday they get a weekend. If you are filing ona Monday then the probability is they will all have to work the weekend.</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: And this is a long weekend too. I am sorry, I shouldn't have said this PRESIDENT: So we will go for the 26th MR BALDWIN: Yes, please.</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: Thank you, Mr Chairman.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: Now we come to the question of</li> </ul>	<b>465</b> 1:49
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	stage. But what we would like to do is just, and I do this in the form of a ruling, what we do want some more information on is the question of the relevant Delaware law and the international rules for determining the Claimant in this arbitration And how we propose to do this is we are going to have within the context of where we go from here, we have 28 days from now, from the end of today, for the agreement of the transcript, and then, as was agreed yesterday, we are going to have one round of post-hearing briefs, and we ruled on that, and then we have the notice that we have been given on security for costs MR GOUIFFÈS: Sorry, Mr Chairman, on these dates, are they specific dates you have or you put this in an order afterwards? PRESIDENT: On the post-hearing brief? MR GOUIFFÈS: Yes. When do we need to agree? PRESIDENT: That is going to be 29 May. MR GOUIFFÈS: Thank you.	11:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>will be a month after the transcript. You are able 13 to work on the transcript because I would expect whilst there may be a little bit of things that might need some finessing, it is not as if something is going to be hopefully not anything significant, that won't be there</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: So you mean 28 April for the first, and if we take Fridays, 26 May for the second? I am sorry, I am just asking for clarification.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: The 26 May. Are you happy with 26 May?</li> <li>MR BALDWIN: Yes.</li> <li>PRESIDENT: It is better for the members of your team, because if you have to file on a Friday they get a weekend. If you are filing ona Monday then the probability is they will all have to work the weekend.</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: And this is a long weekend too. I am sorry, I shouldn't have said this PRESIDENT: So we will go for the 26th MR BALDWIN: Yes, please.</li> <li>MR GOUIFFÈS: Thank you, Mr Chairman.</li> </ul>	<b>465</b> 1:49

	No ARB 20/7				
1	you had agreed on dates butyou were not agreed on	466	1	days. If you are replying to us to say we want to 12	467
		11:50	1		1:52
2	time. So we would expect the application for the			reply, and we will reply within another week or	
3	security for costs from Respondent on 14 April, and		3	whenever that is, because we could say seven days or	
4	the reply on the 28 April, but on all points, and we		4	ten days from the date you receive 28 April is	
5	will deal with that then		5	when you will receive the reply on the security for	
6	Now, in the reply for security for costs		6	costs.	
7	we would like the Claimant to provide more details		7	MR GOUIFFÈS: Could we say 10 or 11 May or	
8	of the relevant Delaware law and the specific rules		8	something like that? The 7th is a Sunday. So 10 or	
9	on international law as applicable to the		9	11 of May, if that is okay, if it is ten days, if we	
	transaction in relationship to the claim. And then			take out the weekend. 10 May? Is that okay?	
	if Respondent if Respondent feels they need to		11	10 May, which is a Wednesday.	
	reply, they will then first apply to the Tribunal		12	<b>PRESIDENT:</b> And the reply is only on the	
13	for opportunity to respond, on the Delaware		13	issue of Delaware law.	
14	question. If you then wish to reply to anything		14	MR GOUIFFÈS: Understood, Mr Chairman.	
15	that has come from the Claimant, you will apply to		15	MR GONZÁLEZ: I am sorry, but I understood	
16	the Tribunal for permission to do so		16	10 May is our date to indicate our intent to reply.	
17	MR GOUIFFÈS: We are all in a hearing		17	PRESIDENT: Yes.	
18	today in London, so it is likely that, assuming they		18	MR GONZÁLEZ: Are we going to set the	
19	give you documents on 28 April, we will have seen		19	further briefing schedule now or wait?	
20	this for the first time and it is very likely we are		20	PRESIDENT: No, we would expect you to say	
	going to have to say something on this.		21	"we are going to reply", and by that time you will	
	I understand you don't want to rule now, but by when		22	have had 12 days so you would be able to say "can we	
	do you want			please have permission to reply because", and we	
24				will do so within seven days. You will have worked	
	application we would expect that within, say, ten			out what you want to say to us where you disagree or	
25					
		<b>468</b> 11:53	1	I am just trying to be clear as to	<b>469</b> 1:54
25 1 2	you think something needs to be added.	468		I am just trying to be clear as to 1:	<b>469</b> 1:54
1	you think something needs to be added. <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission"	<b>468</b> 11:53	1 2 3	PRESIDENT: This particular issue –	<b>469</b> 1:54
1 2	you think something needs to be added.	<b>468</b> 11:53	2	PRESIDENT: This particular issue obviously it is a very important issue but it is	<b>469</b> 1:54
1 2 3 4	you think something needs to be added. <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual	11:53	2 3 4	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is	<b>469</b> 1:54
1 2 3 4 5	you think something needs to be added. <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then	11:53	2 3 4 5	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not	<b>469</b> 1:54
1 2 3 4 5 6	you think something needs to be added. <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter.	11:53	2 3 4 5 6	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there	<b>469</b> 1:54
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	you think something needs to be added. <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am	11:53	2 3 4 5 6 7	PRESIDENT: This particular issue obviously it is a very important issue but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law we are not	469 1:54
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you think something needs to be added. <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the	11:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that	469 1:54
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you think something needs to be added. <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file-	11:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what	469
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you think something needs to be added. <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file– <b>PRESIDENT:</b> You will get permission to	11:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate	<b>469</b> 1:54
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you think something needs to be added <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file– <b>PRESIDENT:</b> You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for	11:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that. MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because	<b>469</b> 1:54
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you think something needs to be added <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file- <b>PRESIDENT:</b> You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for permission to make a reply-	11:53	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because we will have to wait until we know there has been	<b>469</b> 1:54
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you think something needs to be added <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file- <b>PRESIDENT:</b> You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for permission to make a reply <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> By 10 May we are going to	11:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because we will have to wait until we know there has been leave granted by the Tribunal.	<b>469</b> 1:54
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you think something needs to be added <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file- <b>PRESIDENT:</b> You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for permission to make a reply <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> By 10 May we are going to ask you for permission to make a reply.	11:53	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because we will have to wait until we know there has been leave granted by the Tribunal. PRESIDENT: Absolutely.	<b>469</b> 1:54
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you think something needs to be added <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file- <b>PRESIDENT:</b> You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for permission to make a reply <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> By 10 May we are going to ask you for permission to make a reply. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> And you will tell us why you	11:53	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because we will have to wait until we know there has been leave granted by the Tribunal. PRESIDENT: Absolutely. MR GONZÁLEZ: That is clear enough. Thank	469
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you think something needs to be added. <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file- <b>PRESIDENT:</b> You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for permission to make a reply <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> By 10 May we are going to ask you for permission to make a reply. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> And you will tell us why you think it is important and how soon you will make	11:53	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because we will have to wait until we know there has been leave granted by the Tribunal. PRESIDENT: Absolutely. MR GONZÁLEZ: That is clear enough. Thank you.	469
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you think something needs to be added <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file- <b>PRESIDENT:</b> You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for permission to make a reply <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> By 10 May we are going to ask you for permission to make a reply. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> And you will tell us why you think it is important and how soon you will make that.	11:53	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because we will have to wait until we know there has been leave granted by the Tribunal. PRESIDENT: Absolutely. MR GONZÁLEZ: That is clear enough. Thank you. PRESIDENT: We will confirm these in a	469
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you think something needs to be added. <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file- <b>PRESIDENT:</b> You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for permission to make a reply <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> By 10 May we are going to ask you for permission to make a reply. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> And you will tell us why you think it is important and how soon you will make that. <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> Okay. So in that request we	11:53	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because we will have to wait until we know there has been leave granted by the Tribunal. PRESIDENT: Absolutely. MR GONZÁLEZ: That is clear enough. Thank you. PRESIDENT: We will confirm these in a post-hearing. After today we will confirm this in	469
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	you think something needs to be added <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file– <b>PRESIDENT:</b> You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for permission to make a reply– <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> By 10 May we are going to ask you for permission to make a reply. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> And you will tell us why you think it is important and how soon you will make that. <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> Okay. So in that request we will ask you for how much time we need to make that	11:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because we will have to wait until we know there has been leave granted by the Tribunal. PRESIDENT: Absolutely. MR GONZÁLEZ: That is clear enough. Thank you. PRESIDENT: We will confirm these in a post-hearing. After today we will confirm this in an order from the Tribunal.	<b>469</b> 1:54
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you think something needs to be added <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file– <b>PRESIDENT:</b> You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for permission to make a reply <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> By 10 May we are going to ask you for permission to make a reply. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> And you will tell us why you think it is important and how soon you will make that. <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> Okay. So in that request we will ask you for how much time we need to make that reply and then we will await the Tribunal's decision	11:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law –- we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because we will have to wait until we know there has been leave granted by the Tribunal. PRESIDENT: Absolutely. MR GONZÁLEZ: That is clear enough. Thank you. PRESIDENT: We will confirm these in a post-hearing. After today we will confirm this in an order from the Tribunal. MR GOUIFFÈS: Very practically, on 10 May,	469
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you think something needs to be added <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file– <b>PRESIDENT:</b> You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for permission to make a reply <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> By 10 May we are going to ask you for permission to make a reply. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> And you will tell us why you think it is important and how soon you will make that. <b>MR GONZÁLEZ:</b> Okay. So in that request we will ask you for how much time we need to make that reply and then we will await the Tribunal's decision on that before our clock starts running on that	11:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because we will have to wait until we know there has been leave granted by the Tribunal. PRESIDENT: Absolutely. MR GONZÁLEZ: That is clear enough. Thank you. PRESIDENT: We will confirm these in a post-hearing. After today we will confirm this in an order from the Tribunal. MR GOUIFFES: Very practically, on 10 May, so we will do what you have just said, we have to	469
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you think something needs to be added MR GONZÁLEZ: It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file- PRESIDENT: You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for permission to make a reply MR GONZÁLEZ: By 10 May we are going to ask you for permission to make a reply. PRESIDENT: And you will tell us why you think it is important and how soon you will make that. MR GONZÁLEZ: Okay. So in that request we will ask you for how much time we need to make that reply and then we will await the Tribunal's decision on that before our clock starts running on that reply.	11:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because we will have to wait until we know there has been leave granted by the Tribunal. PRESIDENT: Absolutely. MR GONZÁLEZ: That is clear enough. Thank you. PRESIDENT: We will confirm these in a post-hearing. After today we will confirm this in an order from the Tribunal. MR GOUIFFÈS: Very practically, on 10 May, so we will do what you have just said, we have to file on 26 May the post-hearing briefs, so it is	469
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you think something needs to be added MR GONZÁLEZ: It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file- PRESIDENT: You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for permission to make a reply MR GONZÁLEZ: By 10 May we are going to ask you for permission to make a reply. PRESIDENT: And you will tell us why you think it is important and how soon you will make that. MR GONZÁLEZ: Okay. So in that request we will ask you for how much time we need to make that reply and then we will await the Tribunal's decision on that before our clock starts running on that reply. PRESIDENT: Well, you will be working on	11:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because we will have to wait until we know there has been leave granted by the Tribunal. PRESIDENT: Absolutely. MR GONZÁLEZ: That is clear enough. Thank you. PRESIDENT: We will confirm these in a post-hearing. After today we will confirm this in an order from the Tribunal. MR GOUIFFÈS: Very practically, on 10 May, so we will do what you have just said, we have to file on 26 May the post-hearing briefs, so it is very clearly, because you are saying it is just one	469
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you think something needs to be added MR GONZÁLEZ: It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file- PRESIDENT: You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for permission to make a reply MR GONZÁLEZ: By 10 May we are going to ask you for permission to make a reply. PRESIDENT: And you will tell us why you think it is important and how soon you will make that. MR GONZÁLEZ: Okay. So in that request we will ask you for how much time we need to make that reply and then we will await the Tribunal's decision on that before our clock starts running on that reply. PRESIDENT: Well, you will be working on your post-hearings hopefully anyway.	11:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because we will have to wait until we know there has been leave granted by the Tribunal. PRESIDENT: Absolutely. MR GONZÁLEZ: That is clear enough. Thank you. PRESIDENT: We will confirm these in a post-hearing. After today we will confirm this in an order from the Tribunal. MR GOUIFFÈS: Very practically, on 10 May, so we will do what you have just said, we have to file on 26 May the post-hearing briefs, so it is very clearly, because you are saying it is just one issue, it is very likely to be before 26 May that we	469
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you think something needs to be added MR GONZÁLEZ: It is the word "permission" that I was confused by. So it is permission be granted in the sense that we will be giving actual notice that we do intend to reply and then we then reply thereafter. In other words, I am asking if I am expecting an order from the Tribunal granting us the leave, or do we just proceed to go ahead and file- PRESIDENT: You will get permission to make the application. You are asking us for permission to make a reply MR GONZÁLEZ: By 10 May we are going to ask you for permission to make a reply. PRESIDENT: And you will tell us why you think it is important and how soon you will make that. MR GONZÁLEZ: Okay. So in that request we will ask you for how much time we need to make that reply and then we will await the Tribunal's decision on that before our clock starts running on that reply. PRESIDENT: Well, you will be working on your post-hearings hopefully anyway.	11:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	PRESIDENT: This particular issue – obviously it is a very important issue – but it is also very specific. So to the extent that there is law, unless it is your view that they have not covered the Delaware law as it is, or you say there is a different application of the law – we are not looking for anything other than that MR GONZÁLEZ: Understood. It is just what is clear what we cannot set today is the ultimate date of when such reply by uswould be due because we will have to wait until we know there has been leave granted by the Tribunal. PRESIDENT: Absolutely. MR GONZÁLEZ: That is clear enough. Thank you. PRESIDENT: We will confirm these in a post-hearing. After today we will confirm this in an order from the Tribunal. MR GOUIFFÈS: Very practically, on 10 May, so we will do what you have just said, we have to file on 26 May the post-hearing briefs, so it is very clearly, because you are saying it is just one	469

Case N	o ARB 20/7	Final		Wednesday, 29 Mar	rch, 202
1	PRESIDENT: Yes.	470 11:56 1	_	of the Tribunal, we just wanted to address two quick	<b>471</b>
2	MR GOUIFFÈS: That is very clear.	2	2	points following Claimant's comments on our slides	
3	<b>PRESIDENT:</b> There are separate issues,	3		19 and 22 of our opening presentation.	
4	your application for the security for costs and			<b>PRESIDENT:</b> This was your opening	
5	there may be overlaps, and then of course the		;	presentation?	
6	post-hearings.	6		MS MELISSA ORDOÑEZ: Yes.	
7	MR GOUIFFÈS: Understood.	7	,	First, counsel for Claimant commented on	
8	<b>PRESIDENT:</b> Anything I have left out?	8	3	our slide 19 of our opening presentation which, as a	
9	PROFESSOR HOBÉR: No.	9	)	reminder, presented the 2020 tender requirements	
10	PROFESSOR DERAINS: No.		0	Claimant complains about. So more specifically,	
11	PRESIDENT: Very well. We had one further	11	1	Claimant explained that the 70 per cent maximum	
12	matter of clarification that Respondent wanted to	) 12	2	level of indebtedness that you can see here was not	
13	make.		3	based on ITU recommendations, but rather on Decree	
14	MR GONZÁLEZ: Yes. Mr Chairman, I am	n 14	4	1082 of 2015. This is incorrect.	
15	reminded of one clarification point. On the	15	5	If we can have a look at the relevant	
16	post-hearing briefs, and I think the Tribunal I	16	6	section of the ITU report, C-67, which we will	
17	believe made it clear yesterday but I think it is	5 17	7	project on screen. Here you can see section 4.3.4,	
18	worth repeating and asking, that of course is not	: 18	8	page 110, and as you can see, the top of the table	
19	inviting the parties to present any new evidence	e 19	9	provides: "Financial indicators requested by Decree	
20	that has not been presented.	20	0	1082/2015'. And then if you go on, you then have a	
21	<b>PRESIDENT:</b> No new evidence.	21	1	list of these financial indicators actually on the	
22	MR GONZÁLEZ: Correct. Thank you.	22	2	left, including the level of indebtedness, in	
23	With that, I will turn the word over to my	23	3	Spanish "nivel de endeudamiento", and then you have	
24	partner, Melissa Ordoñez, on the last issue.			specific recommended values on the right.	
25	MS MELISSA ORDOÑEZ: Mr Chairman, members	25	5	So, to explain what is going on, you have	
1	Docrop 1092, which we can produce if the Tribunal	472 11:59 1		So we are here at the last bit of a	<b>473</b>
1 2	Decree 1082, which we can produce if the Tribunal wishes so. This decree requires that any public			hearing having counsel talk about what a decree says	12:00
2	tender – any public tender – include these	3		that is not in the record based on another document	
4	financial indicators. However, and this is	4		in the record that is not related to the slides.	
5	important, it does not set out the specific values			I find that whole exercise completely improper.	
6	of these indicators, which are evidently set out for			<b>PRESIDENT:</b> Let's hear what she has to	
7	each and every specific tender	7		say, because if this is to say, as often happens	
8	MR BALDWIN: I am sorry, Mr President,			with a clarification, we added up the numbers and it	
9	I find this whole presentation odd, that we are			came to 100, we checked it and it is now 110 or is	
10	having additional argument at the end about			90, that might be one situation where there is a	
	something before. I find that odd and improper.			darification. But let's see exactly what was being	
12				discussed here, and then we will certainly hear from	
13				you.	
14	us what a decree says and doesn't say and that	-		Please proceed.	
15	decree is not in the record.	15	5	MS MELISSA ORDOÑEZ: Thank you,	
16	PRESIDENT: I understand counsel is trying	16	6	Mr Chairman. This is just a clarification on what	
17				was said, so I just need to explain it.	
18	that is the case presumably there will be a	18	8	Just to continue, the specific values that	
19	replacement to that slide, if it is wrong	19	9	you have here on the right, these are specific	
20	MR BALDWIN: This is not a slide that she			values that were recommended by the ITU, and this is	
21	is showing, this is an exhibit, and in that exhibit,	21	1	why they are in the ITU report. And not only that,	
22	as you can see on table 4, it says Decree 1082/2015	22	2	but this requirement of 70 per cent was actually	
23	and for the last minute MsOrdoñez has been talking			adapted following a request of none other than .CO	
	about what that Decree 1082/2015 says and that		4	Internet itself, and you will find the entire paper	
25	decree is not in the record.	25	5	trail of this at R-48, page 20.	

www.dianaburden.com

Case N	lo ARB 20/7	Final		Wednesday, 29 March, 202
		474		475
1	So this is for the first point	12:02	1	because there is a reference in the ITU report, as $12:03$
2	And then if we move on to the second			you can see here, to this decree.
3	point, counsel for Claimant also		3	My point is just that this decree only
4	<b>PRESIDENT:</b> Could you just go back to that		4	sets out the financial indicators that every tender
5	first slide? Based on this slide that we have,		5	in Colombia has to comply with, but the specific
6	No 19, what is not clear to meis specifically what		6	values are of course different for every tender and
7	you are darifying.		7	they are set out here in the ITU report.
8	MS MELISSA ORDOÑEZ: Yes. So counsel for		8	<b>PRESIDENT:</b> Am I right to understand that
9	Claimant in their opening statement, I mean their		9	what you are saying is that this figure of
10	submissions, they claim that these requirements,		10	70 per cent, you say that was recommended by the
11	which are requirements which were included in the			ITU?
12	2020 tender, show somehow that the tender was		12	MS MELISSA ORDOÑEZ: That is correct.
13	designed for Afilias, because these requirements		13	<b>PRESIDENT:</b> And you have given the reason
14			-	being this decree that you have mentioned.
15	Our argument is to say well, no, these		15	MS MELISSA ORDOÑEZ: The reason is that
	requirements were actually recommended by the ITU.		-	this specific value is included in the ITU report.
	There was no intention at all to favour Afilias,			
			17	The decree does not set out the number,
	which by the way did not even participate. And			70 per cent
	these requirements were recommended by the ITU, and		19	<b>PRESIDENT:</b> And that is your response to
	the proof is in their report C-67 that I showed you			the allegation that is made by the Claimant
21	However, during their opening		21	MS MELISSA ORDOÑEZ: Yes.
22	presentation, counsel for Claimant made the argument		22	<b>PRESIDENT:</b> – that the tender figures
23	that well, during the clarifications said that			initially were set out specifically for Afilias
24	these requirements were not recommended by the ITU		24	MS MELISSA ORDONEZ: Exactly. Yes.
25	but rather they were based on Decree 1082/2015		25	So the second point was on slide 22 of our
		170		
1	opening presentation, and in particular counsel for	<b>476</b> 12:05	1	477 I find this entire last segment to be 12:07
2	Claimant questioned the fact that while the number		2	completely improper. It is continuing argument. It
3	of domain names stalled in the last year of			is rebuttal argument from the Respondent, and giving
4	Neustar's ownership, it started growing again when			it to us where we are at the end of the hearing, and
5	Neustar exited the country, and this is because, and			in both of those points neither of which was a
6	I quote my colleague, Teddy Baldwin, he said the new		6	darification, it was argument and it was
7	concession didn't start until October 2020, so the		7	rebuttal – in both of those points Ms Ordoñez has
8	numbers from 2020 would be more than 70 per cent due			talked about evidence, said what things said, the
9	to the earlier concession.		9	3.3 million registrations that she daimed are the
10	On this we would just like to say that		-	current figures, and she talked about, and it is
	this omits that Neustar sold its investment in			dear in the record, what this Decree 1082, I
	April 2020 with a closure in August 2020, so at			believe a decree from 2015 said. She said it didn't
13	least half of the year was spent under GoDaddy			say 70 per cent, it said what you had to include
14				That decree is not in the record. So she was
	force, and we have also checked the current numbers			allowed to testify here and do rebuttal argument
	of the .co domain and currently we have more than			
	-			with things that are not in the record that weren't clarifications.
17	3.3 million. So clearly there has been asteady			
	increase under the new contract.		18	I will do my best to respond. I don't
19	That is it, Mr Chairman.			have the evidence in front of me
20	PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Baldwin?		20	I will say with regard to one particular
21	MR BALDWIN: I will again reiterate my			thing, I will start with the second point first, and
22	objection, and even in this last portion Ms Ordoñez			the second point was about the domain registrations
	has told about more information not in the record			in 2020. Again, because there was a one-sided
	that she is saying at the very end of the hearing			preparation here of argument, I don't have the
25	about the current number of registrations.		25	transcript in front of me and I didn't look at it

1		-	• · · · ·
	this morning to prepare for a rebuttal, but I will $_{12:08}$	1	it doesn't happen and to act like it is something $12:10$
2	say, and if we have enough space we will make a	2	new and fresh is absurd.
3	reference to this in our post-hearing brief, what	3	But, going back to what I started with on
4	Respondent said when they presented that slide, they	4	this point, and that is the transcript, when they
5	didn't say now they are saying Neustar sold in	5	presented their opening argument they didn't say,
6	April of 2020 and therefore it is only a portion	6	when they presented this slide, they didn't say
7	of it is attributable to Neustar.	7	well, you know, when Neustar left the country you
8	.CO Internet is the entity that runs and	8	can see that the domains increased exponentially.
9	manages the thingCO was sold. The people at .CO	9	They said that there was a new concession in 2020
	were the same that is why coincidentally they are	10	and you can see how the numbers drastically
	not witnesses here and Nicolai Bezsonoff, who was		increased in 2020. That is what they said. Nothing
	mentioned here, why isn't he here? He works for		about Neustar selling, or it is not attributable to
	GoDaddy. He was with Neustar managing the .Co		Neustar. It is whether or not they were making a
	contract when it was soldto GoDaddy, now he works	13	
	for GoDaddy in the same role, who are the current		the numbers started going way up. That is the point
	operators of that and subject to issues in Colombia.		they made. I don't have it in front of me in the
	So I say all that to say that these were the same	10	
	people.	18	addressing, not when Neustar exited the country.
19	A lot goes into this. It is like any	19	So to answer that piece of improper
-	sales you are doing in domains. It is not like the	20	rebuttal, that is the answer to that.
	minute somebody takes over they have credit for all	20	In terms of the 70 per cent the ITU report
	the new sales. It doesn't work that way. Because		talks about, and this is again an exhibit that she
	what happens is these are sales that you are	23	argued from today, not the slide, but the exhibit
	developing over time. This is the process of		that was put up, which is exhibit C-67, states
	building these domain registrations, so to act like		that – it gives these financial indicators in
			5
	480		481
1	accordance with this decree. 12:11	1	Mr Baldwin? 12:13
2			
	I have looked at the decree. The decree	2	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to
3	in that section, since we are freely testifying	3	<b>MR BALDWIN:</b> We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court
4	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that	3 4	<b>MR BALDWIN:</b> We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to
4 5	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates	3 4 5	<b>MR BALDWIN:</b> We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and
4 5 6	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you	3 4 5 6	<b>MR BALDWIN:</b> We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would
4 5 6 7	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know,	3 4 5 6 7	<b>MR BALDWIN:</b> We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and
4 5 6 7 8	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong	3 4 5 6 7 8	<b>MR BALDWIN:</b> We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure.
4 5 7 8 9	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship,
4 5 7 8 9 10	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ns Lavista and
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not, I think was completely improper. And the ITU report	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ns Lavista and to the ICSID Secretariat for their work here. So
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not, I think was completely improper. And the ITU report states what it states and that is what's in the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ms Lavista and to the ICSID Secretariat for their work here. So that would be my remarks by way of conclusion.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not, I think was completely improper. And the ITU report states what it states and that is what's in the record and that is what was discussed and argued in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ns Lavista and to the ICSID Secretariat for their work here. So that would be my remarks by way of conclusion. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> Mr Gouiffès, any issues you
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not, I think was completely improper. And the ITU report states what it states and that is what's in the record and that is what was discussed and argued in the opening, and now is being brought back at the	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ns Lavista and to the ICSID Secretariat for their work here. So that would be my remarks by way of conclusion. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> Mr Gouiffès, any issues you wish to raise?
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not, I think was completely improper. And the ITU report states what it states and that is what's in the record and that is what was discussed and argued in the opening, and now is being brought back at the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ns Lavista and to the ICSID Secretariat for their work here. So that would be my remarks by way of conclusion. PRESIDENT: Mr Gouiffès, any issues you wish to raise? MR GOUIFFÈS: No issues to raise, Mr
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not, I think was completely improper. And the ITU report states what it states and that is what's in the record and that is what was discussed and argued in the opening, and now is being brought back at the very end of this proceeding. So on that I will conclude.	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ns Lavista and to the ICSID Secretariat for their work here. So that would be my remarks by way of conclusion. PRESIDENT: Mr Gouiffès, any issues you wish to raise? MR GOUIFFÈS: No issues to raise, Mr Chairman, and for once I agree with everything that
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not, I think was completely improper. And the ITU report states what it states and that is what's in the record and that is what was discussed and argued in the opening, and now is being brought back at the very end of this proceeding. So on that I will conclude. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> Thank you. Well, as you say,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ns Lavista and to the ICSID Secretariat for their work here. So that would be my remarks by way of conclusion. PRESIDENT: Mr Gouiffès, any issues you wish to raise? MR GOUIFFÈS: No issues to raise, Mr Chairman, and for once I agree with everything that has been presented by my colleague, so I don't need
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not, I think was completely improper. And the ITU report states what it states and that is what's in the record and that is what was discussed and argued in the opening, and now is being brought back at the very end of this proceeding. So on that I will conclude.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ns Lavista and to the ICSID Secretariat for their work here. So that would be my remarks by way of conclusion. PRESIDENT: Mr Gouiffès, any issues you wish to raise? MR GOUIFFÈS: No issues to raise, Mr Chairman, and for once I agree with everything that has been presented by my colleague, so I don't need
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not, I think was completely improper. And the ITU report states what it states and that is what's in the record and that is what was discussed and argued in the opening, and now is being brought back at the very end of this proceeding. So on that I will conclude. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> Thank you. Well, as you say, the ITU record is there, the Tribunal will look at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ns Lavista and to the ICSID Secretariat for their work here. So that would be my remarks by way of conclusion. PRESIDENT: Mr Gouiffès, any issues you wish to raise? MR GOUIFFÈS: No issues to raise, Mr Chairman, and for once I agree with everything that has been presented by my colleague, so I don't need to repeat the same thing Thank you very much.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not, I think was completely improper. And the ITU report states what it states and that is what's in the record and that is what was discussed and argued in the opening, and now is being brought back at the very end of this proceeding. So on that I will conclude. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> Thank you. Well, as you say, the ITU record is there, the Tribunal will look at that and either party is welcome to make any other	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ns Lavista and to the ICSID Secretariat for their work here. So that would be my remarks by way of conclusion. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> Mr Gouiffès, any issues you wish to raise? <b>MR GOUIFFÈS:</b> No issues to raise, Mr Chairman, and for once I agree with everything that has been presented by my colleague, so I don't need to repeat the same thing Thank you very much. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> We will check the record.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not, I think was completely improper. And the ITU report states what it states and that is what's in the record and that is what was discussed and argued in the opening, and now is being brought back at the very end of this proceeding. So on that I will conclude. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> Thank you. Well, as you say, the ITU record is there, the Tribunal will look at that and either party is welcome to make any other additional comments in their post-hearings should	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ns Lavista and to the ICSID Secretariat for their work here. So that would be my remarks by way of conclusion. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> Mr Gouiffès, any issues you wish to raise? <b>MR GOUIFFÈS:</b> No issues to raise, Mr Chairman, and for once I agree with everything that has been presented by my colleague, so I don't need to repeat the same thing. Thank you very much. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> We will check the record. I am sure we will find other areas where you agreed. There may be many where you don't agree, but that will be for us to sort out.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not, I think was completely improper. And the ITU report states what it states and that is what's in the record and that is what was discussed and argued in the opening, and now is being brought back at the very end of this proceeding. So on that I will conclude. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> Thank you. Well, as you say, the ITU record is there, the Tribunal will look at that and either party is welcome to make any other additional comments in their post-hearings should you feel it is appropriate.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ns Lavista and to the ICSID Secretariat for their work here. So that would be my remarks by way of conclusion. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> Mr Gouiffès, any issues you wish to raise? <b>MR GOUIFFÈS:</b> No issues to raise, Mr Chairman, and for once I agree with everything that has been presented by my colleague, so I don't need to repeat the same thing Thank you very much. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> We will check the record. I am sure we will find other areas where you agreed. There may be many where you don't agree, but that
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not, I think was completely improper. And the ITU report states what it states and that is what's in the record and that is what was discussed and argued in the opening, and now is being brought back at the very end of this proceeding. So on that I will conclude. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> Thank you. Well, as you say, the ITU record is there, the Tribunal will look at that and either party is welcome to make any other additional comments in their post-hearings should you feel it is appropriate. We have nothing further from this end. Do	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ns Lavista and to the ICSID Secretariat for their work here. So that would be my remarks by way of conclusion. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> Mr Gouiffès, any issues you wish to raise? <b>MR GOUIFFÈS:</b> No issues to raise, Mr Chairman, and for once I agree with everything that has been presented by my colleague, so I don't need to repeat the same thing. Thank you very much. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> We will check the record. I am sure we will find other areas where you agreed. There may be many where you don't agree, but that will be for us to sort out.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	in that section, since we are freely testifying about it, I will tell you that the decree in that section has a listing of 70 per cent, but it relates to financial guarantees and what kind of assets you need to have and everything else. So, you know, I don't know whether Mrs Ordoñez is right or wrong and that decree is certainly not a part of the record, but to state and to be able to present that testimony without having the decree in the recordin the way it was done, whether she is right or not, I think was completely improper. And the ITU report states what it states and that is what's in the record and that is what was discussed and argued in the opening, and now is being brought back at the very end of this proceeding. So on that I will conclude. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> Thank you. Well, as you say, the ITU record is there, the Tribunal will look at that and either party is welcome to make any other additional comments in their post-hearings should you feel it is appropriate. We have nothing further from this end. Do	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR BALDWIN: We have nothing particular to raise and I know you are going to thank the court reporters and the interpreters, but we would like to do so as well. It is extraordinarily hard work and the professionalism has been astounding. I would like to thank the Tribunal for their attention and obviously it has been a pleasure. We have had a fairly good relationship, actually, with our colleagues over there during that time and we appreciate it and I would be remiss if I didn't give a special thank you to Ns Lavista and to the ICSID Secretariat for their work here. So that would be my remarks by way of conclusion. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> Mr Gouiffès, any issues you wish to raise? <b>MR GOUIFFÈS:</b> No issues to raise, Mr Chairman, and for once I agree with everything that has been presented by my colleague, so I don't need to repeat the same thing. Thank you very much. <b>PRESIDENT:</b> We will check the record. I am sure we will find other areas where you agreed. There may be many where you don't agree, but that will be for us to sort out.

1 <b>PRESIDENT:</b> On behalf of the Tribunal,2I am going reiterate those thanks to our court3reporters and also to the translators, and I would4also like specifically to thank counsel for what has5been very well presented and prepared presentations,6which help us greatly, and the professionalism on7both sides. There has been a bit from time to time,8as one would anticipate, slight differences between9counsel, but that is also recognised and respected,10and finally again to our Tribunal secretary,11Ms Lavista, for all her efforts of keeping things on	482 12:14	
<ul> <li>12 the road.</li> <li>13 With that, I call the hearing to an end</li> <li>14 and for those who are leaving London andgoing back</li> <li>15 to wherever they are going, we wish you safe</li> <li>16 travels. Thank you very much.</li> <li>17 (The hearing was concluded at 12.15 pm)</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ul>		
25		
www.dianaburden.com		Pages 410-482

## Security Services LLC v Republic of Colombia Final

Wednesday, 29 March, 2023

ICSID Case No ARB 20/7	Final	wednesday, 29 March, 2023
	0	2
MR BALDWIN: [13] 417/5 418/6	<b>019 [1]</b> 448/14	<b>20 [4]</b> 416/20 463/12 463/18
418/9 418/15 432/20 435/19		473/25
439/9 465/13 465/22 472/8	1	<b>2001 [3]</b> 443/11 443/16 460/25
472/20 476/21 481/2	<b>10 [7]</b> 420/21 436/14 438/18	<b>2006 [1]</b> 420/16
MR GONZÁLEZ: [13] 417/8 417/24	439/24 443/5 467/7 467/8	<b>2008 [1]</b> 436/21
451/21 467/15 467/18 468/2	<b>10 May [4]</b> 467/10 467/11 468/13	<b>2009 [11]</b> 420/12 420/18 420/25
468/13 468/18 468/25 469/9	469/20	424/5 436/15 436/22 442/20
469/15 470/14 470/22	10 May is [1] 467/16	447/14 448/14 448/24 461/5
MR GOUIFFÈS: [15] 439/20	<b>10-G [2]</b> 432/10 449/14	<b>2014 [1]</b> 453/15
464/16 464/20 464/23 465/7	<b>10-year [1]</b> 434/8	<b>2015 [7]</b> 444/7 471/14 471/20
465/19 465/23 466/17 467/7	<b>10.03 [1]</b> 416/1	472/22 472/24 474/25 477/12
467/14 469/20 470/2 470/7	<b>10.16 [3]</b> 450/13 450/15 450/20	<b>2018 [2]</b> 433/3 453/23
481/17 481/25	<b>10.17 [1]</b> 442/16	<b>2019 [4]</b> 450/6 450/7 461/3 461/4
MS BALDWIN: [1] 429/6	<b>10.18 [4]</b> 429/14 447/19 449/6	<b>2020 [21]</b> 432/24 433/4 433/13
MS MELISSA ORDOÑEZ: [9]	449/7	444/23 450/1 450/2 450/8 450/9
447/10 470/25 471/6 473/15	<b>10.22 [1]</b> 445/13	451/2 451/6 451/10 471/9 474/12
474/8 475/12 475/15 475/21	<b>10.28 [1]</b> 425/18	476/7 476/8 476/12 476/12
475/24	<b>100 [1]</b> 473/9	477/23 478/6 479/9 479/11
MS ORDOÑEZ PUENTES: [1]	<b>106 [1]</b> 425/15	<b>2022 [5]</b> 427/23 428/22 428/23
461/19	<b>1065 [2]</b> 420/16 423/14	440/24 443/23
PRESIDENT: [47] 416/4 416/12	<b>1082 [3]</b> 471/14 472/1 477/11	<b>2023 [2]</b> 410/20 416/1
417/7 417/22 418/5 418/7 435/18	<b>1082/2015 [4]</b> 471/20 472/22	<b>2030 [3]</b> 447/14 448/15 448/18
439/7 439/11 451/19 463/11	472/24 474/25	<b>22 [2]</b> 471/3 475/25
463/20 464/19 464/22 464/24	<b>11 [2]</b> 437/24 467/9	23 December 2019 [1] 450/7
465/11 465/14 465/21 465/24	11 May or [1] 467/7	<b>235 [1]</b> 431/19
466/24 467/12 467/17 467/20	<b>11-17 [1]</b> 449/21	<b>25 [3]</b> 425/19 437/3 445/25
468/10 468/15 468/23 469/2	<b>11.12 [1]</b> 463/19	<b>26 May [2]</b> 465/11 465/12
469/14 469/17 470/1 470/3 470/8	<b>11.47 [1]</b> 463/19	26 May for [1] 465/8
470/11 470/21 471/4 472/16	<b>110 [2]</b> 471/18 473/9	26 May that [1] 469/24
473/6 474/4 475/8 475/13 475/19	<b>113 [2]</b> 431/19 438/9	26 May the [1] 469/22
475/22 476/20 480/19 481/15	<b>113 million [1]</b> 438/13	<b>26th [1]</b> 465/21
481/21 482/1	<b>114 [1]</b> 438/17	<b>28 [1]</b> 464/10
PROFESSOR DERAINS: [1] 470/10	<b>114 million [1]</b> 438/9	<b>28 April [4]</b> 465/7 466/4 466/19
PROFESSOR HOBÉR: [1] 470/9	<b>12 [1]</b> 467/22	467/4
<b>THE INTERPRETER: [1]</b> 416/9	<b>12.15 [1]</b> 482/17	<b>29 [3]</b> 410/20 416/1 460/11
1	<b>135 [2]</b> 441/3 441/3	<b>29 July [1]</b> 427/19
latheush [1] 422/20	<b>136 [2]</b> 441/3 441/4	<b>29 July 2022 [1]</b> 440/24
'although [1] 423/20	<b>14 April [2]</b> 447/5 466/3	<b>29 May [1]</b> 464/22
'Sponsoring [1] 437/5	<b>15 [2]</b> 418/2 439/24	3
•	<b>15 August 2022 [1]</b> 428/23	
.CO [22] 424/4 432/22 435/4	<b>15 September 2022 [1]</b> 427/23	<b>3 April 2020 [2]</b> 432/24 450/1
435/15 436/7 436/16 436/18	<b>1652 [1]</b> 436/21	<b>3.3 million [2]</b> 476/17 477/9
436/23 437/5 437/9 438/6 444/1	<b>17 [2]</b> 420/25 449/21 <b>18 [1]</b> 433/3	<b>30 [1]</b> 418/18 <b>32 [1]</b> 456/19
449/24 451/10 458/7 458/16	<b>18 [1]</b> 433/3 <b>18-19 [1]</b> 423/18	
473/23 476/16 478/8 478/9 478/9		<b>35 [3]</b> 443/20 443/24 444/1
478/13	<b>19 [4]</b> 423/18 471/3 471/8 474/6	4
.co domain [1] 476/16		<b>4.3.4 [1]</b> 471/17
		,
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

www.dianaburden.com

#### Security Services LLC v Republic of Colombia Final

ICSID Case No ARB 20/7	Final	Wednesday, 29 March, 2023
4	445/10 469/14	449/10 458/1 465/1 469/18
<b>410 [1]</b> 410/1	absurd [1] 479/2	afterwards [1] 464/18
<b>48 [1]</b> 473/25	abuse [4] 442/5 442/7 459/5	again [17] 424/24 428/6 430/17
<b>482 [1]</b> 410/1	461/15	440/14 442/11 442/22 442/23
	accompanying [1] 436/16	443/13 445/23 452/16 454/23
5	accordance [3] 422/13 445/15	459/21 476/4 476/21 477/23
<b>5-year [3]</b> 434/6 434/12 438/18	480/1	479/22 482/10
50 million [1] 438/24	according [3] 418/1 443/6 447/23	against [15] 424/2 425/9 427/5
6	accreditation [1] 437/12	427/11 428/6 428/10 445/20
	accuse [1] 459/2	446/14 446/21 446/23 447/6
6 million [2] 438/14 438/19	accused [1] 456/1	448/11 451/5 454/13 461/15
6 September 2019 [1] 450/6	act [3] 459/11 478/25 479/1	Agencia [1] 413/5
60-70 million [1] 438/24	action [5] 430/7 430/7 447/24	aggravate [1] 430/20
<b>67 [3]</b> 471/16 474/20 479/24	448/2 459/5	aggravation [1] 430/5
7	actions [3] 433/1 433/2 434/19	ago [2] 429/8 440/23
<b>70 [1]</b> 476/8	activities [1] 421/11	agree [6] 424/17 443/6 443/7
<b>70 per cent [7]</b> 471/11 473/22	acts [1] 434/24	464/21 481/18 481/23
475/10 475/18 477/13 479/21	actual [4] 441/6 456/14 460/14	agreed [6] 421/2 421/6 464/12
480/5	468/4	466/1 466/1 481/22
<b>7th [1]</b> 467/8	actually [15] 436/10 445/12	agreement [6] 420/21 426/2
	447/16 449/9 450/14 450/15	426/19 444/18 445/15 464/11
8	451/6 451/13 451/15 451/18	ahead [2] 435/18 468/9
8 August 2022 [1] 428/22	462/7 471/21 473/22 474/16	Alberro [1] 434/21
<b>80 [1]</b> 449/20	481/10	all [30] 417/9 428/15 433/8
9	Adamakopoulos [1] 446/15 adapted [1] 473/23	433/10 433/12 434/22 437/17 438/3 441/17 445/8 449/2 451/14
	added [2] 468/1 473/8	451/18 453/5 453/15 454/1
9 March 2020 [1] 450/8	addition [1] 451/21	455/15 456/5 457/4 458/6 459/13
<b>90 [1]</b> 473/10 <b>92 [2]</b> 443/20 443/21	additional [3] 416/15 472/10	459/21 460/17 465/17 466/4
<b>99 per cent [1]</b> 438/5	480/22	466/17 474/17 478/17 478/21
	address [5] 420/2 447/11 451/24	482/11
<u>A</u>	451/25 471/1	allegation [3] 453/12 457/20
<b>AA [1]</b> 450/15	addressing [1] 479/18	475/20
abides [1] 462/5	administer [1] 424/11	allegations [4] 451/4 455/24
ability [2] 421/18 421/21	administrative [3] 429/25 430/4	457/4 458/4
able [4] 431/7 465/1 467/22	433/10	allege [1] 449/17
480/10	admissible [1] 455/3	alleged [4] 441/2 449/15 449/20
about [44] 419/7 419/10 422/4	adoption [1] 430/3	450/21
422/6 423/7 423/9 423/25 425/17		allowed [2] 458/21 477/15
427/1 427/24 431/9 433/11	Adviser [1] 414/2	allows [1] 447/19
434/10 436/25 437/23 448/19	advisory [4] 423/18 423/19	alongside [1] 462/2
452/8 452/23 453/7 456/8 457/4	437/15 458/8	already [4] 438/8 443/11 443/12
457/6 457/7 457/14 457/22	affect [1] 426/2	459/18
458/22 459/19 459/20 459/23	affected [1] 420/13	also [19] 420/1 423/2 423/16
460/12 463/16 471/10 472/10	afforded [1] 422/20	432/3 448/1 455/7 455/24 459/13
472/12 472/24 473/2 476/23	Afilias [6] 451/8 451/8 474/13	462/1 462/16 462/22 463/6 463/9
476/25 477/8 477/10 477/22	474/14 474/17 475/23	469/4 474/3 476/15 482/3 482/4
479/12 479/22 480/4	afraid [2] 454/16 456/16	482/9
absolutely [4] 441/4 441/15	after [7] 419/14 441/8 441/9	alternative [4] 419/3 441/20

www.dianaburden.com

	<b>r</b>	<b>.</b> .
Α	445/16 466/9	422/8 423/12 423/13 425/18
alternative [2] 447/2 447/5	application [6] 444/24 466/2	425/19 429/14 431/19 442/16
alternatives [1] 441/18	466/25 468/11 469/7 470/4	442/20 442/21 442/24 445/25
Although [1] 427/20	applications [1] 447/3	447/19 448/16 449/6 449/7
ALVARO [1] 414/5	applied [2] 425/3 461/1	450/13 450/15 450/20 460/6
always [3] 454/22 454/24 462/23	applies [5] 422/3 422/3 422/5	Article 4 [1] 460/6
am [30] 416/1 418/9 419/10	422/6 424/16	as [69] 416/24 418/17 419/4
427/8 429/1 429/2 430/16 438/2	apply [5] 422/5 424/20 455/1	419/4 419/7 419/9 420/19 421/13
439/7 439/7 439/12 450/15 452/7	466/12 466/15	423/12 423/16 423/17 424/3
454/20 455/5 463/11 463/19	appreciate [3] 461/25 463/25	424/17 426/6 426/7 426/21 427/7
463/19 465/9 465/9 465/20	481/11	427/21 429/13 429/17 430/8
467/15 468/7 468/7 469/1 470/14	appropriate [2] 458/7 480/23	430/12 431/5 431/23 431/24
472/8 475/8 481/22 482/2	approval [1] 437/11	432/3 432/25 435/20 436/25
AMALIA [1] 414/13	approving [1] 437/8	437/5 437/9 437/9 438/24 439/2
amazing [1] 453/12	April [10] 432/24 447/5 450/1	440/12 440/14 442/23 446/17
AmecFoster [1] 450/19	465/7 466/3 466/4 466/19 467/4	447/2 448/8 450/9 450/18 450/22
American [1] 436/10	476/12 478/6	451/23 452/10 453/2 454/10
amount [3] 434/12 438/23 439/25	April 2020 [1] 476/12	454/10 454/14 456/22 457/13
ANA [2] 413/6 414/12	<b>ARB [1]</b> 410/5	457/15 460/4 460/7 460/12
analysis [5] 423/3 424/11 424/21	ARB/20/7 [1] 410/5	461/13 464/11 465/4 466/9 469/1
424/23 426/3	Arbitral [1] 410/14	469/6 471/8 471/18 472/22 473/7
ANDRÉS [1] 413/10	arbitrarily [1] 459/11	475/1 480/19 481/5 482/8
ANN [1] 414/10	arbitrariness [1] 451/3	aside [1] 433/8
annex [4] 426/25 427/1 432/10	arbitration [26] 425/7 426/21	ask [7] 420/10 457/24 458/3
449/14	428/3 428/24 431/4 431/8 431/15	458/5 458/9 468/14 468/19
another [6] 431/7 431/11 453/4	432/9 442/9 444/24 445/1 445/21	asked [19] 417/16 417/16 423/7
461/7 467/2 473/3	446/4 446/9 448/4 448/7 448/20	423/24 424/4 427/8 428/14
answer [11] 424/3 427/9 427/9	449/10 450/3 450/7 450/18 462/8	
428/6 428/8 442/17 443/1 445/17	462/13 462/18 463/1 464/7	441/10 444/10 447/3 455/18
460/12 479/19 479/20	Arbitrator [2] 410/16 410/17	455/18 458/5 458/11 459/18
answering [1] 444/3	arbitrators [2] 411/6 462/23	asking [6] 424/4 448/17 465/9
anticipate [1] 482/8	are [122]	468/7 468/11 470/18
any [36] 416/15 417/2 419/25	areas [1] 481/22	aspect [2] 433/14 446/7
425/21 428/9 431/24 432/1	aren't [1] 423/3	assertions [1] 424/1
432/13 437/1 440/9 446/20	Argentina [1] 425/11	assets [3] 426/23 427/1 480/6
449/16 450/9 451/13 453/5 453/6	argue [2] 424/13 434/10 argued [5] 420/9 432/25 463/25	assigned [2] 432/23 449/25
453/10 453/12 454/7 454/15	479/23 480/15	associate [1] 456/21 assume [1] 453/11
456/2 457/11 457/14 457/14	arguing [2] 422/19 427/6	assuming [1] 455/11 assuming [1] 466/18
457/16 457/25 458/1 459/20	argument [14] 418/19 435/13	assured [1] 454/22
464/1 470/19 472/2 472/3 478/19	452/17 452/21 456/5 472/10	astounding [1] 434/22
480/21 480/25 481/15	474/15 474/22 477/2 477/3 477/6	
anything [8] 422/7 427/7 441/5	477/15 477/24 479/5	attaches [1] 452/22
457/21 465/5 466/14 469/8 470/8	arguments [3] 416/8 433/5	attend [1] 462/2
anyway [2] 416/23 468/24	452/20	attention [3] 420/4 463/5 481/7
apologies [3] 429/22 430/15	Arias [1] 423/20	attributable [2] 478/7 479/12
433/16	arises [1] 422/16	attribution [1] 451/2
apologise [1] 429/19	arising [1] 425/21	AUBRY [1] 413/15
appearing [1] 462/10	article [23] 421/14 421/18 422/4	August [3] 428/22 428/23 476/12
applicable [4] 425/5 444/16	······································	

www.dianaburden.com

Security Services LLC v Republic of Colombia Final

Wednesday, 29 March, 2023

ICSID Case No ARB 20/7	Final	wednesday, 29 March, 2023
A	becomes [1] 434/2	450/21
August 2020 [1] 476/12	been [37] 417/14 420/7 423/25	breached [1] 449/11
authorisation [1] 421/10	425/24 427/8 429/20 432/5	breaches [2] 449/18 450/22
automatic [10] 421/19 422/10	432/23 434/8 435/13 441/1	break [2] 463/12 463/19
423/24 424/1 424/2 424/5 443/21	442/17 445/4 445/9 448/25 449/7	brief [7] 418/24 420/2 428/13
460/9 460/9 460/20	449/19 449/25 450/10 453/14	435/21 452/1 464/19 478/3
automatically [2] 443/9 443/14	453/17 457/15 459/1 461/6 463/9	briefed [1] 463/25
available [2] 429/16 430/2	463/24 463/24 464/14 469/12	briefing [2] 457/12 467/19
avoid [2] 430/4 458/15	470/20 472/23 476/17 481/6	briefings [1] 457/15
await [1] 468/20	481/8 481/19 482/5 482/7	briefly [2] 424/14 440/10
award [13] 425/9 427/5 427/10	before [26] 417/2 418/2 422/18	briefs [6] 416/23 443/18 464/13
	422/23 423/23 436/6 436/21	464/25 469/22 470/16
428/5 431/16 433/4 433/13	436/23 437/6 437/14 443/3 445/2	bring [3] 453/6 453/12 453/14
445/20 446/13 446/21 447/6	447/14 447/20 449/16 449/18	bringing [1] 453/18
450/2 461/13	451/12 457/13 458/1 461/22	brought [12] 433/6 448/2 453/17
aware [1] 457/25	462/10 462/21 463/6 468/21	453/20 453/22 456/7 456/8
В	469/24 472/11	456/12 459/2 461/14 461/22
back [9] 417/17 432/18 434/1	beginning [1] 424/21	480/16
459/22 463/14 474/4 479/3	behalf [10] 412/2 413/2 414/1	building [1] 478/25
480/16 482/14	419/12 430/18 436/9 436/11	<b>burden [9]</b> 414/10 414/10 419/11
background [2] 429/9 448/11	436/19 442/13 482/1	419/17 441/12 445/7 452/6
Bad [1] 457/7	being [6] 427/19 432/10 436/25	452/16 452/16
BALDWIN [19] 412/8 412/9 415/5	473/11 475/14 480/16	businesses [1] 427/16
415/6 415/7 418/14 429/4 429/5	belabour [1] 459/8	buying [1] 438/5
432/18 432/19 439/16 439/17	believe [9] 426/3 426/10 427/6	
454/18 458/5 458/5 459/21 476/6	427/10 428/4 428/7 436/22	C
	470/17 477/12	<b>C-113 [1]</b> 431/19
476/20 481/1	believes [1] 452/5	<b>C-135 [2]</b> 441/3 441/3
BARBOSA [1] 413/10	BERNAL [1] 413/17	<b>C-136 [2]</b> 441/3 441/4
based [6] 417/25 450/22 471/13	best [1] 477/18	<b>C-17 [1]</b> 420/25
473/3 474/5 474/25	better [1] 465/14	<b>C-67 [3]</b> 471/16 474/20 479/24
baseless [1] 462/20	between [6] 410/6 416/6 416/19	calculate [1] 438/4
basic [2] 433/22 445/24	442/1 446/6 482/8	call [1] 482/13
basically [2] 435/23 453/6	beyond [3] 448/21 448/21 453/16	came [1] 473/9
basis [2] 416/21 455/5	Bezsonoff [1] 478/11	CAMILO [1] 413/6
be [83]	bid [5] 435/6 435/9 435/15	can [37] 417/17 420/5 421/1
bears [1] 424/15		424/3 424/13 426/18 426/22
because [46] 420/3 420/8 422/2	435/16 436/23	428/11 431/5 433/2 434/10 435/1
425/2 431/16 438/7 440/19 441/8	big [1] 425/23	436/4 437/2 438/3 440/13 446/17
441/25 445/7 446/6 446/24	BIGGE [2] 414/5 442/13	448/13 448/16 449/19 450/19
448/16 448/23 449/13 450/12	<b>bit [6]</b> 438/3 441/25 443/17 465/3	451/5 451/7 454/21 458/9 458/20
451/6 451/8 451/14 452/4 453/7	473/1 482/7	463/13 467/22 471/12 471/15
454/7 454/8 454/16 454/17	blocked [1] 437/22	471/17 471/18 472/1 472/22
458/24 459/8 460/5 460/15	Bogotá [1] 424/25	475/2 479/8 479/10
460/23 461/3 461/8 461/10	bold [1] 441/24	can't [3] 434/13 438/18 458/24
462/11 465/2 465/15 467/3	<b>both [9]</b> 421/15 422/16 425/18	candour [1] 433/9
467/23 469/11 469/23 473/7	425/19 426/5 426/6 477/5 477/7	cannot [2] 438/14 469/10
474/13 475/1 476/5 477/23	482/7	capital [2] 427/13 428/17
478/22	bought [3] 438/7 438/8 438/10	• • • •
become [1] 420/5	breach [4] 432/7 449/4 449/16	car [3] 433/16 433/18 433/21

www.dianaburden.com

		···· <b>·</b> ··· <b>·</b> ····· <b>·</b> ·················
с	<b>choice [1]</b> 435/14	closing [9] 415/2 415/4 415/8
carried [1] 452/5	<b>chosen [1]</b> 451/6	416/2 416/8 418/13 439/18 440/1
carrying [2] 421/11 455/5	circumstances [1] 451/17	452/1
carve [1] 448/10	cite [1] 436/20	closure [1] 476/12
carve-out [1] 448/10	<b>civil [1]</b> 419/9	<b>Co [1]</b> 411/6
case [27] 410/5 420/20 425/1	CL [1] 425/15	Co-Arbitrators [1] 411/6
425/14 434/22 434/25 441/21	CL-106 [1] 425/15	Code [1] 429/25
442/4 442/8 444/10 444/22	claim [12] 427/2 434/14 441/6	coffee [1] 463/13
446/15 446/20 449/9 452/6	441/7 446/6 450/20 450/21	coincidentally [1] 478/10
453/13 455/5 455/24 456/3 457/5	453/19 459/5 460/14 466/10	colleague [7] 429/4 440/4 440/5
459/1 461/11 461/13 461/14	474/10	442/6 447/7 476/6 481/19
461/23 462/15 472/18	Claimant [37] 410/9 412/2 415/4	colleagues [3] 439/15 463/9
cases [1] 434/21	416/24 418/2 418/13 425/6	481/10
CASTAÑO [4] 413/18 437/19	426/22 427/12 428/15 428/15	collected [1] 460/24
456/13 459/12	428/17 428/20 430/8 430/18	Colombia [26] 410/11 416/7
categories [1] 440/13	430/25 431/20 432/11 432/14	422/19 422/21 423/4 424/18
cause [2] 419/25 457/22	440/18 440/25 441/13 442/23	431/1 431/10 436/9 436/12
<b>CCAP [2]</b> 431/17 431/19	444/13 444/17 452/5 464/7 466/7	436/19 437/14 440/2 443/23
ccTLD [1] 437/9	466/15 471/7 471/10 471/11	451/8 454/20 456/8 458/2 460/24
ccTLDs [1] 437/6	474/3 474/9 474/22 475/20 476/2	
cent [9] 438/5 471/11 473/22	Claimant's [10] 417/3 417/6 431/3	
475/10 475/18 476/8 477/13	431/5 431/13 452/3 452/25 453/2	Colombia's [1] 424/10
479/21 480/5	453/3 471/2	Colombian [11] 422/16 422/16
<b>CENTRE [2]</b> 410/2 425/20	Claimants [2] 446/19 460/5	422/17 423/9 423/10 423/17
<b>CEO [1]</b> 453/23	claimed [1] 477/9	424/8 429/25 430/14 430/19
certain [3] 446/13 450/9 451/13	claims [12] 414/2 425/2 425/15	430/20
certainly [10] 418/23 422/24	432/2 432/3 432/5 432/9 433/11	come [8] 416/19 417/17 419/12
424/22 447/1 453/16 453/17	442/2 461/22 462/20 463/2	452/17 459/22 463/14 465/24
457/21 458/3 473/12 480/9	clarification [10] 417/15 417/17	466/15
chair [7] 453/1 453/20 454/6	417/19 465/10 470/12 470/15	comes [3] 427/17 452/17 453/19
454/7 454/8 456/17 456/17	473/8 473/11 473/16 477/6	commenced [1] 433/3
Chairman [10] 417/25 461/20	clarifications [2] 474/23 477/17	commented [1] 471/7
464/16 465/23 467/14 470/14	clarify [1] 472/17	comments [5] 439/24 440/6
470/25 473/16 476/19 481/18	clarifying [1] 474/7	453/5 471/2 480/22
challenging [1] 433/3	clause [7] 421/24 421/24 432/10	committed [2] 461/25 462/5
change [4] 440/17 440/24 441/1	449/19 459/24 459/24 460/7	committee [2] 423/18 437/15
445/23	clawback [1] 438/24	common [3] 419/8 426/8 444/21
changed [2] 446/10 461/8	<b>clear [21]</b> 423/24 425/11 425/17	communication [1] 427/16
channel [1] 416/10	425/19 430/16 432/7 432/25	Communications [2] 437/4 437/7
CHAPMAN [1] 414/12	445/13 445/18 445/21 446/18 446/22 460/3 460/21 469/1	company [6] 427/22 433/16
Chapter [2] 429/24 431/17		436/10 438/7 438/9 438/17
Chapter Eleven [2] 429/24 431/17	469/10 469/15 470/2 470/17	compensation [3] 432/15 438/15
charge [1] 456/14	474/6 477/11 clear as [1] 469/1	451/17
Charlie [1] 453/22	clearly [5] 446/10 448/9 448/15	competence [1] 428/5 competent [1] 425/15
check [1] 481/21	469/23 476/17	
checked [2] 473/9 476/15	client [4] 412/5 454/13 456/1	complain [1] 435/11
checking [1] 439/5	<b>client [4]</b> 412/5 454/13 456/1 457/11	complains [1] 471/10
Chief [1] 423/19		completely [5] 425/3 461/14 473/5 477/2 480/13
CHLOE [1] 412/9	clock [1] 468/21	4/3/3 4///2 480/13

www.dianaburden.com

с	continue [3] 447/20 447/24	470/18 475/6
complexity [1] 431/9	473/18	court [17] 414/9 422/19 422/23
comply[2] 450/24 475/5	continued [1] 449/9	424/25 430/16 443/11 449/16
complying [1] 462/6	continuing [1] 477/2	452/9 452/12 452/15 454/11
concept [1] 433/22	contract [26] 420/13 421/8	454/25 455/2 455/3 463/8 481/3
concern [2] 454/7 457/22	421/16 421/24 432/7 432/23	482/2
concession [39] 420/18 420/18	433/23 434/6 436/15 438/16	courts [2] 432/6 447/21
420/24 420/25 421/8 421/16	442/20 447/14 448/17 448/24	cover [2] 416/22 418/24
421/25 422/4 424/5 424/19	449/25 450/2 451/2 451/7 451/10	covered [1] 469/6
430/21 431/7 431/11 432/13	451/15 457/17 459/17 461/6	crackle [1] 416/9
433/4 433/7 433/13 433/22 434/9	476/14 476/18 478/14	credit [1] 478/21
434/12 435/12 436/1 436/22	contractual [2] 432/3 442/2	CRISTINA [1] 413/17
437/1 437/16 438/10 438/11	contrary [2] 419/18 433/4	cross [9] 453/25 454/9 454/12
438/12 438/18 438/19 438/25	control [1] 437/10	456/18 456/18 456/23 457/1
	Convention [4] 425/19 444/20	457/2 458/11
439/3 448/14 460/13 460/18	444/25 445/25	cross-examination [6] 453/25
476/7 476/9 479/9 479/14	conventional [1] 423/21	454/9 456/18 456/23 457/1 457/2
concessionaire [2] 421/11 437/17	conversation [1] 421/13	cross-examinations [1] 458/11
<b>conclude [3]</b> 439/10 449/22	convinced [2] 461/21 462/7	cross-examine [1] 454/12
480/18	copies [1] 418/11	cross-examined [1] 456/18
concluded [1] 482/17	corporate [2] 426/13 453/25	cue [1] 439/9
concluding [1] 439/10	corporation [1] 426/13	cumulative [2] 419/19 419/21
conclusion [1] 481/14	corporations [2] 426/7 426/8	current [4] 476/15 476/25 477/10
concrete [2] 422/9 433/12	correct [5] 424/22 428/7 459/16	478/15
conditions [4] 447/21 447/22	470/22 475/12	currently [3] 427/21 432/6 476/16
460/17 461/4	corruption [7] 451/4 455/24	customary [1] 432/17
conduct [1] 434/19	456/1 456/3 457/20 457/22 458/1	customs [1] 422/17
<b>confirm [4]</b> 432/11 462/4 469/17 469/18	costs [14] 428/10 428/15 446/14	
confirmed [1] 429/18	446/21 447/3 447/6 461/13	D
	462/15 464/15 465/25 466/3	d'Etât [1] 443/23
confirms [2] 450/5 451/2 conflict [2] 458/15 458/25	466/6 467/6 470/4	<b>d/b/a [2]</b> 410/8 428/19
	could [15] 418/10 431/15 431/23	Daimler [2] 425/10 425/16
confused [1] 468/3	453/17 453/20 453/22 454/3	damage [5] 450/9 450/17 451/13
Conseil [1] 443/23 Conseil d'Etât [1] 443/23	455/10 455/16 461/6 462/3 467/3	451/14 451/18
consent [5] 442/14 442/15 446/1	467/7 474/4 474/14	damages [10] 432/15 434/2 434/4
446/2 450/13	Council [9] 430/13 430/15 430/19	434/13 434/20 434/21 434/25
consequence [5] 447/12 447/16	443/22 444/6 447/15 447/17	435/2 435/5 447/25
447/17 449/12 450/24	448/12 449/18	Dan [3] 440/5 442/6 461/19
consequences [2] 449/3 450/3	counsel [17] 412/4 413/4 416/13	Dan González [1] 442/6
consider [1] 420/12	418/16 436/5 452/17 453/3 471/7	DANIEL [1] 413/14
CONSTAÍN [4] 413/17 423/7	472/12 472/16 473/2 474/3 474/8	dare [2] 427/7 458/3
456/14 459/12	474/22 476/1 482/4 482/9	dared [1] 458/4
constituted [1] 446/9	count [1] 452/20	dark [2] 452/4 452/4
constitutes [2] 449/4 449/13	country [3] 476/5 479/7 479/18	DARÍO [1] 413/18
constitutional [5] 422/19 422/23	couple [3] 429/8 429/11 439/11	date [4] 421/9 467/4 467/16
424/25 443/11 460/25	course [18] 417/24 419/24 434/11	469/11
context [2] 430/24 464/9	439/22 442/14 442/21 443/10	dates [3] 464/17 464/17 466/1
contingency [3] 437/24 438/1	444/19 445/4 446/3 446/5 446/15	DAVID [1] 414/5
438/20	448/23 451/25 463/15 470/5	day [9] 416/5 416/5 416/12

www.dianaburden.com

Security Services LLC v Republic of Colombia Final

Wednesday, 29 March, 2023

		-
D	determination [1] 444/16	420/11 421/21 424/25 427/6
day [6] 417/10 418/17 418/18	determine [1] 425/6	427/9 428/7 436/1 437/21 438/3
424/15 433/15 443/3	determined [3] 425/13 425/24	438/4 439/11 440/4 440/5 443/18
days [13] 417/11 429/2 429/8	429/16	446/16 446/17 446/23 447/18
440/23 452/24 463/5 464/10	determining [1] 464/7	449/5 452/20 454/16 456/4
467/1 467/3 467/4 467/9 467/22	developing [1] 478/24	456/24 457/1 459/20 460/1 460/5
467/24	DIANA [2] 414/10 414/10	460/12 460/13 460/15 461/10
-	did [15] 416/24 422/10 428/25	464/3 464/4 464/4 464/8 464/20
de [4] 413/5 413/9 414/13 471/23	451/9 453/1 454/18 456/6 457/5	466/16 466/23 467/24 468/5
deal [5] 417/17 417/21 440/3	457/7 457/9 457/10 457/13	468/9 469/21 469/25 477/15
447/4 466/5	457/24 458/5 474/18	477/18 480/24 481/5
deals [1] 429/14	didn't [26] 429/20 435/10 438/21	document [8] 432/14 439/2
debate [1] 433/2	438/22 438/25 453/6 453/12	441/10 441/10 444/1 445/5 445/6
December [2] 444/7 450/7	453/13 454/6 454/6 454/8 454/9	473/3
decide [1] 445/14	455/9 455/17 455/20 456/10	documentary [2] 455/8 455/11
decided [1] 463/22	458/3 459/11 460/22 476/7	documentation [1] 455/17
decision [9] 430/4 443/11 443/22	477/12 477/25 478/5 479/5 479/6	documents [4] 436/16 441/2
444/6 461/11 461/12 462/16	481/12	452/18 466/19
462/25 468/20	differences [1] 482/8	does [15] 417/10 423/8 424/9
decisions [1] 462/12	different [6] 425/4 432/4 433/24	424/11 425/1 425/8 427/4 438/16
decree [26] 443/20 471/13 471/19	457/16 469/7 475/6	441/5 443/8 443/9 447/24 460/2
472/1 472/2 472/13 472/14	difficult [1] 431/12	472/5 475/17
472/15 472/22 472/24 472/25	difficulties [1] 462/19	doesn't [9] 422/9 434/13 434/19
473/2 474/25 475/2 475/3 475/14	diligent [1] 462/12	437/16 452/17 452/22 472/14
475/17 477/11 477/12 477/14	DIMOND [1] 412/9	478/22 479/1
480/1 480/2 480/2 480/4 480/9	directly [3] 425/21 427/18 456/9	doing [5] 435/3 448/6 456/23
480/11	director [1] 456/13	459/3 478/20
defective [1] 446/7	disagree [1] 467/25	domain [6] 421/12 437/8 476/3
Defensa [1] 413/5		476/16 477/22 478/25
defined [1] 428/16	disagreement [1] 443/7 discretion [2] 461/6 461/11	domains [2] 478/20 479/8
defining [1] 437/7	• • · · ·	
definitions [1] 426/23	discrimination [3] 451/3 451/5	domestic [4] 426/16 429/16 429/23 430/12
definitive [1] 449/13	457/7	
<b>del [1]</b> 413/5	discussed [5] 429/13 430/8 432/4	
Delaware [7] 426/4 426/10 464/6	473/12 480/15	don't [25] 419/9 419/22 424/17
466/8 466/13 467/13 469/6	discussion [1] 423/25	425/22 427/6 428/4 429/10 438/4
delegation [1] 437/8	discussions [2] 458/22 458/22	445/9 445/10 454/17 455/1
deliver [1] 433/19	dismiss [2] 446/19 462/14	455/12 455/13 455/14 459/19
demonstrated [1] 419/16	dismissed [1] 441/12	460/17 463/22 466/22 477/18
denied [1] 434/16	dispositive [2] 441/21 442/11	477/24 479/16 480/8 481/19
denotes [1] 421/18	dispute [4] 425/21 430/21 430/22	481/23
<b>Department [1]</b> 414/2	445/15	done [4] 424/18 443/17 445/9
deprivations [1] 433/9	DISPUTES [2] 410/3 414/3	480/12
Derains [2] 410/16 411/7	disputing [2] 414/1 429/19	doubt [1] 435/8
described [1] 436/6	disqualified [1] 458/25	Dr [1] 423/20
designed [1] 474/13	distinct [1] 422/7	Dr Ricardo [1] 423/20
desire [1] 455/9	distribute [1] 418/11	dramatic [1] 455/23
despite [1] 461/21	<b>DM [2]</b> 410/15 411/4	dramatically [1] 461/8
detail [2] 429/9 443/19	do [54] 417/2 417/13 417/14	drastically [2] 433/24 479/10
details [1] 466/7	417/22 418/7 418/19 419/17	due [5] 433/9 455/15 457/8

www.dianaburden.com

Security Services LLC v Republic of Colombia Final

Wednesday, 29 March, 2023

ICOID Case NO AILD 2011		weunesday, 25 March, 2025
D	established [2] 421/3 421/22	existence [2] 426/12 426/15
due [2] 469/11 476/8	Estado [1] 413/5	exited [2] 476/5 479/18
Duque [1] 444/3	even [22] 420/5 424/16 424/18	expect [4] 465/2 466/2 466/25
duration [1] 420/21	424/18 424/21 426/14 432/5	467/20
during [10] 431/3 431/8 448/4	434/14 434/17 435/6 436/8	expecting [1] 468/8
448/7 448/20 452/2 458/1 474/21	436/18 436/22 436/23 443/4	expert [1] 434/21
474/23 481/10	447/1 450/10 451/9 457/13	experts [1] 434/4
	460/10 474/18 476/22	explain [4] 460/13 460/14 471/25
E	event [2] 428/9 432/1	473/17
each [10] 419/15 419/16 419/22	events [2] 418/24 435/22	explained [3] 445/5 458/13
439/22 441/20 442/10 458/12	ever [1] 456/21	471/11
458/13 462/11 472/7	every [4] 456/21 472/7 475/4	explains [1] 444/4
earlier [1] 476/9	475/6	exponentially [1] 479/8
early [2] 433/6 458/21	everybody [1] 463/13	expressly [1] 430/1
easier [1] 429/11	everyone [2] 422/3 429/7	extend [2] 425/21 463/6
economic [2] 433/23 460/17	everything [3] 459/3 480/7	extended [1] 448/17
economics [1] 434/7	481/18	extending [1] 423/22
effect [4] 426/1 426/11 432/22	evidence [14] 452/14 452/23	extension [5] 422/10 422/11
449/24	452/24 454/13 454/17 455/8	431/2 447/13 448/14
effectively [1] 431/6	455/11 455/13 455/14 456/2	extensions [1] 454/22
effects [1] 430/5	470/19 470/21 477/8 477/19	extensive [1] 436/17
efforts [1] 482/11	evidenced [1] 462/11	extent [2] 434/11 469/4
either [7] 416/15 417/3 452/14	evidently [1] 472/6	extraordinarily [1] 481/5
452/18 452/23 480/21 480/25	exactly [8] 438/22 443/20 444/4	extraordinary [1] 436/7
election [1] 431/21	444/9 449/17 460/19 473/11	extremely [1] 431/12
Eleven [2] 429/24 431/17	475/24	F
ELIZABETH [1] 413/9	examination [7] 419/24 453/25	face [1] 460/3
else [2] 427/7 480/7	454/9 456/18 456/23 457/1 457/2	facing [1] 462/20
emails [1] 416/18	examinations [1] 458/11	fact [13] 428/25 439/1 445/4
empty [1] 453/1	examine [1] 454/12	452/21 455/17 455/23 457/10
encounter [1] 462/19	examined [2] 419/23 456/18	458/16 459/21 461/3 461/21
encourages [1] 463/1	example [1] 437/19	462/9 476/2
end [11] 424/22 430/22 438/1	exceed [1] 443/13	factors [2] 425/2 455/15
458/23 464/10 472/10 476/24	exceeds [1] 448/15	factual [1] 419/21
477/4 480/17 480/24 482/13	except [1] 446/20	failed [1] 450/24
endeudamiento [1] 471/23	exception [4] 447/18 447/23	fair [1] 462/21
engineered [1] 441/9	448/8 449/6	fairly [2] 425/12 481/9
enough [2] 469/15 478/2	exchange [1] 416/18	faith [1] 457/8
ensure [1] 458/15	exclude [1] 458/7	fall [2] 447/18 449/5
entered [2] 420/18 420/19	excluded [1] 436/3	far [2] 448/21 461/24
entire [3] 437/10 473/24 477/1	exemplary [1] 462/25 exercise [2] 445/6 473/5	fault [1] 459/4
entirely [1] 441/13	exercised [1] 422/13	favour [2] 451/8 474/17
entirety [2] 441/21 444/8		favouritism [1] 451/7
entitled [3] 454/11 454/12 455/21	exhibit [8] 420/25 431/19 437/2	fear [1] 455/9
entity [7] 426/12 426/13 426/17 431/7 431/11 437/4 478/8	472/21 472/21 479/22 479/23	feel [4] 417/10 418/21 455/9
equal [2] 420/23 423/15	479/24	480/23
erase [2] 434/19 434/20	exist [1] 455/2	feels [1] 466/11
essentially [2] 438/6 438/7	existed [3] 426/14 461/4 461/4	fees [1] 461/13

www.dianaburden.com

Security Services LLC v Republic of Colombia Final

Wednesday, 29 March, 2023

ICSID Case No ARB 20/7	Final	Wednesday, 29 March, 2023
F	formerly [1] 410/8	going [34] 418/20 419/10 421/19
felt [1] 436/1	formulated [2] 427/21 430/9	423/12 428/23 429/1 429/3 433/7
FERNANDA [1] 413/17	forum [2] 442/3 449/13	438/3 439/13 447/4 448/21 452/7
few [6] 435/20 445/2 446/25	forward [3] 445/5 454/13 456/2	454/20 456/25 457/1 459/22
447/1 463/5 463/14	found [2] 430/16 434/24	463/12 464/1 464/8 464/12
fiction [1] 437/22	four [2] 440/10 440/14	464/22 465/5 466/21 467/18
	fourth [2] 442/12 447/11	467/21 468/13 471/25 479/3
figure [2] 456/24 475/9	frank [1] 455/1	479/15 481/3 482/2 482/14
figures [2] 475/22 477/10 file [3] 465/15 468/9 469/22	frankly [1] 452/10	482/15
• • · · · ·	fraud [1] 427/15	Golden [1] 427/12
filed [2] 446/4 450/5	freedom [1] 436/17	gone [1] 443/17
filing [1] 465/16	freely [1] 480/3	GONZÁLEZ [5] 413/14 415/11
filings [1] 427/24	fresh [1] 479/2	442/6 451/19 451/20
final [8] 416/16 417/10 418/18	Friday [1] 465/16	good [8] 416/4 417/8 418/15
431/15 431/23 452/11 452/12	Fridays [1] 465/8	418/16 429/6 437/1 458/14 481/9
452/14	friend [1] 434/21	got [3] 451/15 457/12 479/14
finalised [1] 433/12	frivolous [2] 461/14 461/22	<b>Gottdiener [1]</b> 453/23
finally [3] 432/1 437/12 482/10	front [6] 452/7 454/5 458/23	gotten [2] 461/3 461/23
financial [6] 471/19 471/21 472/4	477/19 477/25 479/16	GOUIFFÈS [4] 413/13 415/9
475/4 479/25 480/6	fros [1] 446/5	439/19 481/15
find [6] 472/9 472/11 473/5	FTA [1] 430/23	govern [1] 426/11
473/24 477/1 481/22	full [4] 428/13 435/22 457/12	governed [2] 426/4 444/20
finessing [1] 465/4	462/15	government [4] 416/7 437/13
finish [2] 446/24 463/6	<b>further [7]</b> 443/18 449/2 451/25	437/14 457/8
firm [1] 433/17	455/7 467/19 470/11 480/24	grabbed [1] 460/24
first [29] 419/1 424/15 427/18	<b>future [3]</b> 450/22 450/23 458/17	grant [1] 462/15
428/10 429/13 429/17 439/24		granted [5] 434/18 436/16 454/22
440/4 440/7 440/11 440/15	G	468/4 469/13
440/16 440/23 441/15 442/8	Gate [1] 427/12	granting [1] 468/8
442/17 444/15 445/17 449/3	General [1] 456/16	
456/24 459/21 462/4 465/8	gentlemen [2] 416/5 457/24	gratitude [1] 463/7 greatly [1] 482/6
466/12 466/20 471/7 474/1 474/5	get [11] 418/22 419/9 421/19	• • • •
477/21	422/12 422/15 423/11 438/25	grew [1] 454/25
five [5] 433/23 435/19 440/12	440/22 459/15 465/16 468/10	group [1] 426/24
441/20 460/16	gets [1] 437/17	grouped [2] 440/12 441/19
five-year [1] 433/23	<b>GIOVANNY [1]</b> 413/10	growing [1] 476/4
floor [1] 447/7	give [4] 433/20 455/21 466/19	guarantees [1] 480/6
focus [1] 418/20	481/12	guardians [1] 462/24
following [3] 440/17 471/2	given [9] 420/3 420/7 421/10	guess [1] 458/9
473/23	435/23 435/25 446/1 454/15	н
force [4] 420/14 421/3 448/24		
476/15	464/14 475/13	had [41] 426/19 428/13 432/5
foremost [1] 429/17	gives [2] 422/22 479/25	434/22 434/24 435/6 435/9
forgot [1] 417/14	giving [3] 427/8 468/4 477/3	435/12 436/1 436/10 436/23
fork [2] 431/21 432/9	<b>go [11]</b> 420/24 426/16 435/18	
form [1] 464/4	435/20 440/7 455/7 464/9 465/21	
formal [2] 454/23 454/24	468/9 471/20 474/4	453/18 453/24 454/2 454/3 455/7
formalise [4] 431/1 432/13	GoDaddy [5] 455/13 476/13	455/10 457/3 457/13 457/15
447/13 448/14	478/13 478/14 478/15	458/21 458/21 460/17 460/24
former [1] 423/6	goes [3] 421/12 448/21 478/19	461/3 461/8 466/1 467/22 470/11

www.dianaburden.com

	-	<b>2</b> .
н	416/17 416/23 417/10 418/4	422/25 424/9 424/10 426/2 427/7
had [2] 477/13 481/9	418/23 418/25 420/2 424/12	437/21 452/5 452/19 455/5
half [5] 420/5 420/6 434/1 438/11	428/11 435/21 435/22 438/2	459/10 459/11 460/12 460/13
476/13	439/25 440/6 441/14 443/18	462/10 462/11 464/8 468/16
halfway [1] 438/10	452/11 462/2 463/8 464/13	468/19 479/10
hand [2] 432/18 462/4	464/19 464/24 466/17 469/18	However [2] 472/4 474/21
handed [1] 418/12	469/22 470/16 473/2 476/24	Hoyos [1] 444/3
happen [2] 435/1 479/1	477/4 478/3 482/13 482/17	HUGHES [2] 412/6 454/4
happened [6] 433/12 435/22	hearings [5] 417/12 454/5 468/24	
443/15 445/3 449/17 457/13	470/6 480/22	
happens [3] 462/22 473/7 478/23	hearsay [1] 455/1	l agree [1] 481/18
happy [1] 465/11	help [1] 482/6	I always [1] 462/23
hard [1] 481/5	her [3] 431/9 457/13 482/11	I am [26] 418/9 419/10 427/8
harm [1] 450/21	here [57] 416/8 416/12 418/16	429/1 429/2 430/16 438/2 439/7
has [56] 416/14 419/15 419/16	420/20 421/1 425/10 427/18	439/7 439/12 450/15 452/7
419/23 420/9 421/20 422/13	429/11 430/11 434/1 435/1 435/9	454/20 455/5 463/11 465/9 465/9
423/25 425/24 426/19 427/8	435/14 436/4 436/15 436/17	465/20 467/15 468/7 468/7 469/1
427/10 428/1 428/5 429/20	438/3 440/10 440/13 442/1	470/14 472/8 481/22 482/2
432/11 435/23 435/25 441/1	442/12 442/16 443/12 443/15	l and [1] 439/14
442/13 442/15 442/16 443/15	443/17 443/19 444/15 444/18	I apologise [1] 429/19
445/3 445/9 446/10 448/2 448/5	444/20 445/2 445/12 445/20	l asked [1] 424/4
449/2 449/15 449/19 450/2	446/14 448/13 449/17 452/10	I believe [1] 436/22
450/16 450/20 451/13 451/14	453/17 454/4 454/5 457/3 460/8	I briefly [1] 424/14
452/5 453/14 454/4 456/21 460/2	461/9 461/10 464/9 471/12	I conclude [1] 449/22
466/15 469/12 470/20 472/23	471/17 473/1 473/12 473/19	I could [1] 418/10
473/6 475/5 476/17 476/23 477/7	475/2 475/7 477/15 477/24	I described [1] 436/6
480/5 481/6 481/8 481/19 482/4	478/11 478/12 478/12 481/13	I didn't [3] 429/20 477/25 481/12 I do [4] 427/9 428/7 439/11 464/4
482/7	here to [1] 416/8	I don't [8] 427/6 429/10 459/19
have [154]	herring [1] 424/6	477/18 477/24 479/16 480/8
haven't [1] 445/8	hierarchy [3] 419/1 440/8 440/16	481/19
having [6] 432/23 438/15 449/25	high [1] 462/2	I find [4] 472/9 472/11 473/5
472/10 473/2 480/11	highest [2] 456/9 457/3	477/1
he [17] 434/22 437/19 453/16	highlighted [3] 420/20 443/13	I finish [1] 463/6
453/17 453/20 454/6 454/21	113/13	l go [1] 440/7
457/21 457/23 457/24 459/22	highly [1] 462/5	l grew [1] 454/25
460/8 476/6 478/12 478/12	him [2] 453/20 453/24	I have [7] 423/23 429/10 435/8
478/13 478/14	hinted [1] 423/23	435/19 456/20 470/8 480/2
headquartered [1] 426/6	his [3] 416/24 439/13 458/10	I hope [1] 433/17
heads [1] 438/4	Hobér [2] 410/17 411/8	l indicated [1] 464/25
hear [15] 416/8 416/13 416/25	hoc [1] 424/11	l just [1] 473/17
425/15 428/22 453/1 456/7 457/5	Hogan [1] 413/12	I know [3] 438/1 454/23 481/3
457/7 457/9 457/14 459/9 463/16	holds [1] 427/20	I make [1] 424/14
473/6 473/12	hope [1] 433/17	I mean [1] 474/9
heard [18] 419/14 429/2 436/25	hopefully [3] 423/10 465/5	I mentioned [2] 433/15 435/21
440/23 440/23 441/14 443/1	468/24	I must [1] 417/11
443/12 452/24 453/3 455/11	hour [1] 416/16	I pass [1] 447/7
455/25 457/11 458/12 459/7	hours [1] 456/19	I point [1] 433/14
459/11 459/12 459/13	housekeeping [1] 417/13	I respectfully [2] 462/14 462/24
hearing [35] 410/19 416/6 416/13	how [22] 417/11 419/8 420/11	·····

www.dianaburden.com

ICSID Case No ARB 20/7

Security Services LLC v Republic of Colombia Final

Wednesday, 29 March, 2023

	1	
I	improper [5] 472/11 473/5 477/2	interim [5] 429/14 430/1 430/2
I said [2] 423/16 457/20	479/19 480/13	430/9 431/16
I say [1] 478/17	Inc [16] 410/8 425/9 426/5 427/5	international [18] 410/2 414/2
I shouldn't [1] 465/20	427/11 427/13 427/15 444/14	425/13 425/25 426/3 426/14
I showed [1] 474/20	445/20 445/22 446/4 446/10	430/20 430/22 432/17 434/17
I started [1] 479/3	446/14 446/23 447/6 455/14	436/11 444/20 445/16 462/6
I talked [1] 454/21	include [3] 458/18 472/3 477/13	462/8 462/17 464/6 466/9
I think [14] 416/20 417/14 418/18	included [3] 427/23 474/11	Internet [15] 424/4 432/22 435/4
419/4 424/15 432/25 434/2 443/1	475/16	435/15 436/8 436/16 436/18
	including [5] 427/16 430/3 430/10	
444/14 444/17 463/14 470/16	437/11 471/22	458/7 458/16 473/24 478/8
470/17 480/13	incorporated [1] 426/9	interpret [1] 460/7
I train [1] 456/22	incorporation [1] 426/17	interpretation [1] 459/17
I understand [2] 466/22 472/16	incorrect [1] 471/14	interpreted [1] 460/4
I understood [1] 467/15	increase [1] 476/18	interpreters [2] 414/11 481/4
I want [1] 430/15	increased [2] 479/8 479/11	investment [12] 410/3 414/2
l was [1] 479/17	incurred [4] 450/9 450/17 451/13	425/22 430/21 430/22 431/14
I went [1] 429/8	451/14	442/9 458/20 459/1 462/18 463/3
I will [20] 419/10 430/17 432/18	-	476/11
435/4 435/20 439/9 440/3 446/24	indebtedness [2] 471/12 471/22	-
447/11 456/20 459/20 461/16	independent [1] 427/22	investor [4] 447/20 449/15
470/23 476/21 477/18 477/20	indicate [1] 467/16	450/16 450/20
477/21 478/1 480/4 480/18	indicated [2] 464/25 465/25	investor's [2] 448/3 448/23
I won't [3] 440/22 442/22 444/17	indicators [6] 471/19 471/21	investors [5] 422/18 422/21
I would [9] 419/7 440/10 441/14	472/4 472/6 475/4 479/25	422/22 422/25 462/21
443/23 463/6 465/2 481/6 481/11	individuals [2] 456/10 456/11	inviting [1] 470/19
482/3	inference [1] 455/22	involve [1] 447/25
l'd [1] 433/20	inferior [1] 421/5	involved [1] 456/9
ICANN [12] 421/10 436/2 436/3	informal [1] 454/10	irrespective [1] 476/14
436/9 436/11 436/19 436/24	information [3] 455/21 464/5	irresponsible [1] 462/17
437/6 437/14 437/18 437/20	476/23	is [347]
437/21	informed [1] 462/12	isn't [1] 478/12
ICSID [12] 410/5 411/9 425/19	initial [2] 419/4 419/7	issue [19] 416/11 417/3 421/19
428/21 444/20 444/22 444/25	initially [2] 421/6 475/23	427/5 427/10 428/5 430/6 432/2
445/1 445/25 446/6 463/7 481/13	initiate [1] 447/20	435/2 437/24 444/19 445/12
<b>ICSID Convention [4]</b> 425/19	initiating [1] 449/10	459/23 467/13 468/25 469/2
444/20 444/25 445/25	initiation [1] 449/8	469/3 469/24 470/24
	injunctive [2] 429/14 447/24	issues [9] 418/23 429/9 433/11
ICSID Secretariat [1] 481/13	INNES [1] 412/8	445/14 463/23 470/3 478/16
idea [2] 419/11 437/21	inguired [1] 457/15	481/15 481/17
illegal [1] 443/15	inside [1] 458/23	it [187]
imagine [2] 431/5 458/20	instead [4] 432/14 454/19 459/2	items [1] 426/25
impacting [1] 463/2	460/16	its [17] 424/12 424/16 426/15
implies [1] 422/12	integrity [1] 440/19	427/15 430/5 430/9 431/14 446/2
importance [1] 462/7	intend [1] 468/5	447/14 450/6 450/6 450/8 450/19
important [9] 418/22 440/21	intent [2] 450/6 467/16	452/6 460/3 462/6 476/11
445/23 446/7 448/1 461/10	intention [1] 474/17	itself [4] 440/21 444/2 458/16
468/16 469/3 472/5	interest [1] 458/25	473/24
importantly [2] 419/15 472/12		473/24 ITU [14] 471/13 471/16 473/20
impose [1] 430/6	interesting [2] 442/25 443/24	
impossible [2] 431/12 448/25	interestingly [1] 442/4	473/21 474/16 474/19 474/24

www.dianaburden.com

### Security Services LLC v Republic of Colombia Final

Wednesday, 29 March, 2023

ICSID Case No ARB 20/7	Final	Wednesday, 29 March, 2023
1	480/7 480/8 481/3	legal [11] 414/2 423/19 423/20
ITU [7] 475/1 475/7 475/11	known [2] 434/22 437/5	425/21 427/7 427/9 427/9 428/7
475/16 479/21 480/13 480/20	knows [1] 422/3	440/15 444/2 449/2
IVÁN [2] 413/18 456/13		legislation [7] 420/14 420/17
Iván Castaño [1] 456/13	<u> </u>	421/3 421/22 421/24 422/14
	lack [3] 433/9 455/15 457/6	460/25
J	ladies [1] 416/4	legitimate [2] 457/6 459/10
Johnson [1] 412/7	laid [1] 435/14	length [1] 464/25
José [1] 434/21	Lamborghini [3] 433/18 433/19	lesson [1] 462/16
Julian [2] 410/15 411/4	435/16	let's [10] 424/16 452/23 453/11
JULIANA [1] 413/9	language [8] 420/12 420/16	455/1 455/7 459/15 463/12
July [3] 427/19 436/21 440/24	423/13 442/20 459/23 460/21	463/18 473/6 473/11
July 2008 [1] 436/21	460/21 460/22	letter [3] 427/23 428/21 452/21
Juridica [1] 413/5	largely [1] 416/13	letters [1] 427/18
jurisdiction [14] 425/8 425/11	last [12] 416/5 416/12 416/20	level [3] 456/9 471/12 471/22
425/12 425/14 425/18 425/20	429/2 437/23 452/24 470/24	Lew [2] 410/15 411/4
425/24 440/17 442/1 444/13	472/23 473/1 476/3 476/22 477/1	LEÓN [1] 413/6
445/19 446/13 446/16 446/19	late [1] 433/3	liable [1] 434/24
jurisdictional [11] 419/2 419/6	later [4] 417/22 434/17 442/7	licence [1] 434/18
419/12 420/4 426/3 433/5 440/8	463/17	licences [1] 434/15
440/11 441/18 450/4 451/12	LAURENT [2] 413/13 447/10	life [1] 438/12
jury [1] 452/15	LAVISTA [3] 411/10 481/12	light [1] 431/15
just [37] 416/21 418/9 419/7	482/11	like [18] 417/24 418/19 426/11
420/10 423/23 429/10 429/20	law [53] 419/8 419/9 420/16	442/8 457/20 462/20 463/6 464/3
432/11 433/21 437/23 438/16	422/1 422/2 422/2 422/3 422/5	466/7 467/8 476/10 478/19
439/7 440/23 441/1 442/23 443/5	422/5 422/16 423/4 423/9 423/13	478/20 478/25 479/1 481/4 481/7
444/22 445/13 445/23 448/19	423/14 423/17 424/3 424/11	482/4
449/17 456/4 462/21 464/3 465/9	424/12 424/16 424/19 425/3	likelihood [1] 439/3
468/9 469/1 469/9 469/21 469/23	425/3 425/5 425/13 425/25 426/3	likely [4] 426/16 466/18 466/20
471/1 473/16 473/17 473/18	426/10 426/14 426/16 426/16	469/24
474/4 475/3 476/10	427/3 429/16 429/23 432/17	likewise [1] 455/4
justified [1] 458/14	442/21 442/24 443/7 443/8	limine [1] 440/20
K	444/15 444/20 445/16 452/9	limitation [1] 422/13
	452/12 454/11 460/25 462/5	limited [3] 447/21 447/22 448/6
Kaj [2] 410/17 411/8	464/6 466/8 466/9 467/13 469/5	LINDSEY [1] 412/9
<b>KC [2]</b> 410/15 411/4	469/6 469/7	line [2] 430/11 436/5
keep [3] 420/10 439/12 458/18	laws [2] 426/4 444/23	link [2] 427/23 442/1
keeping [1] 482/11	lawyer [2] 444/3 452/21	linked [1] 440/19
<b>KEVIN [2]</b> 412/6 454/4	lawyer's [1] 456/5	list [5] 410/21 411/12 412/12
Kevin Hughes [1] 454/4	lawyers [3] 418/19 419/9 419/9 Lawyers' [1] 452/20	436/17 471/21
<b>KIA [4]</b> 433/16 433/17 433/20	lay [1] 435/21	listed [1] 426/25
435/16	lead [3] 421/7 421/14 437/13	listing [1] 480/5
kind [1] 480/6	lead-in [2] 421/7 421/14 437/13	lists [2] 426/24 428/18
KLEMM [1] 414/13	least [3] 451/24 454/3 476/13	litis [1] 440/20
knew [2] 456/11 461/1	leave [2] 468/9 469/13	little [4] 423/11 431/22 438/3
know [18] 419/14 419/17 438/1	leaving [1] 482/14	465/3
440/12 442/21 443/10 445/10	left [8] 435/19 451/22 456/4	LLC [3] 410/8 426/6 428/19
445/10 452/8 453/2 454/23	456/5 461/2 470/8 471/22 479/7	LLOYD [1] 414/10
456/10 457/10 469/12 479/7	+30/3 +01/2 +/0/0 +/1/22 +/3//	LLP [1] 412/7
1	1	1

www.dianaburden.com

ICSID	Case	No	ARB	20/7	
10010	0400			20/1	

	-	Weanesday, 20 March, 2020
L	MARÍA [1] 413/10	473/10
local [2] 432/6 447/21	math [2] 438/3 438/16	million [9] 438/9 438/9 438/13
logically [1] 449/4	matter [9] 416/6 417/11 417/13	438/14 438/19 438/24 438/24
London [3] 462/2 466/18 482/14	419/4 419/7 427/3 456/10 463/15	476/17 477/9
long [2] 417/11 465/19	470/12	mind [1] 420/10
longer [1] 417/10	mattered [1] 421/23	minimum [1] 423/1
look [15] 425/2 426/22 427/1	matters [2] 416/15 480/25	mining [1] 434/15
	max [1] 440/2	Minister [4] 423/7 456/14 457/12
428/16 428/17 434/4 436/20 437/16 443/5 443/25 460/11	maximum [1] 471/11	457/13
	may [36] 418/22 420/13 420/21	Minister Constaín [1] 423/7
471/15 477/25 479/14 480/20	421/2 421/5 430/2 431/18 442/22	Ministry [3] 437/4 437/6 437/12
looked [3] 423/7 429/24 480/2	443/13 443/14 446/1 450/23	MinTIC [1] 431/1
looking [2] 429/23 469/8	454/10 454/11 457/19 460/22	MinTIC's [2] 456/13 456/15
loss [2] 450/17 450/23	460/23 461/2 463/14 463/20	MinTIC-Republic [1] 431/1
lot [4] 418/18 423/25 462/19	464/22 465/3 465/8 465/11	minute [2] 472/23 478/21
478/19	465/12 467/7 467/9 467/10	minutes [9] 416/20 418/2 418/18
loved [1] 453/24	467/11 467/16 468/13 469/20	435/19 439/24 440/2 456/19
Lovells [1] 413/12	469/22 469/24 470/5 481/23	463/13 463/18
Ltd [1] 414/10	me [8] 429/2 454/22 454/24	mitigate [1] 435/5
LUCAS [1] 413/15	456/21 474/6 477/19 477/25	model [2] 436/6 437/10
LUCIA [1] 413/8	479/16	modified [2] 431/18 431/24
LUISA [2] 413/17 456/15	mean [2] 465/7 474/9	moment [5] 418/9 421/20 423/13
м	meaning [8] 421/25 422/1 432/5	452/13 453/11
	434/24 460/2 460/3 460/20 461/3	<b>momentum [1]</b> 439/12
made [11] 424/14 428/10 435/13	meaningless [1] 459/25	Monday [5] 429/13 432/4 443/4
453/5 455/24 457/5 457/11	meaninglessly [1] 460/2	447/2 465/17
470/17 474/22 475/20 479/16	means [6] 419/13 422/12 422/15	monetary [1] 447/25
main [1] 440/18	431/23 437/6 438/11	month [1] 465/1
mainly [1] 418/20	meant [2] 422/1 438/20	months [4] 426/20 433/3 446/5
make [20] 422/5 424/14 425/9	measures [2] 430/9 431/16	447/1
430/15 431/22 439/13 439/24	mechanism [1] 431/23	more [16] 418/24 419/15 441/25
452/23 458/4 461/10 462/3	meeting [1] 437/20	442/4 443/4 443/17 443/19 451/4
462/16 468/11 468/12 468/14	meetings [1] 458/8	455/23 464/5 466/7 471/10
468/16 468/19 470/13 478/2	MELISSA [5] 413/14 417/20 440/4	
480/21	447/8 470/24	morning [9] 416/4 417/8 418/15
making [4] 425/11 431/21 466/24		429/6 438/2 451/24 452/3 460/10
479/13	members [7] 417/9 418/15	478/1
manages [1] 478/9	460/10 461/20 463/4 465/14	most [2] 418/21 433/22
managing [4] 436/8 436/18	400/10 401/20 403/4 403/14	
436/24 478/13	-	motion [1] 450/10
manner [3] 421/2 421/21 424/16	memorial [1] 452/22 memorialises [1] 421/15	move [1] 474/2
many [5] 426/19 436/7 446/7		moving [1] 449/23
453/4 481/23	mention [1] 440/10 mentioned [5] 429/17 433/15	<b>MR [47]</b> 412/6 412/8 412/8 413/6
MARCELA [1] 413/10		413/10 413/13 413/14 413/15
March [4] 410/20 416/1 423/18	435/21 475/14 478/12	413/18 414/5 414/5 415/5 415/7
450/8	merits [3] 442/1 445/12 451/1	415/9 415/11 417/6 417/25
MARIA [1] 413/6	met [3] 425/24 438/14 474/14	418/10 418/14 432/18 432/19
market [1] 461/5	midway [1] 440/25	435/17 437/19 439/6 439/16
marketing [1] 427/15	might [8] 419/20 424/21 424/24	439/19 442/13 451/19 451/20
MARTHA [1] 413/8	426/2 434/20 439/15 465/4	454/18 458/5 458/5 459/12

www.dianaburden.com

Wednesday, 29 March, 2023

Μ	N	467/20 470/9 470/10 470/21
MR [14] 459/21 461/20 464/16	Nacional [1] 413/5	474/6 474/15 474/17 481/17
465/23 467/14 470/14 470/25	name [5] 427/17 427/21 440/25	No 19 [1] 474/6
472/8 473/16 476/19 476/20	441/1 445/24	No 2 [1] 455/18
481/1 481/15 481/17	names [2] 437/9 476/3	No 3 [1] 425/5
Mr Baldwin [7] 432/18 439/16	narrow [1] 448/10	No 5 [2] 430/25 448/12
454/18 458/5 459/21 476/20	national [1] 423/2	non [3] 414/1 425/12 429/19
481/1	nature [4] 419/22 429/15 442/2	non-disputing [2] 414/1 429/19
Mr Bigge [1] 442/13	461/22	non-objectionable [1] 425/12
Mr Castaño [2] 437/19 459/12	NDPS [2] 448/9 450/19	none [1] 473/23
Mr Chairman [8] 461/20 464/16	need [10] 455/9 459/19 461/10	norms [1] 423/21
465/23 467/14 470/14 470/25	464/20 465/4 466/11 468/19	not [111]
473/16 476/19	473/17 480/7 481/19	noted [1] 436/13 nothing [10] 417/5 419/18 422/4
Mr President [5] 417/6 418/10	needed [1] 461/1	422/6 441/4 441/15 451/4 479/11
435/17 439/6 472/8	needs [1] 468/1	480/24 481/2
Mrs [1] 480/8	nefarious [1] 457/23	notice [4] 450/6 450/14 464/14
Mrs Ordoñez [1] 480/8	negotiate [1] 451/16	468/5
MS [34] 411/10 412/9 412/9	neither [2] 423/9 477/5	now [40] 418/3 423/13 426/20
413/6 413/8 413/9 413/9 413/10	Neustar [47] 410/8 410/8 425/9	427/3 427/20 432/21 433/25
413/14 413/17 413/17 414/10	426/5 426/20 427/5 427/11	434/20 434/25 438/1 439/17
414/10 414/12 414/13 415/6	427/13 427/15 427/17 427/21	441/8 442/5 445/2 445/11 445/19
415/10 415/12 419/5 423/6 424/3	428/1 428/2 428/6 428/10 428/18	446/12 447/11 449/23 454/18
429/4 429/5 431/8 439/17 447/9	428/19 435/4 438/5 438/21	456/6 456/20 456/22 457/5
459/12 459/13 461/18 472/23	444/14 445/20 445/22 446/4	457/19 458/24 459/2 460/15
476/22 477/7 481/12 482/11	446/6 446/10 446/14 446/23	460/16 461/2 461/16 464/10
Ms Baldwin [2] 429/4 439/17	447/6 449/9 450/5 450/24 451/12	465/24 466/6 466/22 467/19
Ms Constaín [1] 459/12	451/14 453/18 456/12 457/16	473/9 478/5 478/14 480/16
Ms Lavista [2] 481/12 482/11	457/19 476/5 476/11 478/5 478/7	number [3] 475/17 476/2 476/25
Ms Ordoñez [4] 419/5 472/23	478/13 479/7 479/12 479/13	numbers [5] 473/8 476/8 476/15
476/22 477/7	479/18	479/10 479/15
<b>Ms Trujillo [3]</b> 423/6 431/8	Neustar's [8] 426/23 431/13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
459/13	447/13 448/11 451/3 453/14	0
Ms Trujillo's [1] 424/3	453/23 476/4	objection [2] 441/18 476/22
much [15] 419/8 419/10 420/3	never [1] 423/24	objectionable [1] 425/12
426/11 429/2 435/7 436/25 438/5	new [12] 432/23 433/15 449/25	objections [6] 419/2 419/6 419/12
439/16 444/17 463/11 468/19	460/13 470/19 470/21 476/6	420/4 440/9 440/12
481/20 481/25 482/16	476/18 478/22 479/2 479/9	objective [2] 458/9 458/10
municipal [1] 444/23	479/14	objectives [1] 456/25
must [3] 417/11 437/12 446/19	next [2] 429/3 449/23	obligation [2] 421/15 421/17
my [26] 417/20 429/3 429/21	Nicolai [3] 453/14 453/14 478/11	obligations [4] 428/1 430/6
430/15 433/16 434/21 439/8	Nicolai Bezsonoff [1] 478/11	434/17 462/6
439/14 440/4 440/5 441/15	nivel [1] 471/23	obvious [1] 442/5
441/17 442/6 442/12 447/7 455/5	<b>no [38]</b> 410/5 417/11 424/6 425/5	obviously [4] 421/25 423/1 469/3
456/1 459/15 463/6 470/23 475/3	428/1 430/25 433/17 435/8	481/8
476/6 476/21 477/18 481/14	435/14 440/17 440/25 443/2	occasion [2] 420/22 423/15
481/19	443/7 443/21 444/23 445/21	occupy [1] 420/6
myself [1] 429/10	446/1 448/12 450/19 450/21	occurred [1] 418/24
	451/5 451/7 451/14 451/18 453/2	October [1] 476/7
	453/18 455/18 456/2 457/7 457/7	

www.dianaburden.com

Security Services LLC v Republic of Colombia Final

Wednesday, 29 March, 2023

		Wednesday, 25 March, 2020
0	415/10 415/12 417/20 419/5	Ρ
October 2020 [1] 476/7	447/8 447/9 461/18 470/24	package [1] 451/17
odd [2] 472/9 472/11	472/23 476/22 477/7 480/8	page [3] 444/7 471/18 473/25
off [1] 434/3	organisation [1] 436/11	page 110 [1] 471/18
Office [5] 412/8 412/9 414/2	Organisation' [1] 437/5	page 7 [1] 444/7
414/2 423/19	original [4] 420/23 423/15 438/11	pages [2] 410/1 449/20
officials [2] 456/9 457/4	460/18	paper [3] 418/7 418/11 473/24
often [1] 473/7	other [25] 416/15 417/2 418/23	paragraph [4] 421/1 421/7 421/14
okay [4] 417/1 467/9 467/10	422/18 422/21 422/25 423/2	421/17
468/18	425/2 426/7 432/13 433/10	paramount [1] 442/14
old [1] 437/1	433/15 441/17 443/4 454/1	pardon [1] 433/16
omits [1] 476/11	454/15 455/15 463/10 463/15	part [9] 418/22 420/8 421/15
once [2] 433/6 481/18	468/7 469/8 473/23 480/21	422/6 438/17 440/6 445/6 459/15
one [32] 417/13 418/9 419/22	480/25 481/22	480/9
420/22 422/11 423/15 427/18	others [2] 440/5 441/19	PARTICIPANTS [3] 411/1 412/1
433/5 433/14 433/17 436/2	otherwise [3] 422/2 428/22 461/5	413/1
437/23 438/8 440/11 440/15	our [34] 416/6 416/13 418/23	participate [3] 451/9 458/24
440/16 442/8 442/9 449/3 449/23	419/17 419/24 420/1 420/2	474/18
453/4 458/9 462/21 463/15	427/18 427/22 433/17 435/21	participating [1] 436/3
464/12 469/23 470/11 470/15	438/4 439/21 451/23 451/25	particular [7] 444/5 460/23 469/2
473/10 477/20 477/23 482/8	452/19 454/13 457/11 459/4	472/17 476/1 477/20 481/2
one-sided [1] 477/23	463/7 463/9 467/16 467/16	particularly [3] 418/19 423/6
one-time [1] 422/11	468/21 471/2 471/3 471/8 471/8	448/8
only [14] 420/22 421/23 443/8	474/15 475/25 478/3 481/10	parties [9] 418/16 420/3 420/11
447/5 449/15 455/20 460/16	482/2 482/10	421/16 428/23 445/25 452/13
461/25 462/14 467/12 473/21	out [24] 421/11 425/21 427/18	463/24 470/19
474/14 475/3 478/6	429/20 430/1 433/14 435/4	parties' [2] 432/22 449/24
open [1] 456/17	435/14 435/22 437/22 448/10	partner [2] 417/20 470/24
opened [1] 423/21	455/2 456/24 458/18 467/10	parts [1] 439/21
opening [12] 417/19 436/14	467/25 470/8 472/5 472/6 475/4	party [6] 414/1 416/16 427/22
455/25 457/23 471/3 471/4 471/8	475/7 475/17 475/23 481/24	429/19 446/1 480/21
474/9 474/21 476/1 479/5 480/16	outcome [1] 431/14	pass [1] 447/7
operation [1] 436/17	outrageous [1] 453/4	passed [1] 436/21
operators [1] 478/16	outright [1] 455/25	past [2] 446/25 463/5
opinion [4] 444/2 444/6 444/8	outset [2] 451/15 459/22	Pause [1] 418/10
444/9	outside [1] 422/1	pay [2] 428/15 462/22
opportunistic [1] 463/2	outsized [1] 420/8	payment [5] 437/24 438/1 438/14
opportunities [1] 416/22	outsourcing [1] 436/6	438/20 447/25
opportunity [5] 428/13 435/9	over [11] 429/1 429/3 437/10	pendency [5] 431/3 431/8 448/4
454/16 455/8 466/13	444/14 446/25 456/19 461/16	448/7 448/20
opposite [1] 438/22	470/23 478/21 478/24 481/10	pending [2] 431/14 450/11
<b>ORAL [1]</b> 410/19	overlaps [1] 470/5 own [2] 419/23 451/23	people [3] 454/20 478/9 478/18
order [13] 428/15 430/3 430/13		per [9] 438/5 471/11 473/22
430/19 430/25 432/12 449/14	owned [3] 427/13 427/14 438/8 owner [1] 441/6	475/10 475/18 476/8 477/13
458/14 458/15 458/16 464/18		479/21 480/5
468/8 469/19	owners [2] 427/12 428/4 ownership [2] 476/4 476/14	PERALTA [1] 414/5
ordered [1] 431/16	ownersnip [2] 4/0/44/0/14	percent [1] 438/8
orders [1] 430/6		percentage [1] 427/14
ORDOÑEZ [14] 413/6 413/14		perhaps [3] 431/12 442/4 442/8

www.dianaburden.com

		····· <b>;</b> , ···;
Ρ	post-hearing [12] 416/23 418/23	457/16
period [1] 453/16	420/2 435/21 443/18 464/13	probability [1] 465/17
permanent [1] 431/17	464/19 464/24 469/18 469/22	probably [3] 434/22 437/23
permission [7] 466/16 467/23	470/16 478/3	442/10
468/2 468/3 468/10 468/12	post-hearings [3] 468/24 470/6	problem [1] 453/18
468/14	480/22	problematic [1] 450/12
permit [2] 434/16 434/18	post-hoc [1] 424/11	procedural [1] 444/19
permitted [1] 448/15	potential [2] 446/21 458/17	procedure [2] 429/25 444/24
person [3] 412/3 413/3 413/11	power [5] 421/18 421/21 427/5	procedures [1] 437/11
-	427/10 446/22	proceed [7] 416/21 418/5 428/24
perspective [1] 450/4	practically [1] 469/20	439/20 463/20 468/9 473/14
phase [1] 434/2	practice [6] 422/17 423/10 423/17	proceeding [9] 420/5 420/8
piece [1] 479/19	424/9 424/10 448/25	426/15 428/2 433/8 454/14
place [3] 420/17 426/8 461/5	PRADO [1] 413/9	454/15 454/25 480/17
pleading [1] 435/15	preliminary [1] 450/25	proceedings [11] 432/3 440/20
pleadings [2] 443/2 443/3	preparation [1] 477/24	445/22 447/15 447/18 447/20
please [6] 417/23 418/12 435/17	prepare [1] 478/1	449/5 449/8 449/9 452/10 455/12
465/22 467/23 473/14	prepared [1] 482/5	process [16] 431/10 433/9 441/10
pleasure [1] 481/8	present [11] 419/14 421/8 442/6	442/5 442/7 450/10 451/9 454/10
pled [1] 420/9	447/4 449/10 452/14 455/8	455/15 457/8 458/18 458/19
plenty [1] 426/7	455/10 456/6 470/19 480/10	459/6 461/15 462/1 478/24
plus [1] 438/9	presentation [17] 417/20 418/2	produce [2] 455/19 472/1
pm [1] 482/17	418/8 420/1 436/14 437/25	production [2] 441/10 445/6
PO4 [1] 418/1	439/14 439/21 447/2 452/3	professionalism [2] 481/6 482/6
point [26] 417/15 417/18 424/14	459/16 471/3 471/5 471/8 472/9	professor [7] 410/15 410/16
433/14 434/3 435/4 440/15	474/22 476/1	410/17 411/4 411/7 411/8 456/22
441/16 441/17 441/22 441/23	presentations [1] 482/5	professor at [1] 456/22
442/12 451/12 459/8 461/24	presented [10] 443/5 455/11	profile [1] 462/3
470/15 474/1 474/3 475/3 475/25	455/16 470/20 471/9 478/4 479/5	profit [1] 434/11
477/21 477/22 479/4 479/14	479/6 481/19 482/5	profitability [3] 434/5 434/6
479/15 479/17	preserve [3] 430/21 431/2 431/14	
pointed [1] 429/20	preserved [1] 431/6	project [1] 471/17
points [6] 440/10 440/14 466/4	preserving [4] 448/3 448/6	promise [2] 422/9 433/19
471/2 477/5 477/7	448/19 448/22	promises [2] 422/8 422/11
policies [1] 459/10	President [10] 410/15 411/3	promising [1] 417/14
policy [2] 437/8 457/6	417/6 418/10 418/17 435/17	proof [8] 419/7 419/8 419/11
portion [3] 420/20 476/22 478/6	439/6 453/15 453/23 472/8	441/12 445/8 452/16 452/16
pose [1] 464/1	press [1] 441/3	474/20
posed [1] 416/14	pressure [1] 453/7	proper [5] 425/6 442/3 444/13
position [2] 416/25 435/7 positions [2] 432/22 449/24	presumably [1] 472/18	444/16 463/1
• • • •	prevent [3] 430/5 432/8 462/17	properly [1] 445/9
possibility [4] 423/14 423/21	prevents [1] 463/2	propos [1] 452/2
443/6 443/8	previous [1] 458/8	propose [1] 464/8
possible [2] 447/23 463/9	previously [2] 416/24 437/18	protect [2] 458/16 459/3
<b>post [17]</b> 416/23 418/23 420/2	price [1] 462/22	protection [1] 458/19
424/11 435/21 443/18 452/1	priced [1] 439/5	prove [2] 419/11 457/21
464/13 464/19 464/24 468/24	principle [1] 445/24	proven [1] 419/15
469/18 469/22 470/6 470/16	principles [1] 432/16	provide [4] 454/14 454/20 455/20
478/3 480/22	prior [4] 433/3 433/12 449/7	466/7
post-closing [1] 452/1		

www.dianaburden.com

## Security Services LLC v Republic of Colombia Final

Wednesday, 29 March, 2023

P         R         443/19 444/5 446/15 475/1 478/           provides [3] 423/14 430/1 471/19         R-2[2] 443/19 443/20         referred [2] 437/25 452/10           provision [1] 451/19         R-25 [1] 437/3         reflects [1] 427/24           provisions [2] 423/3 430/12         R-48 [1] 473/25         resould 44/2           public [2] 472/2 4772/3         R-80 [1] 449/20         regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20           PUENTES [3] 413/6 415/12 461/18         raise [8] 416/16 417/3 439/15         463/16 480/25 481/3 481/16           purpose [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22         raise [8] 416/16 407/3 449/10         registrare [1] 452/5 452/25 452/2 5 453/3           purpose [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22         reinterpret [1] 460/4         registrare [1] 437/11           put [17] 416/24 429/10 440/13         ret. [3] 425/17 471/13 474/25         registrare [1] 437/11           442/24 442/23 443/13 444/22         re interpret [1] 460/4         re-interpret [1] 460/4         re-interpret [1] 450/17           quantum [1] 451/11         read [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24         read [4] 442/22 442/3 433/4 455/14         relates [2] 450/13 480/5           quantum [1] 451/11         read [4] 442/22 442/3 433/10         446/611         reall [2] 452/14 428/14           quantum [1] 451/11         read [4] 442/22 442/2 442/3 434/20         reall [2] 452/14 428/14           quantum [1] 451/11         reall [2] 42
provided [1] 45/11       mc2 [2] 443/15 443/20       mc2 [2] 443/15 445/20         providing [1] 454/19       mc2 [3] 437/3       reflects [1] 427/24         provision [1] 431/22       mc48 [1] 473/25       reflects [1] 427/24         provision [2] 423/3 430/12       mc48 [1] 473/25       reflects [1] 427/24         public [2] 472/2 472/3       mc48 [1] 449/20       regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20         public [2] 472/2 472/3       mc48 [1] 449/20       regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20         public [2] 472/2 472/3       mc48 [1] 449/20       regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20         public [2] 472/2 472/3       mc48 [1] 449/20       regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20         public [2] 472/2 472/3       mc48 [8] 416/16 417/3 439/15       regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20         purpose [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22       481/17       raised [1] 463/24       registrars [1] 437/11         purposes [1] 458/17       raised [1] 463/24       reinterpret [1] 460/7       recinterpret [1] 460/7       recinterpret [1] 460/7         426/2 433/8 454/13       mc48 [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24       read [2] 451/12 473/4       relate [2] 450/13 480/5         putting [2] 433/8 454/13       mcady [2] 418/5 451/16       ready [2] 418/5 451/16       ready [2] 418/5 451/16         real [1] 456/11       real [1] 456/11       realdy [2] 441/22 452/24 428/14       428/16 428/18
provides [3] 423/14 430/1 471/19       R-25 [1] 437/3       reflect [1] 427/24         providing [1] 454/19       R-35 [3] 443/20 443/24 444/1       reflect [1] 427/24         provision [1] 431/22       R-35 [3] 443/20 443/24 444/1       reflect [1] 427/24         provisions [2] 423/3 430/12       R-48 [1] 473/25       reflect [1] 427/24         public [2] 472/2 472/3       R-80 [1] 449/20       regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20         public [2] 472/2 472/3       R-92 [2] 443/20 443/21       regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20         public [2] 422/2 472/3       R-92 [2] 443/20 443/21       regard [3] 451/11         purposes [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22       481/17       raised [1] 463/24         purposes [1] 458/17       raised [1] 463/24       registrars [1] 437/11         put [17] 416/24 429/10 440/13       rather [3] 425/17 471/13 474/25       re [3] 451/16 460/4         442/12 442/23 443/13 444/22       re [3] 451/16 460/4       re-interpret [1] 460/4       resotiate [1] 451/11         quastion [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       read [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24       read [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24       read [4] 442/22 452/4 426/14 480/5         quastion [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       read [4] 442/22 452/4 426/14 480/5       relating [1] 432/14       relates [2] 450/13 480/5         quastion [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       read [4] 442/24 452/4 426/10 481/9       relationship [5] 436/9 436/19
providing [1] 454/19       R-35 [3] 443/20 443/24 444/1       reflects [1] 423/16         provision [1] 431/22       R-48 [1] 473/25       reflects [1] 423/16         provisions [2] 423/3 430/12       R-80 [1] 449/20       regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20         public [2] 472/2 472/3       R-92 [2] 443/20 443/21       regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20         PUENTES [3] 413/6 415/12 461/18       raise [8] 416/16 417/3 439/15       regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20         purpose [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22       463/16 480/25 481/3 481/16       registrantions [4] 452/5 452/25 453/3         put [17] 416/24 429/10 440/13       raised [1] 463/24       registrant [1] 437/11         put [17] 416/24 429/10 440/13       raised [1] 451/16       reinterpret [1] 460/7       registrant [1] 437/11         quattum [1] 452/21       re-interpret [1] 460/7       re-interpret [1] 460/4       reinterpret [1] 451/16         putting [2] 433/8 454/13       read [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24       real [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24       real [1] 455/16         quantum [1] 451/11       ready [2] 418/5 451/16       real [1] 456/11       real [1] 456/11       real [1] 456/11       relates [2] 450/13 480/5         quastion [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       real [1] 455/14 425/2 452/2 452/4       real [1] 456/13       relations [1] 432/14         quastion [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       real [1] 456/11       real [1] 456/11
provision [1] 431/22       R-48 [1] 473/25       refused [1] 455/19         provisions [2] 423/3 430/12       R-80 [1] 449/20       regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20         public [2] 472/2 472/3       R-92 [2] 443/20 443/21       regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20         PUENTES [3] 413/6 415/12 461/18       raise [8] 416/16 417/3 439/15       463/16 480/25 481/3 481/16       regard [7] 452/5 452/25 453/3         purpose [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22       463/16 480/25 481/3 481/16       regard [7] 452/5 452/25 457/18 457/19       regarts [1] 450/8         purpose [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22       raise [1] 463/24       registrars [1] 437/11       registrars [1] 437/11         purpose [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22       reinterpret [1] 460/7       reilsterpret [1] 460/7       reinterpret [1] 460/7       reinterpret [1] 450/17         445/5 446/12 446/14 448/1 448/8       re-interpret [1] 450/17       reed [2] 451/16       read [2] 452/21       reinterpret [1] 450/17         putting [2] 433/8 454/13       ready [2] 418/5 451/16       read [2] 451/12 473/4       relates [2] 450/13 480/5         quantum [1] 451/11       ready [2] 418/5 451/16       read [2] 451/12 473/4       relates [2] 450/13 480/5         question [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       read [9] 431/2 436/25 443/10       452/11 455/2 452/2 452/4       relation [2] 444/10 451/1         426/5 5 425/2 435/3 440/18       452/11 455/2 455/4 460/23       realion [2] 44
provisions [2] 423/3 430/12       R-80 [1] 449/20       regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20         public [2] 472/2 472/3       R-92 [2] 443/20 443/21       regard [3] 441/15 446/20 477/20         PUENTES [3] 413/6 415/12 461/18       raise [8] 416/16 417/3 439/15       463/16 480/25 481/3 481/16         purpose [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22       463/16 480/25 481/3 481/16       453/22 455/22 457/18 457/19         purpose [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22       481/17       registrars [1] 450/8         purposes [1] 458/17       raise [1] 463/24       registrars [1] 457/11         put [17] 416/24 429/10 440/13       rather [3] 425/17 471/13 474/25       registrars [1] 476/25 477/9         442/12 442/23 443/13 444/22       reinterpret [1] 460/7       re-interpreted [1] 460/4       reinterpreted [1] 450/14         452/11 452/21       re-interpreted [1] 451/16       read [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24       read [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24         putting [2] 433/8 454/13       read [2] 418/5 451/16       read [2] 451/12 473/4         read [4] 422/22 442/8 459/24       read [2] 450/13 480/5       realtei [2] 450/13 480/5         question [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       read [2] 418/5 451/16       realte [2] 450/13 480/5         realtig [1] 422/9       426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       475/13 475/15       reasonably [1] 422/9         420/21 441/13 442/18       427/13 435/14 435/23 435/25       426/14 646/8 471
public [2] 472/2 472/3       R-92 [2] 443/20 443/21       regarding [1] 451/11         PUENTES [3] 413/6 415/12 461/18       raise [8] 416/16 417/3 439/15       463/16 480/25 481/3 481/16         purpose [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22       463/16 480/25 481/3 481/16       regards [7] 452/5 452/25 452/25 453/3         purpose [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22       481/17       raised [1] 463/24       rejistered [1] 450/8         purpose [1] 458/17       raised [1] 463/24       raised [1] 452/17 471/13 474/25       re [3] 451/16 460/4 460/7         retater [3] 425/17 471/13 474/25       re [3] 451/16 460/4 448/1 448/8       re-interpret [1] 460/7       re-interpret [1] 460/7         445/5 446/12 446/14 448/1 448/8       re-interpret [1] 450/17       re-interpret [1] 451/16       read [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24         putting [2] 433/8 454/13       read [2] 418/5 451/16       read [2] 451/12 473/4       related [2] 451/12 473/4         quantum [1] 451/11       ready [2] 418/5 451/16       real [1] 456/11       real [1] 456/11         question [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       465/12 2452/2 452/4       reason [9] 431/2 436/25 443/10       436/24 466/10 481/9         424/9 425/5 425/23 426/1 426/12       475/13 475/15       reasonably [1] 422/9       relavant [0] 421/13 422/22         420/21 435/2 435/3 440/18       457/23 458/14       relevant [10] 421/13 422/22       422/24 423/3 424/7 434/2 453/14         42
PUENTES [3]       413/6       415/12       461/18       raise [8]       416/16       417/3       439/15         purchase [2]       426/2       426/2       426/18       463/16       480/25       481/17       regards [7]       452/5       452/25       453/25       452/25       453/25       45
purpose [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22       481/17         purposes [1] 458/17       raised [1] 463/24         put [17] 416/24 429/10 440/13       rather [3] 425/17 471/13 474/25         442/12 442/23 443/13 444/22       re [3] 451/16 460/4 460/7         445/5 446/12 446/14 448/1 448/8       re-interpret [1] 460/7         450/10 450/18 456/1 464/17       re-interpret [1] 460/7         479/24       re-interpret [1] 451/16         putting [2] 433/8 454/13       read [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24         pefkEZ [1] 413/18       ready [2] 418/5 451/16         quantum [1] 451/11       ready [2] 418/5 451/16         question [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       460/1         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       452/11 455/2 455/4 460/23         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       452/11 455/2 455/4 460/23         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       452/11 455/2 455/4 460/23         420/21 441/13 442/18       457/23 458/14         440/21 441/13 442/18       457/23 458/14
purpose [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22       481/17       registered [1] 450/8         purposes [1] 458/17       raised [1] 463/24       registered [1] 450/8         put [17] 416/24 429/10 440/13       rather [3] 425/17 471/13 474/25       registered [1] 450/8         442/12 442/23 443/13 444/22       rather [3] 425/17 471/13 474/25       registered [1] 450/8         442/12 442/23 443/13 444/22       rather [3] 425/17 471/13 474/25       registered [1] 450/8         445/5 446/12 446/14 448/1 448/8       re [3] 451/16 460/4       re-interpreted [1] 460/7       re-interpreted [1] 451/16         450/10 450/18 456/1 464/17       re-interpreted [1] 451/16       read [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24       read [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24         putting [2] 433/8 454/13       read [2] 418/5 451/16       read [2] 451/12 473/4         putting [2] 433/8 454/13       read [2] 418/5 451/16       read [2] 451/12 473/4         question [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       read [2] 418/5 451/16       real [1] 456/11         question [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       468/8 451/22 452/2 452/4       reason [9] 431/2 436/25 443/10         424/9 425/5 425/23 426/1 426/12       452/11 455/2 455/4 460/23       relates [1] 441/4         relates [1] 441/4       release [1] 441/4       release [1] 441/4         relates [2] 426/10 481/9       release [1] 441/4       release [1] 441/4         429/3 429/21 429/22 430
put [17]       416/24 429/10 440/13       raised [1]       463/24       registrations [4]       476/25 477/9         put [17]       416/24 429/10 440/13       rather [3]       425/17 471/13 474/25       registrations [4]       476/25 477/9         442/12 442/23 443/13 444/22       re [3]       451/16 460/4 460/7       re [3]       451/16 460/4       registrations [4]       442/25         445/5 446/12 446/14 448/1 448/8       re-interpret [1]       460/7       re-interpret [1]       460/4       re-negotiate [1]       451/16       reinterpret [1]       460/4       428/16 428/18       related [2]       451/12 473/4         putting [2]       433/8 454/13       ready [2]       418/5 451/16       ready [2]       418/5 451/16       related [2]       450/13 480/5         quantum [1]       451/11       ready [2]       418/5 451/16       relating [1]       432/14         question [49]       419/1 420/11 424/8       reason [9]       431/2 436/25 443/10       relations [5]       436/24 466/10 481/9         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       428/7       425/713 475/15       reasonably [1]       422/9         420/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       reasons [5]       435/14 435/23 435/25       relevant [10]       421/13 422/22         422/24 423/3 424/7 434/2 453/1       464/6 466/8 471/15
put [17] 416/24 429/10 440/13       raitile [5] 429/17 471/13 474/23       477/22 478/25         442/12 442/23 443/13 444/22       re [3] 451/16 460/4 460/7       re align [1] 450/7       re align [1] 460/4         450/10 450/18 456/1 464/17       re-interprete [1] 460/4       re-interprete [1] 450/4       re-interprete [1] 450/4       reinter [2] 476/21 482/2         puts [1] 452/21       re al [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24       re al [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24       460/1       ready [2] 418/5 451/16       ready [2] 418/5 451/16       ready [2] 418/5 451/16       reated [2] 450/13 480/5       related [2] 450/13 480/5       relateg [2] 450/13 480/5       relating [1] 432/14       relates [2] 450/13 480/5       relating [1] 432/14       relation [2] 444/10 451/1       relation [2] 444/10 451/1       relation [2] 444/10 451/1       relation [2] 442/10 451/1       relation [2] 444/10 451/1       relation [2] 442/10 451/1       relation [2] 444/10 451/1       relation [2] 442/10 451/1       relation [2] 444/10 451/1       relation [
442/12 442/23 443/13 444/22       re [3] 451/16 460/4 460/7         445/5 446/12 446/14 448/1 448/8       re-interpret [1] 460/7         450/10 450/18 456/1 464/17       re-interpret [1] 460/4         479/24       re-interpret [1] 451/16         puts [1] 452/21       re-adg [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24         putting [2] 433/8 454/13       ready [2] 418/5 451/16         PÉREZ [1] 413/18       ready [2] 418/5 451/16         Q       ready [2] 418/5 451/16         quantum [1] 451/11       really [7] 427/3 431/20 435/13         question [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       reason [9] 431/2 436/25 443/10         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       452/11 455/2 455/4 460/23         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       475/13 475/15         420/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25         440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       457/23 458/14
443/3 446/12 446/12 446/14 446/1 446/1 446/1 446/1 446/1 446/1 446/1 446/1 446/1       re-interpretel [1] 460/4       reiterate [2] 476/21 482/2         450/10 450/18 456/1 464/17       re-interpretel [1] 450/4       re-interpretel [1] 450/4       Rejoinder [4] 428/12 428/14         puts [1] 452/21       re-adg [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24       read [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24       428/16 428/18         putting [2] 433/8 454/13       read [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24       read [2] 451/12 473/4         putting [2] 433/8 454/13       read [2] 418/5 451/16       related [2] 450/13 480/5         quantum [1] 451/11       really [7] 427/3 431/20 435/13       relates [2] 450/13 480/5         question [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       reason [9] 431/2 436/25 443/10       reason [9] 431/2 436/25 443/10         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       425/5 425/23 426/1 426/12       475/13 475/15         420/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       reasonably [1] 422/9       relevancy [1] 433/25         440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25       relevant [10] 421/13 422/22         422/24 423/3 424/7 434/2 453/1       464/6 466/8 471/15       464/6 466/8 471/15
430/10 450/18 450/1 404/17       re-interpreted [1] 400/4       Rejoinder [4] 428/12 428/14         479/24       re-negotiate [1] 451/16       read [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24       428/16 428/18         putting [2] 433/8 454/13       ready [2] 418/5 451/16       ready [2] 418/5 451/16       related [2] 451/12 473/4         Q       ready [2] 418/5 451/16       ready [2] 418/5 451/16       relates [2] 450/13 480/5         quantum [1] 451/11       reason [9] 431/2 436/25 443/10       reason [9] 431/2 436/25 443/10       relationship [5] 436/9 436/19         424/9 425/5 425/23 426/1 426/12       452/11 455/2 455/4 460/23       reason [9] 431/2 436/25 443/10       relates [1] 441/4         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       429/3 429/21 429/22 430/11       435/21 435/2 435/3 440/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25       relevant [10] 421/13 422/22         440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       457/23 458/14       457/23 458/14       464/6 466/8 471/15
4/9/24       re-negotiate [1] 451/16       428/16 428/18         puts [1] 452/21       read [4] 442/22 444/8 459/24       460/1         pfREZ [1] 413/18       ready [2] 418/5 451/16       related [2] 451/12 473/4         Q       ready [2] 418/5 451/16       relates [2] 450/13 480/5         quantum [1] 451/11       real [1] 456/11       realiy [7] 427/3 431/20 435/13       relation [2] 444/10 451/1         question [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       46/8 451/22 452/2 452/4       reason [9] 431/2 436/25 443/10       436/24 466/10 481/9         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       425/11 455/2 455/4 460/23       452/11 455/2 455/4 460/23       release [1] 441/4         422/9/3 429/21 429/22 430/11       435/14 435/23 435/25       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25       relevancy [1] 433/25         440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25       relevant [10] 421/13 422/22         422/24 423/3 424/7 434/2 453/1       464/6 466/8 471/15
putting [2] 433/8 454/13       read [4] 442/22 444/8 439/24         putting [2] 433/8 454/13       read [4] 442/22 444/8 439/24         pitting [2] 433/8 454/13       read [2] 413/18         Q       read [2] 418/5 451/16         quantum [1] 451/11       real [1] 456/11         question [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       460/2         424/9 425/5 425/23 426/1 426/12       466/8 451/22 452/2 452/4         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       429/3 429/21 429/22 430/11         432/21 435/2 435/3 440/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25         440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25         440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25
putting [2]       433/8 454/13       460/1         PÉREZ [1]       413/18       ready [2]       418/5 451/16         Q       ready [2]       418/5 451/16       relates [2]       450/13 480/5         quantum [1]       451/11       really [7]       427/3 431/20 435/13       relation [2]       444/10 451/1         question [49]       419/1 420/11 424/8       46/8 451/22 452/2 452/4       reason [9]       431/2 436/25 443/10       436/24 466/10 481/9         426/15       427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       425/11 455/2 455/4 460/23       452/11 455/2 455/4 460/23       release [1]       441/4         420/21       429/22 430/11       435/21 429/22 430/11       435/14 435/23 435/25       relevant [10]       421/13 422/22         420/21       441/13       442/18       reasons [5]       435/14 435/23 435/25       464/6 466/8 471/15         440/21       441/13       442/14       457/23 458/14       457/23 458/14       457/23 458/14
PEREZ [1] 413/18       ready [2] 418/3 431/10         Q       real [1] 456/11       really [7] 427/3 431/20 435/13         quantum [1] 451/11       really [7] 427/3 431/20 435/13       relating [1] 432/14         question [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       reason [9] 431/2 436/25 443/10       relation [5] 436/9 436/19         424/9 425/5 425/23 426/1 426/12       reason [9] 431/2 436/25 443/10       relation [1] 441/4       relation [1] 432/24         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       452/11 455/2 455/4 460/23       reasonably [1] 422/9       relation [1] 433/25         432/21 435/2 435/3 440/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25       relevant [10] 421/13 422/22       422/24 423/3 424/7 434/2 453/14         440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       457/23 458/14       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25       relevant [10] 455/17
Q       real [1] 456/11         quantum [1] 451/11       really [7] 427/3 431/20 435/13         question [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       446/8 451/22 452/2 452/4         424/9 425/5 425/23 426/1 426/12       reason [9] 431/2 436/25 443/10         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       452/11 455/2 455/4 460/23         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       452/11 455/2 455/4 460/23         422/21 435/2 435/3 440/18       475/13 475/15         432/21 435/2 435/3 440/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25         440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25         457/23 458/14       457/23 458/14
quantum [1] 451/11       really [7] 427/3 431/20 435/13         question [49] 419/1 420/11 424/8       446/8 451/22 452/2 452/4         424/9 425/5 425/23 426/1 426/12       reason [9] 431/2 436/25 443/10         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       429/3 429/21 429/22 430/11         432/21 435/2 435/3 440/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25         440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25         440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25         457/23 458/14       reasons [1] 455/17
question [49]       419/1       420/11       424/9       425/2       436/2       436/24       466/10       481/9         424/9       425/5       425/2       326/1       426/12       436/24       466/10       481/9         426/15       425/5       425/2       326/14       426/12       436/24       466/10       481/9         426/15       427/4       427/4       427/8       428/7       452/11       455/2       455/4       460/23       436/24       466/10       481/9         426/15       427/4       427/4       427/8       428/7       475/13       475/15       reasonably [1]       422/9       relevant [10]       421/13       422/22         420/21       435/2       435/14       435/23       435/25       464/6       466/8       471/15         40/21       441/13       442/14       427/2       455/14       457/23       458/14       455/17
424/9 425/5 425/23 426/1 426/12       422/11 455/2 436/25 443/10         426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       452/11 455/2 455/4 460/23         429/3 429/21 429/22 430/11       452/11 455/2 455/4 460/23         432/21 435/2 435/3 440/18       475/13 475/15         440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25         457/23 458/14       457/23 458/14
426/15 427/4 427/4 427/8 428/7       452/11 455/2 455/4 400/23         426/15 427/4 427/8 428/7       475/13 475/15         429/3 429/21 429/22 430/11       reasonably [1] 422/9         432/21 435/2 435/3 440/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25         440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25         457/23 458/14       457/23 458/14
429/3 429/21 429/22 430/11       reasonably [1] 422/9         432/21 435/2 435/3 440/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25         440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       resons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25         457/23 458/14       457/23 458/14
432/21 435/2 435/3 440/18       reasons [5] 435/14 435/23 435/25       422/24 423/3 424/7 434/2 453/1         440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18       457/23 458/14       464/6 466/8 471/15
440/21 441/13 442/14 442/18 457/23 458/14 457/23 458/14 464/6 466/8 471/15
45//23 458/14
447/19 443/2 444/5 444/1()
reputtal 5 4///3 4///4//15
4/8/14/9/20
recall [2] 428/21 429/24
receive [3] 460/13 467/4 467/5
received [2] 410/1 410/5
recognise [1] 455/20
recommendations [1] 4/1/13
recommended [6] 4/1/24 4/3/20 reminded [2] 4/2/8 470/15
4/4/10 4/4/19 4/4/24 4/3/10
record [17] 425/16 428/24 429/21 remiss [1] 491/11
4/2/15 4/2/25 4/5/5 Pomoto [2] 412/7 414/4
4/3/4 4/6/23 4///11 4///14
480/20 481/21 renow [1] 422/7
recourse [1] 432/0
recriminations [1] 453/9
red [1] 424/0 421/10 422/20 422/14
reduce [1] 434/13
reduces [1] 434/12 429/10 442/6 442/21 449/24
reference [7] 420/14 429/12

www.dianaburden.com

	1 mai	wednesday, 25 March, 2025
R	450/14 450/16 472/2	rules [9] 444/23 445/1 445/16
renewals [1] 424/2	resolution [3] 436/21 437/1 437/2	
renewed [6] 420/13 421/2 442/22	resources [1] 462/1	464/6 466/8
443/14 460/7 461/6	respect [2] 431/20 436/7	ruling [1] 464/4
renewing' [1] 423/22	respected [2] 442/17 482/9	rulings [1] 417/25
<b>RENGIFO [1]</b> 413/17	respectfully [2] 462/14 462/24	run [1] 421/9
repeat [3] 429/10 459/19 481/20	respectively [1] 420/12	running [1] 468/21
repeated [1] 421/20	respond [3] 439/23 466/13	runs [1] 478/8
repeatedly [2] 436/2 458/6	477/18	S
repeating [2] 424/15 470/18	Respondent [32] 410/12 413/2	
replacement [2] 440/25 472/19	415/8 416/25 419/6 419/13 420/9	safe [1] 482/15
reply [18] 466/4 466/6 466/12	421/20 424/2 426/19 428/13	said [26] 422/10 423/16 424/6
466/14 467/2 467/2 467/5 467/12	431/6 431/25 432/12 433/1 433/6	442/13 451/16 453/4 453/6 453/9
467/16 467/21 467/23 468/5	434/23 434/23 435/8 435/23	457/20 457/23 458/23 460/22
468/6 468/12 468/14 468/20	435/25 437/20 439/13 439/17	460/23 465/20 469/21 473/17
468/22 469/11	439/18 459/23 466/3 466/11	474/23 476/6 477/8 477/8 477/12
replying [1] 467/1	466/11 470/12 477/3 478/4	477/12 477/13 478/4 479/9
report [8] 471/16 473/21 474/20	Respondent's [9] 417/7 428/9	479/11
475/1 475/7 475/16 479/21	428/12 432/16 433/5 436/4	sale [1] 427/25
4/3/14/3/104/9/21	436/13 437/25 462/15	sales [3] 478/20 478/22 478/23
reporters [4] 414/9 463/8 481/4	response [3] 416/14 458/12	same [16] 418/12 419/20 427/13
482/3	475/19	428/4 433/18 433/21 433/24
representation [1] 437/13	responsible [3] 436/8 436/18	439/25 443/21 460/17 460/20
representations [3] 457/9 457/10	437/7	461/4 478/10 478/15 478/17
457/16	restrictive [1] 448/8	481/20
representative [1] 412/5	result [1] 461/14	Same handed [1] 418/12
representing [1] 434/23	retained [3] 426/21 428/3 446/13	<b>SAS [2]</b> 432/23 449/25
represents [1] 433/17	retains [1] 426/24	sat [2] 454/4 456/17
reprisal [2] 453/19 454/8	returned [1] 434/18	satisfactory [1] 462/9
reprisals [1] 453/8	revisited [1] 431/15	saw [1] 423/5
reproach [1] 453/17	revoked [2] 431/18 431/24	say [48] 417/11 419/11 423/9
<b>Republic [4]</b> 410/11 431/1 437/14	RfA [1] 450/8	424/17 424/18 433/20 434/5
440/1	Ricardo [2] 423/20 444/2	436/15 437/16 438/20 441/5
reputation [1] 463/3	right [9] 424/20 435/11 450/4	441/9 443/9 443/9 444/19 445/23
request [24] 428/9 430/9 430/10	459/3 471/24 473/19 475/8 480/8	446/16 448/9 457/12 460/15
430/12 430/14 430/18 430/25	480/12	460/22 461/2 462/23 463/12
431/13 431/13 432/1 441/11	rightful [1] 460/3	466/21 466/25 467/1 467/3 467/7
451/13 451/13 452/1 441/11	rights [15] 422/20 426/21 427/16	467/20 467/22 467/25 469/6
447/14 448/12 450/7 450/18	427/20 428/1 428/3 431/3 431/5	472/14 473/7 473/7 474/15
455/18 462/14 462/25 468/18	435/24 437/17 437/21 448/3	475/10 476/10 477/13 477/20
473/23	448/6 448/22 448/23	478/2 478/5 478/17 478/17 479/5
requested [3] 428/12 432/12	risk [2] 439/4 439/4	479/6 480/19
471/19	road [3] 431/21 432/9 482/12	saying [10] 428/22 430/16 436/5
requirement [6] 425/22 425/23	role [1] 478/15	441/12 444/9 457/10 469/23
449/5 449/11 450/25 473/22	roughly [1] 439/25	475/9 476/24 478/5
requirements [7] 471/9 474/10	round [1] 464/12	says [21] 418/17 420/20 421/2
474/11 474/13 474/16 474/19	routinely [1] 422/22	422/7 423/19 424/19 424/19
474/11 474/13 474/16 474/19	rule [2] 462/5 466/22	426/20 426/23 437/3 442/22
requires [5] 449/15 450/14	ruled [1] 464/13	443/20 444/9 454/21 457/21
1 Cquiles [5] 445/15 450/14		

www.dianaburden.com

c	September [3] 427/23 441/11	situations [1] 434/14
S	450/6	situations [1] 434/14 six [1] 441/19
says [6] 460/8 472/14 472/17	Services [11] 410/8 410/8 416/7	slide [18] 436/14 436/14 437/24
472/22 472/24 473/2	426/6 426/20 427/14 428/2	440/13 443/5 448/2 448/13
scenarios [1] 419/21	428/18 428/19 428/20 455/14	460/11 471/8 472/17 472/19
schedule [1] 467/19	serving [1] 458/2	472/20 474/5 474/5 475/25 478/4
scope [1] 448/15	Serving [1] 436/2 Session [2] 415/3 416/3	479/6 479/23
screen [2] 436/15 471/17	set [8] 434/3 467/18 469/10	slides [5] 417/19 429/11 435/20
SEC [1] 427/24	472/5 472/6 475/7 475/17 475/23	471/2 473/4
second [13] 419/14 421/17 440/6	set-off [1] 434/3	slight [1] 482/8
441/17 441/22 442/19 449/12	sets [2] 430/1 475/4	small [2] 439/3 439/4
451/1 465/9 474/2 475/25 477/21	SETTLEMENT [1] 410/2	smokescreen [1] 451/5
477/22	seven [4] 440/11 441/19 467/3	so [97]
Secretariat [2] 411/9 481/13	467/24	sold [5] 427/14 476/11 478/5
secretary [3] 411/10 456/16	several [1] 450/2	478/9 478/14
482/10	shall [6] 417/22 425/20 443/9	sole [3] 448/3 448/5 448/22
Secretary-General [1] 456/16	445/14 460/7 460/22	solely [1] 450/22
section [5] 430/23 471/16 471/17	share [1] 419/20	some [9] 418/22 419/20 429/9
480/3 480/5	shares [1] 438/6	433/25 434/14 434/15 451/24
section 4.3.4 [1] 471/17	she [13] 424/5 457/12 457/15	464/5 465/4
sector [1] 443/16	472/13 472/20 473/6 476/24	somebody [1] 478/21
security [20] 410/8 410/8 416/7	477/9 477/10 477/12 477/14	somehow [4] 419/19 459/4 459/4
426/6 426/20 426/22 426/25	479/22 480/12	474/12
427/14 428/2 428/18 428/19	short [3] 439/22 463/12 463/19	someone [1] 433/19
428/20 447/3 455/14 464/15	should [10] 435/11 435/12 445/4	something [11] 421/12 422/9
465/25 466/3 466/6 467/5 470/4	448/6 449/6 451/24 455/20 459/4	422/15 443/24 465/4 466/21
Security Services [8] 416/7 426/6	461/23 480/22	467/8 468/1 469/25 472/11 479/1
426/20 427/14 428/2 428/18	shouldn't [1] 465/20	soon [1] 468/16
428/19 428/20	show [3] 438/21 445/8 474/12	SOPHIA [1] 414/12
Security Services Inc [1] 455/14	showed [1] 474/20	sorry [9] 418/9 430/14 450/15
see [26] 420/5 420/6 420/19 421/1 423/12 424/3 426/18	showing [2] 441/3 472/21	458/24 464/16 465/9 465/20
428/11 430/12 436/4 437/2	shown [2] 434/11 437/18	467/15 472/8
440/13 448/13 448/16 449/20	shows [1] 439/2	sort [2] 455/4 481/24
452/7 458/13 462/9 471/12	shred [1] 456/2	space [1] 478/2
471/17 471/18 472/22 473/11	side [8] 417/3 417/4 417/6 417/7	Spanish [1] 471/23
475/2 479/8 479/10	443/4 456/6 463/10 480/25	special [1] 481/12
seeking [3] 451/8 460/4 460/9	sided [1] 477/23	specific [13] 441/25 459/18 464/1
seeks [2] 447/24 459/23	sides [2] 416/19 482/7	464/17 466/8 469/4 471/24 472/5
seems [1] 444/18	significant [2] 462/1 465/6	472/7 473/18 473/19 475/5
seen [4] 416/18 420/1 442/23	SILVA [1] 413/10	475/16
466/19	similar [1] 452/11	specifically [4] 471/10 474/6
segment [1] 477/1	simple [2] 447/17 452/19	475/23 482/4
selected [1] 451/10	simply [2] 446/12 460/1	specified [1] 430/13
selection [1] 449/13	since [4] 446/11 453/15 453/23	specifies [1] 429/15
selling [1] 479/12	480/3	speculation [1] 450/22
Senior [1] 453/15	single [5] 456/2 457/9 457/18	speculative [1] 462/20
sense [3] 431/22 452/12 468/4	457/24 458/2	spend [1] 444/17
separate [3] 432/2 468/25 470/3	sitting [3] 436/10 453/19 454/5	spent [1] 476/13
separately [1] 417/18	situation [1] 473/10	spontaneously [1] 445/7

www.dianaburden.com

ICSID Case No ARB 20/7	Final	Wednesday, 29 March, 2023
S	supervision [1] 437/10	testifying [1] 480/3
stage [1] 464/2	support [3] 452/15 453/5 453/10	testimony [4] 437/19 452/18
stalled [1] 476/3	supposed [2] 418/1 452/14	454/19 480/11
standard [2] 423/1 423/17	sure [3] 461/12 462/3 481/22	than [6] 417/11 451/4 469/8
start [3] 430/17 476/7 477/21	suspect [2] 455/4 455/6	473/23 476/8 476/16
started [5] 436/22 446/8 476/4	SYLVIA [2] 413/17 456/14	thank [27] 417/8 418/6 429/6
479/3 479/15	Sylvia Constaín [1] 456/14	432/20 439/16 447/10 451/21
starts [1] 468/21	system [3] 452/19 462/8 462/24	461/16 461/19 463/4 463/10
state [18] 414/2 419/18 424/16		463/11 463/21 464/23 465/23
426/5 429/20 430/13 430/14	<u>T</u>	469/15 470/22 473/15 476/20
430/15 430/19 430/20 443/22	table [2] 471/18 472/22	480/19 481/3 481/7 481/12
444/6 447/15 447/18 448/12	take [11] 430/6 430/7 439/9	481/20 481/25 482/4 482/16
449/18 462/4 480/10	454/6 454/7 454/8 456/16 460/6	thanks [1] 482/2
state's [2] 442/14 463/3	463/18 465/8 467/10	that [374]
stated [3] 419/5 423/20 433/6	takes [1] 478/21	their [28] 419/16 419/23 428/14
	talk [9] 419/7 419/10 427/24	429/18 433/1 435/24 436/14
statement [7] 415/4 415/8 418/13	457/17 457/25 452/6 452/25	437/12 444/3 446/1 446/6 448/9
431/9 439/18 455/5 474/9	459/20 473/2	452/14 452/15 452/21 458/1
statements [4] 415/2 416/2 424/1	talked [5] 423/9 453/24 454/21	458/6 458/19 459/5 460/11 474/9
455/3	477/8 477/10	474/9 474/20 474/21 479/5
states [7] 426/5 429/18 442/13	talking [3] 433/11 472/12 472/23	480/22 481/7 481/13
462/19 479/24 480/14 480/14	talks [3] 427/1 431/9 479/22	them [28] 419/15 419/16 420/9
stating [1] 435/9	team [2] 463/7 465/15	420/9 423/9 433/17 433/19 435/8
status [1] 448/20	technical [2] 416/11 462/12	440/14 441/19 441/20 442/10
status quo [1] 448/20	TEDDY [2] 412/8 476/6	446/21 450/12 451/6 451/25
steady [1] 476/17	Teddy Baldwin [1] 476/6	453/8 454/21 457/6 457/6 458/18
Steptoe [1] 412/7	telecommunication [1] 443/16	458/18 458/21 458/23 459/3
still [5] 418/3 438/2 454/5 461/9	tell [6] 454/18 454/21 456/20	461/15 462/10 462/11
461/9	459/9 468/15 480/4	theme [1] 458/8
story [3] 456/11 456/12 456/12	telling [2] 439/7 472/13	then [33] 416/25 420/24 421/4
straight [1] 440/7	ten [10] 421/9 421/16 422/11	423/16 426/24 439/14 439/15
structures [1] 454/1	433/22 443/13 460/16 461/7	439/24 440/1 440/5 441/2 443/14
students [1] 456/23	466/25 467/4 467/9	446/8 446/16 452/22 458/23
subject [4] 422/12 430/10 453/21	ten-year [1] 433/22	463/14 464/11 464/13 465/17
478/16	tender [22] 431/7 431/10 433/8	466/5 466/10 466/12 466/14
subjected [1] 454/9	433/15 435/6 435/7 435/10	468/5 468/5 468/20 470/5 471/20
submission [2] 429/19 432/8	435/12 450/4 450/9 451/9 458/17	471/20 471/23 473/12 474/2
submissions [1] 474/10	458/22 471/9 472/3 472/3 472/7	there [70] 416/15 417/2 417/5
submit [5] 441/14 442/9 442/16	474/12 474/12 475/4 475/6	419/1 419/5 419/20 419/22 422/4
450/5 451/18	475/22	422/6 423/25 425/13 425/22
submitted [1] 450/23	tendered [1] 431/11	425/23 426/12 432/5 432/5 432/7
submitting [1] 450/17	term [10] 420/22 420/23 421/2	433/25 434/20 435/13 438/11
subsection [2] 430/3 430/5	421/4 421/5 421/7 421/9 422/11	440/1 440/9 440/16 440/17
such [3] 439/2 456/2 469/11	423/15 423/16	440/24 440/25 441/25 442/5
suffered [1] 450/21	terminated [1] 434/15	442/7 443/7 443/8 443/21 444/14
suggest [4] 416/23 441/23 443/24	terms [10] 419/21 421/3 421/21	444/18 445/4 445/21 446/5
463/12	422/25 423/8 425/20 433/23	446/17 450/19 451/5 451/7
suggests [1] 431/25	454/25 460/21 479/21	451/18 453/1 453/8 457/15
Sumrain [1] 444/23	testify [2] 453/18 477/15	457/19 457/22 458/10 458/14
Sunday [1] 467/8		

www.dianaburden.com

т	438/10 452/17 452/18	418/16 419/25 420/10 422/24
there [20] 459/10 463/15 465/3	throughout [4] 453/15 454/4	424/10 425/1 425/8 425/14 427/4
465/6 469/4 469/6 469/12 470/3	455/12 459/10	427/10 428/5 432/12 433/10
470/5 472/18 473/10 474/17	time [31] 418/19 418/22 420/14	439/23 440/3 441/11 442/3
475/1 476/17 477/23 479/9	420/17 421/4 422/11 423/10	442/19 443/25 444/11 445/6
480/20 481/10 481/23 482/7	428/10 431/24 439/22 439/25	445/11 445/14 446/8 446/12
thereafter [1] 468/6	440/24 444/17 450/17 452/13	446/18 446/18 447/12 451/22
therefore [8] 422/8 424/20 428/4	453/16 456/15 457/11 457/13	452/9 452/15 454/24 455/19
435/10 442/3 449/19 450/18	458/1 461/1 461/25 463/5 466/2	459/18 460/11 461/12 461/20
478/6	466/20 467/21 468/19 478/24	461/23 461/24 463/4 466/12
these [42] 419/12 419/18 419/23	481/11 482/7 482/7	466/16 468/8 469/13 469/19
419/25 420/7 425/15 429/9	title [1] 426/24	470/16 471/1 472/1 480/20 481/7
430/11 432/2 434/16 435/5	today [11] 420/6 428/25 430/11	482/1 482/10
435/20 439/10 442/2 444/4	442/10 454/6 460/8 464/10	Tribunal's [3] 418/21 430/11
445/22 446/19 447/22 449/5	466/18 469/10 469/18 479/23	468/20
	told [5] 433/20 441/2 459/14	triggered [2] 449/14 449/19
449/9 454/4 454/22 455/12	459/21 476/23	true [2] 453/13 460/1
455/16 457/4 457/25 463/5	too [6] 429/2 433/6 438/4 444/17	TRUJILLO [5] 413/17 423/6 431/8
464/16 469/17 471/21 472/3	445/21 465/20	456/15 459/13
472/6 473/19 474/10 474/13	top [1] 471/18	Trujillo's [1] 424/3
474/15 474/19 474/24 478/17	tos [1] 446/5	truly [1] 461/15
478/23 478/25 479/25	total [1] 436/5	truth [1] 452/19
they [136]	<b>TPA [16]</b> 422/24 424/12 425/17	try [2] 457/1 459/3
thing [7] 421/23 433/24 443/21	425/18 432/10 432/16 442/16	trying [7] 435/5 448/24 460/5
456/24 477/21 478/9 481/20	444/21 445/13 445/15 447/19	460/6 460/6 469/1 472/16
things [11] 416/22 419/8 426/24	449/14 449/16 449/18 450/13	turn [7] 416/24 429/1 429/3
445/2 445/5 455/16 461/8 465/3	450/16	439/13 439/17 461/16 470/23
477/8 477/16 482/11	trail [1] 473/25	two [13] 417/19 435/23 435/25
think [30] 416/20 417/14 418/18	train [1] 456/22	436/1 440/2 440/5 440/23 441/2
419/4 419/22 419/22 420/7 422/8	trained [1] 456/20	441/24 444/14 449/2 452/24
424/15 425/23 428/11 432/25	transaction [1] 466/10	471/1
433/21 434/2 438/21 438/22	transcript [7] 436/4 464/11 465/1	-
443/1 444/14 444/17 445/11	465/2 477/25 479/4 479/17	typically [1] 419/13
451/23 453/19 457/22 463/14	transcripts [1] 459/9	
463/23 468/1 468/16 470/16	transfer [2] 441/5 455/13	U
470/17 480/13	transferred [2] 426/22 426/25	UK [2] 412/8 412/9
third [8] 416/5 417/9 418/17	translators [2] 463/7 482/3	ultimate [1] 469/10
427/22 441/23 444/12 451/11	transparency [1] 458/15	unanswered [1] 454/1
459/15	transparent [1] 462/11	uncertainties [1] 446/25
this [220]	TransUnion [2] 427/17 427/20	unconditional [1] 442/15
THOMAS [1] 412/8	travels [1] 482/16	under [16] 422/16 422/24 424/12
those [16] 419/8 419/14 423/2	treat [2] 422/17 424/9	426/25 430/23 431/17 431/18
436/2 451/24 454/12 455/2	treated [1] 422/25	432/9 434/8 437/9 438/11 446/9
457/14 458/3 458/4 458/21	treatment [3] 422/21 423/1 423/2	449/7 450/20 476/13 476/18
458/22 477/5 477/7 482/2 482/14	treaty [4] 432/4 432/8 458/20	underlined [1] 421/1
though [1] 435/7	459/1	understand [3] 466/22 472/16
three [12] 417/11 429/2 436/1	trial [1] 452/12	475/8
439/21 440/4 446/5 456/7 456/8	tribunal [60] 410/14 411/2 411/10	understood [4] 467/14 467/15
456/19 457/3 459/13 462/2	415/3 416/3 416/14 417/9 417/16	
through [6] 416/19 429/8 435/20		

www.dianaburden.com

Security Services LLC v Republic of Colombia Final

Wednesday, 29 March, 2023

		···· <b>;</b> ;; ····;; ···
U	448/10 452/11 455/6 458/14	424/22 428/23 431/7 431/21
undoubtedly [1] 440/18	458/19 460/23 462/9 463/11	433/2 433/11 434/25 435/5
unfairly [1] 463/2	463/20 463/24 466/20 469/3	435/24 436/3 437/22 441/2
unilaterally [1] 446/2	469/4 469/20 469/23 469/24	445/11 446/5 448/23 451/6
unit [2] 426/1 426/18	470/2 470/11 476/24 480/17	451/16 451/22 452/8 453/2 453/7
United [3] 426/5 429/18 442/13	481/20 481/25 482/5 482/16	453/13 454/15 456/17 456/18
United States [3] 426/5 429/18	Vice [1] 453/15	457/11 457/17 457/25 462/12
442/13	Vice-President [1] 453/15	466/1 473/20 474/11 474/16
university [1] 456/22	view [5] 419/17 419/24 440/16	474/19 474/24 474/25 475/23
unless [2] 428/22 469/5	458/7 469/5	478/10 478/17 479/13
unlike [1] 428/2	viewed [2] 439/1 439/2	weren't [2] 456/16 477/16
until [7] 430/21 447/14 448/15	violation [2] 432/16 434/16	what [84]
448/18 450/20 469/12 476/7	violations [1] 457/8	what's [2] 446/7 480/14
untimely [1] 428/11	vis [2] 446/19 446/19	whatsoever [1] 453/10
unwind [1] 449/1	vis-à-vis [1] 446/19	when [29] 423/7 424/16 428/16
unwinding [1] 449/1 unwinding [1] 431/10	\A/	431/23 434/1 434/4 434/14
up [10] 420/21 425/10 428/17	W	445/25 446/3 446/8 446/16 450/5
429/11 442/23 454/25 460/24	wait [2] 467/19 469/12	450/7 452/13 456/23 462/20
473/8 479/15 479/24	waived [2] 435/10 449/7	462/22 464/20 466/22 467/5
<b>UPA [2]</b> 426/11 441/5	waiver [2] 449/4 449/11	469/11 476/4 478/4 478/14 479/4
update [1] 428/24	want [9] 429/10 430/15 454/9	479/6 479/7 479/14 479/18
uphold [1] 419/25	464/4 466/22 466/23 467/1	whenever [1] 467/3
upwards [1] 438/23	467/25 480/25	where [14] 423/18 428/25 434/14
us [22] 414/2 416/19 426/7 426/8	wanted [5] 460/19 460/20 463/16	434/22 436/4 448/9 455/25
440/23 445/3 448/9 450/19 454/5	470/12 471/1	460/11 464/9 467/25 473/10
455/21 459/2 462/21 467/1	wants [1] 416/16	477/4 481/22 481/23
467/25 468/8 468/11 468/15	was [94]	whereas [1] 431/12
469/11 472/14 477/4 481/24	wasn't [1] 437/1	wherever [1] 482/15
482/6	watch [2] 439/6 439/8	whether [15] 425/13 425/14
USD [4] 438/14 438/19 438/24	watching [1] 439/8	426/13 433/1 435/3 445/9 457/14
438/24	way [10] 420/8 422/17 424/20	457/15 457/25 458/6 458/10
use [3] 431/22 462/17 463/1	425/3 461/2 474/18 478/22	460/14 479/13 480/8 480/12
used [1] 433/20	479/15 480/12 481/14	which [56] 416/19 417/15 418/21
	we [240]	420/17 421/9 423/3 424/12 426/4
V	Wednesday [3] 410/20 416/1	426/5 426/19 428/3 428/3 429/25
VALDENEBRO [1] 413/9	467/11	430/10 430/25 431/19 432/7
<b>VALDIVIESO [1]</b> 413/6	week [1] 467/2	432/21 436/6 438/10 439/4 440/6
validity [1] 421/7	weekend [4] 465/16 465/18	440/8 440/12 441/4 441/5 441/11
value [4] 438/17 438/18 462/7	465/19 467/10	441/25 443/12 443/12 443/14
475/16	weeks [1] 447/1	443/20 444/2 444/4 444/12
values [5] 471/24 472/5 473/18	welcome [2] 417/9 480/21	444/25 446/15 447/3 447/12
473/20 475/6	well [25] 426/7 435/9 436/13	447/19 450/13 454/10 459/16
various [1] 463/23	437/9 447/22 451/1 451/23 453/2	460/3 467/11 471/8 471/16 472/1
<b>VEGA [1]</b> 413/10	453/13 454/18 454/23 455/1	472/6 474/11 474/11 474/18
VERONICA [1] 411/10	460/12 460/15 460/19 463/20	476/14 477/5 479/24 482/6
versus [1] 433/22	463/24 468/23 470/11 474/15	while [1] 476/2
very [35] 426/8 439/16 440/21	474/23 479/7 480/19 481/5 482/5	whilst [1] 465/3
445/13 445/20 445/24 446/18	went [3] 429/8 437/20 452/3	who [10] 425/6 436/10 441/6
446/22 447/16 447/21 448/1	were [43] 417/25 422/20 424/18	454/4 454/12 456/10 456/11

www.dianaburden.com

W	466/7 466/25 467/20 467/22
who [3] 478/11 478/15 482/14	469/11 476/8 476/10 481/4 481/6
whole [6] 438/6 438/9 451/16	481/11 481/14 482/3 482/8
456/11 472/9 473/5	wouldn't [3] 419/24 421/25 439/3
whom [1] 463/8	written [1] 424/17
why [13] 435/24 435/25 436/25	wrong [2] 472/19 480/8
441/24 453/12 453/13 458/14	wrongful [3] 433/1 434/19 434/24
461/9 462/13 468/15 473/21	wrongfully [2] 434/15 434/16
478/10 478/12	Υ
will [86]	year [9] 433/22 433/23 434/1
win [2] 438/21 438/23	434/6 434/8 434/12 438/18 476/3
wish [4] 416/22 466/14 481/16	476/13
482/15	years [9] 420/22 421/9 421/16
wishes [2] 417/3 472/2	422/12 438/18 443/13 460/16
withdraw [2] 445/22 446/1	460/16 461/7
within [7] 430/24 447/18 449/6	yes [15] 418/6 418/11 433/25
464/9 466/25 467/2 467/24	434/10 440/15 464/20 465/13
without [4] 453/5 461/2 463/8	465/22 467/17 470/1 470/14
480/11	471/6 474/8 475/21 475/24
witness [8] 431/9 452/18 453/20	yesterday [10] 417/15 419/5
454/19 455/10 456/6 456/7	423/6 424/4 443/3 443/3 464/12
458/13	464/25 465/25 470/17
witnesses [15] 413/16 423/5	yet [3] 450/10 455/23 456/1
452/25 453/2 453/6 453/13	you [217]
457/25 458/6 458/11 458/13	you'll [1] 458/13
459/7 459/9 459/14 462/3 478/11	your [13] 434/4 439/5 443/1
won [2] 435/11 450/3	456/25 460/12 463/5 463/5
won't [5] 440/22 442/22 444/17	465/15 468/24 469/5 470/4 471/4
459/7 465/6	475/19
word [3] 461/16 468/2 470/23	Yves [2] 410/16 411/7
words [1] 468/7	
work [6] 438/16 465/2 465/18	<u>Z</u>
478/22 481/5 481/13	ZAMBRANO [1] 413/10
worked [2] 456/21 467/24	<b>ZAMORA [1]</b> 413/8
working [1] 468/23	zero [1] 434/25
works [3] 452/20 478/12 478/14	à
worried [1] 453/7	·
worse [1] 435/7	à propos [1] 452/2
worth [2] 462/10 470/18	Á
would [55] 419/7 419/13 420/10	ÁVILA [1] 413/8
422/2 422/5 422/22 424/25 426/10 426/15 431/6 431/11	• •
431/22 432/8 434/8 435/8 435/13	
438/21 438/23 438/23 440/10 441/9 441/12 441/14 441/23	
441/9 441/12 441/14 441/23	
442/8 442/9 443/1 443/23 444/18 448/25 453/8 453/24 458/21	
448/25 453/8 453/24 458/21 458/25 459/1 459/24 461/24	
458/25 459/1 459/24 461/24 463/6 463/8 464/3 465/2 466/2	
403/0 403/0 404/3 403/2 400/Z	

www.dianaburden.com