

## ANNEX 1

### TRIBUNAL'S DECISIONS ON CLAIMANTS' REQUESTS

No.	Request	Decision
1.	<p>Claimants request Pemex's administrative file for the 803 Contract. In particular, Claimants seek documents related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A. Pemex's decision to enter into the 803 Contract with MWS and Bisell.</li><li>B. Pemex's decisions to suspend performance under the 803 Contract.</li><li>C. Pemex's decisions to extend the term of the 803 Contract.</li><li>D. Pemex's claims that it did not have the budget to continue requesting work under the 803 Contract.</li><li>E. The finiquito process for the 803 Contract.</li></ul> <p>This Request includes communications exchanged internally at Pemex and between Pemex and any third parties.</p> <p>The time period for this Request ranges from approximately January 2012 (when the parties entered into the 803 Contract) to February 2015 (when the finiquito for the 803 Contract was finalized).</p>	<p>Contracts 803, 804 and 821 were, under Mexican law, "administrative contracts" and hence subject <i>inter alia</i> to the Ley Federal de Procedimiento Administrativo<sup>1</sup>. Thus, an "administrative file" ("<i>expediente administrativo</i>") should have been kept containing all the relevant decisions ("<i>actos administrativos</i>"), reports and documents relating to the life of the contracts. Besides, in response to other requests (e.g. Request # 11) Respondent has indicated that it keeps electronic files in a "Pemex Contracts Residence".</p> <p>At the same time, the Tribunal recognizes that the contracts may have generated a myriad of other communications and exchanges among Pemex 's officials (e. g. informal emails) which were not necessarily included in the contract's "<i>expediente administrativo</i>" and whose comprehensive search now may be, as argued by Respondent, excessively onerous.</p> <p>Thus, the Tribunal orders Respondent to provide to Claimants any documents contained in the "administrative file" ("<i>expediente administrativo</i>") for Contract 803 which are responsive to the categories identified in this request (i.e. letters A through E).</p>
2.	<p>Claimants request Pemex's administrative file for the 804 Contract. In particular, Claimants seek documents related to:</p>	<p>For the same reasons as in Request # 1, the Tribunal orders Respondent to provide to Claimants any</p>

<sup>11</sup> Available at <https://www.gob.mx/indesol/documentos/ley-federal-de-procedimiento-administrativo-dof-09-04-2012>

	<p>A. Pemex’s decision to enter into the 804 Contract with MWS and Bisell.</p> <p>B. Pemex’s decision(s) to issue two work orders under the 804 Contract in July 2013.</p> <p>C. Pemex’s decision(s) to cancel those work orders around September 2013.</p> <p>D. Pemex’s decisions to extend the term of the 804 Contract.</p> <p>E. Pemex’s claims that it did not have the budget to continue requesting work under the 804 Contract.</p> <p>F. Pemex’s contractual obligations under the 804 Contract to (1) conduct activities with the Contractor in good faith and equity, and (2) consult with the Contractor and directly exchange views before issuing any final decision (see 804 Contract Article 3).</p> <p>G. The finiquito process for the 804 Contract.</p> <p>This Request includes communications exchanged internally at Pemex and between Pemex and any third parties.</p> <p>The time period for this Request ranges from approximately early 2013 (when the parties entered into the 804 Contract) to April 2015 (when the finiquito for the 804 Contract was finalized).</p>	<p>documents contained in the “administrative file” (“expediente administrativo”) for Contract 804 which are responsive to the categories identified in this request (i.e. letters A through G).</p>
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p>Claimants request Pemex’s administrative file for the 821 Contract. In particular, Claimants seek documents related to:</p> <p>A. Pemex’s decision to enter into the 821 Contract with Finley and Drake-Mesa.</p> <p>B. Pemex’s decisions to suspend performance under the 821 Contract.</p>	<p>For the same reasons as in Request # 1, the Tribunal orders Respondent to provide to Claimants any documents contained in the “administrative file” (“expediente administrativo”) for Contract 821 which are responsive to the categories identified in this request (i.e. letters A through H).</p>

	<p>C. Pemex’s decision to rescind the 821 Contract.</p> <p>D. Pemex’s claims that it did not have the budget to continue requesting work under the 821 Contract.</p> <p>E. Pemex’s demand for a 5% discount on all work performed under the 821 Contract.</p> <p>F. Pemex’s demand to extend the deadline for payment on its invoices from 20 days to six months.</p> <p>G. Pemex’s demand that Finley and Drake-Mesa transport their equipment off site between work orders.</p> <p>H. Pemex’s contractual obligations under the 821 Contract to (1) conduct activities with the Contractor in good faith and equity, and (2) consult with the Contractor and directly exchange views before issuing any final decision. Pemex’s statement that the 821 Contract does not require it to issue work orders (see 821 Contract Article 3).</p> <p>This Request includes communications exchanged internally at Pemex and between Pemex and any third parties.</p> <p>The time period for this Request ranges from approximately early 2014 (when the parties entered into the 821 Contract) to the present (Pemex is still trying to call on the US\$ 41.8 million performance bond).</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>After Finley and Drake-Mesa initiated a lawsuit against Pemex under the 821 Contract in April 2016, Pemex told Finley and Drake-Mesa that it would not pay them anything further so long as the lawsuit remained pending.</p> <p>Claimants request documents reflecting Pemex’s internal response to Finley and Drake-Mesa’s lawsuit under the 821 Contract initiated in April 2016.</p>	<p>The Tribunal rejects this request for its lack of specificity and, with respect to documents pertaining to Work Order 028-2016, its overlap with Request # 9.</p>

	<p>The time period for this Request ranges from approximately April 2016 to May 2016.</p>	
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p>The 803 Contract, 804 Contract, and 821 Contract each state that Pemex “has allocated the resources to carry out the Works under this Contract.”</p> <p>Claimants request documents reflecting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Pemex’s original budget for the 803 Contract.</li> <li>B. Pemex’s original budget for the 804 Contract.</li> <li>C. Pemex’s original budget for the 821 Contract.</li> </ul> <p>This Request includes communications exchanged (1) internally at Pemex about its budget under each of the three contracts, (2) between Pemex and other bodies of the Mexican government about its original budget under each of the three contracts.</p> <p>The time period for this Request ranges from approximately late 2011 (when MWS and Bisell bid to enter into the 803 Contract) to early 2014 (when Finley and Drake-Mesa entered into the 821 Contract).</p>	<p>Respondent is ordered to produce all the documents under its possession, custody, or control that are responsive to this request.</p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p>Pemex officials have admitted that, beginning in 2013, Pemex diverted funds that it had budgeted for Chicontepec to other areas. Similarly, following the oil price crash of 2014, Pemex officials indicated their intention to divert funds away from Chicontepec to areas with lower production costs. Given that Claimants’ three contracts were to develop Chicontepec, Pemex’s decision to divert its budget away from Chicontepec had serious consequences on Claimants. Based on the information available to Claimants, Claimants believe that they fell victim to Mexico’s decision to shift its focus and resources from Chicontepec.</p> <p>Indeed, in various communications with Claimants under each of the three</p>	<p>Respondent is ordered to produce all the documents under its possession, custody, or control that are responsive to this request.</p>

contracts, Pemex claimed that it did not have the budget to perform as agreed. As such, Claimants request:

- A. The financial ledgers showing the funds that Pemex received in advance so it could execute Contract 803;
- B. The financial ledgers showing the funds that Pemex received in advance so it could execute Contract 804;
- C. The financial ledgers showing the funds that Pemex received in advance so it could execute Contract 821;
- D. The financial ledgers showing the outflows from the budgeted amount for Contract 803;
- E. The financial ledgers showing the outflows from the budgeted amount for Contract 804;
- F. The financial ledgers showing the outflows from the budgeted amount for Contract 821;

Claimants also request documents related to:

- G. Changes to Pemex's original budget for the 803 Contract and the reason(s) for such changes.
- H. Changes to Pemex's original budget for the 804 Contract and the reason(s) for such changes.
- I. Changes to Pemex's original budget for the 821 Contract and the reason(s) for such variations.

This Request includes communications exchanged (1) internally at Pemex about modifying its original budget under each of the three contracts, (2) between Pemex

	<p>and other bodies of the Mexican government about modifying its original budget under each of the three contracts, including to the Pemex board of directors, its directors and officers, and senior managers, and (3) related to any decision by Pemex to shift the budget allocated for any of Claimants' three contracts to any other contracts or projects.</p> <p>The time periods for this are:</p> <p>Request A-F: when Pemex received the funds to execute the 803 Contract, the 804 Contract, and the 821 Contract through the term of each contract; and</p> <p>Request G-I: from approximately September 2013 (when Pemex first indicated it was having budget issues under the 804 Contract) to approximately January 2016 (when Pemex stopped issuing work orders under the 821 Contract).</p>	
7.	<p>Pemex went extended periods without requesting work under both the 803 Contract and the 821 Contract. For the 804 Contract, Pemex issued two work orders; however, it cancelled them before MWS and Bisell performed the work.</p> <p>Claimants request Pemex's internal communications explaining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Pemex's decision to cancel the two July 2013 work orders issued under the 804 Contract (around September 2013).</li> <li>B. Pemex's decision to stop issuing work orders under the 803 Contract (beginning in October 2013).</li> <li>C. Pemex's decision to stop issuing work orders under the 821 Contract (e.g., in November 2014, August 2015, and January 2016).</li> </ul> <p>The time period for this Request ranges from approximately September 2013 (when Pemex cancelled the first two work orders issued under the 804 Contract) to approximately January 2016 (when Pemex stopped issuing work orders under the 821 Contract).</p>	<p>The Tribunal rejects Requests # 7.A and 7.B because of their lack of specificity and enough relevance to the case, particularly bearing in mind that the claims related to contracts 803 and 804 are based on denial of justice.</p> <p>The Tribunal orders Respondent to produce any non-privileged documents under its possession, custody, or control related to request 7.C, which the Tribunal considers potentially relevant, particularly given the minimum amount of the budget to be executed (i.e. US \$ 168.9 million) envisaged in clause 5 of the 821 Contract.</p>

<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p>Pemex twice extended the terms of both the 803 Contract and the 804 Contract.</p> <p>Claimants request Pemex’s internal communications explaining:</p> <p>A. Pemex’s decision to extend the term of the 804 Contract from September 30, 2013 to December 31, 2013.</p> <p>B. Pemex’s decision to extend the term of the 804 Contract from December 31, 2013 to March 31, 2014.</p> <p>C. Pemex’s decision to extend the term of the 803 Contract from December 31, 2013 to March 31, 2014.</p> <p>D. Pemex’s decision to extend the term of the 803 Contract from December 31, 2013 to June 30, 2014.</p> <p>The time period for this Request ranges from approximately August 2013 (around the time Pemex first began deliberating about extending the 804 Contract) to approximately June 2014 (when the term of the 803 Contract concluded).</p>	<p>The Tribunal rejects this request, insofar as its substance is presumably covered by the Tribunal’s decision on Requests # 1 and 2.</p>
<p><b>9.</b></p>	<p>Claimants request documents related to the work order issued in November 2016 under the 821 Contract (Work Order 028-2016 to drill the well called “Coapechaca 1240”).</p> <p>This Request includes documents reflecting:</p> <p>A. Internal and external studies leading to the decision to issue the work order.</p> <p>B. Meeting notes leading to the issuance of the work order.</p> <p>C. The budget (funds) to request this work.</p> <p>D. The “Movimiento de Equipos de Perforación” for 2015 and 2016 that show the</p>	<p>Respondent is ordered to produce all the non-privileged documents under its possession, custody, or control responsive to this request.</p>

	<p>scheduling of the equipment assigned to drill the “Coapechaca 1240” well.</p> <p>E. The rescheduling of the “Coapechaca 1240” well from Weatherford to Finley and Drake-Mesa before Pemex issued the November 2016 work order.</p> <p>F. The ownership of the equipment “EQ02” and “PEMEX 404” identified in the draft “Movimineto de Equipos de Perforacion 2016” attached to Work Order 028-2016.</p> <p>G. Communications with any third party, including Weatherford, about the “Coapechaca 1240” well.</p> <p>H. All permits Pemex obtained to drill the “Coapechaca 1240” well, including all permits from the CNH.</p> <p>I. Internal communications about Claimants’ workers being laid off, including the “Superintendent of Construction,” before Pemex issued this work order.</p> <p>J. Internal communications about rescinding the contract.</p> <p>K. Internal communications about calling on the US\$ 41.8 million performance bond.</p> <p>L. Whether the requested work was ever performed (either by Pemex or by another contractor).</p> <p>The time period for this Request ranges from approximately April 2016 (when Finley and Prize sued Pemex under the 821 Contract and Pemex said that it would not be paying them anything further so long as the lawsuit remained pending) to approximately November 2016 (when Pemex issued the work order).</p>	
<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p>On June 5, 2017, Pemex applied to the CNH for authorization to drill the “Coapechaca-1040” well. This document is labelled PEP-DG-SAPEP-GCR-432-2017. As a result, the CNH authorized Pemex to drill “Coapechaca-1040DES,”</p>	<p>Respondent is ordered to provide the documents requested, if not already provided in response to Request</p>



	<p>which includes the “Coapechaca 1240” well. As explained above, drilling the “Coapechaca 1240” well was the one that Pemex supposedly wanted Claimants to drill under Work Order 028-2016.</p> <p>Claimants request the following documents, which are Pemex’s application to, and correspondence with, the CNH for the permit to drill the “Coapechaca 1240” well:</p> <p>A. PEP-DG-SAPEP-GCR-432-2017.</p> <p>B. The CNH’s response dated June 15, 2017 with the label 240.0323/2017.</p> <p>C. Pemex’s reply dated June 22, 2017 with the label PEP-DG-SAPEP-GCR-2017.</p>	<p># 9.</p>
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p>Claimants request documents related to Pemex’s decision to rescind the 821 Contract and call on Finley and Drake-Mesa’s US\$ 41.8 million performance bond.</p> <p>This Request includes documents and communications related to:</p> <p>A. Pemex’s decision to issue the July 31, 2017 notice of rescission, including all internal analysis regarding the rescission.</p> <p>B. Pemex’s decision to issue the draft finiquitos (in July and August of 2017 and later in November and December of 2021).</p> <p>C. Drafts of the finiquitos Pemex sent to Finley and Drake-Mesa.</p> <p>D. Pemex’s internal communications about the drafts of the finiquitos sent to Finley and Drake-Mesa.</p> <p>E. Pemex’s decision to call on the US\$ 41.8 million performance bond (first in September 2017 and again in December 2021).</p> <p>F. Pemex’s efforts to deliver the draft finiquitos to Claimants, including all instructions and reports.</p> <p>G. Internal communications related to Pemex’s efforts to call on the US\$ 41.8</p>	<p>The Tribunal takes note that Respondent has stated that extensive searches were carried in the physical and electronic files of the Pemex Contract Residence, but no documents related to numerals C and D were found. The Tribunal further notes that the request under numerals B and G are covered and have already been accepted by the Tribunal under its affirmative decisions on Requests # 3 and 9, respectively.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, as a supplement to those decisions, the Tribunal orders Respondent to produce all the non-privileged documents under its possession, custody, or control responsive to numerals A and E of this Request, which the Tribunal regards as specific enough and potentially relevant and material.</p>

	<p>million performance bond.</p> <p>The time period for this Request ranges from approximately April 2016 (when Finley and Prize sued Pemex under the 821 Contract and Pemex said that it would not be paying them anything further so long as the lawsuit remained pending) to approximately the present (Pemex has continued trying to call on the US\$ 41.8 million performance bond).</p>	
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p>Claimants request <i>ex parte</i> communications between Pemex and Mexico’s court system (including both civil and administrative courts) regarding the following cases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. MWS and Bisell’s lawsuit commenced on October 13, 2015 in the District Court in Veracruz related to Pemex’s breaches of the 803 Contract.</li> <li>B. MWS and Bisell’s lawsuit commenced on December 8, 2015 in the District Court in Veracruz related to Pemex’s breaches of the 804 Contract.</li> <li>C. MWS and Bisell’s administrative claim in the Federal Court of Administrative Justice commenced on March 5, 2019 related to Pemex’s breaches of the 804 Contract.</li> <li>D. Finley and Drake-Mesa’s lawsuit commenced on April 29, 2016 in the District Court in Mexico City related to Pemex’s breaches of the 821 Contract.</li> <li>E. Finley and Drake-Mesa’s administrative claim before the Federal Court of Administrative Justice commenced on September 4, 2017 related to Pemex’s rescission of the 821 Contract.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to external communications between Pemex and the courts in the above-mentioned cases, this Request also includes internal communications exchanged within Pemex (1) about initiating communications with the courts in the</p>	<p>The Tribunal takes note that Respondent has stated that “exhaustive searches were carried out in the physical and electronic files of the Legal Department of Pemex, but no document related to this request was located”.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>

	<p>above-mentioned cases, and (2) reflecting the substance of any communications with the courts in the above-mentioned cases.</p> <p>This Request does not include court filings that are publicly available on the courts' dockets.</p> <p>The time period for this Request ranges from approximately April 2016 (when Finley and Prize sued Pemex under the 821) to approximately March 2021 (when Claimants' instructed their attorneys in Mexico to dismiss the lawsuits).</p>	
<p><b>13.</b></p>	<p>Luis Kernion has testified that he received a phone call from a former Pemex attorney named Rob Keoseyan. Mr. Keoseyan told him that Finley and Prize's lawsuit against Pemex under the 821 Contract was one of Pemex's top three legal priorities. According to Mr. Keoseyan, this was because of the high value of the 821 Contract (US\$ 418 million). Mr. Keoseyan further stated that Pemex had appointed a special representative to help "end" the lawsuit so that Pemex could proceed with calling on the US\$ 41.8 million bond. Finally, Mr. Keoseyan stated that Pemex's representative appointed to "end" Finley and Drake-Mesa's challenge to the administrative rescission had met with the judge and the judge told Pemex's representative that he was going to decide in Pemex's favor.</p> <p>Claimants request the following:</p> <p>A. Pemex's internal communications about appointing a special representative to oversee the administrative action related to Pemex's rescission of the 821 Contract.</p> <p>B. Presentations and minutes of Pemex's board of directors or PEP's executive management meeting reflecting Pemex's rescission of the 821 Contract, Claimants' litigation in response, and Pemex's subsequent decision to pursue Claimants' US\$ 41.8 performance bond.</p> <p>C. Pemex's external communications with any third party (including Rob Keoseyan) about (1) appointing a special representative to oversee the administrative action related to Pemex's rescission of the 821 Contract, and (2) Claimants' lawsuit against Pemex regarding Pemex's rescission of the 821</p>	<p>The Tribunal takes notes that Respondent has stated that "exhaustive searches were carried out in the physical and electronic files of the Legal Department of Pemex, but no document related to this request was located". It further notes that the request on numeral B of this request is already covered by the Tribunal's decision on Request # 11 A.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required. The Tribunal reserves, nonetheless, the right to revisit this decision in light of the outcome of Claimants' additional request of 27 January 2023.</p>

	<p>Contract.</p> <p>D. Pemex’s internal communications regarding <i>ex parte</i> communications with the court in the administrative action related to Pemex’s rescission of the 821 Contract.</p> <p>E. Pemex’s external communications with any third party (including Rob Keoseyan) regarding <i>ex parte</i> communications with the court in the administrative action related to Pemex’s rescission of the 821 Contract.</p> <p>F. Pemex’s communications with Rob Keoseyan regarding (1) the 821 Contract, and (2) Claimants’ lawsuit against Pemex regarding Pemex’s rescission of the 821 Contract.</p> <p>The time period for this Request is approximately September 2017 (when Finley and Prize initiated the lawsuit) to October 2018 (when the court upheld the rescission of the 821 Contract).</p>	
<p><b>14.</b></p>	<p>Internal communications within Pemex regarding appointing a representative to communicate with the court (or coordinate the communication with the court) regarding Finley and Drake-Mesa’s administrative claim before the Federal Court of Administrative Justice commenced on September 4, 2017 related to Pemex’s rescission of the 821 Contract.</p> <p>The time period for this Request ranges from approximately September 2017 (when Finley and Prize sued Pemex in administrative court under the 821 Contract) to approximately October 2018 (when the administrative court upheld Pemex’s rescission).</p>	<p>The Tribunal takes notes that Respondent has stated that “exhaustive searches were carried out in the physical and electronic files of the Legal Department of Pemex, but no documents related to this request was located”.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>
<p><b>15.</b></p>	<p>Pemex entered into Contract No. 424043809 with two Mexican oilfield services companies: Integradora de Perforaciones y Servicios, S.A. de C.V. and Zapata Internacional, S.A. de C.V.</p> <p>Based on public information, it appears that the 809 Contract is very similar to Claimants’ contracts with Pemex. It is dated March 1, 2013, which is just 20 days</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes Respondent’s argument that the documents requested may contain sensitive information of companies which are not party to this arbitration. The Tribunal further notes that the “<i>acta circunstanciada</i>” concerning contract 809 supplied by Claimants as document C-0062 refers to an agreement between Pemex</p>

before Claimants signed the 804 Contract. Pemex was supposed to request US\$ 24 million of work from Integradora and Zapata for them to perform oilfield services in Chicontepec. Like with Claimants' contracts, Pemex fell short of its obligation and requested only approximately US\$ 9 million in work. However, Pemex apparently compromised with these companies and paid them (C-0062, Acta Circunstanciada (April 9, 2018)).

Claimants request the following documents:

- A. Contract No. 424043809.
- B. Pemex's administrative file for Contract No. 424043809.
- C. Pemex's internal communications related to its decision to compromise with Integradora de Perforaciones y Servicios, S.A. de C.V. and Zapata Internacional, S.A. de C.V. and pay them.
- D. Pemex's external communications with Integradora de Perforaciones y Servicios, S.A. de C.V. and Zapata Internacional, S.A. de C.V. related to its compromise with these companies.

The time period for this Request ranges from approximately March 2013 (when Pemex entered into the 809 Contract) to approximately April 2018 (when Pemex entered into the "Acta Circunstanciada" memorializing the compromise with these companies).

In addition, the Acta de Circunstancia references communications regarding a pricing determination of US\$42,167/day for when Pemex did not issue work orders under the Contract No. 424043809.

Claimants request the following documents related to this pricing determination from Pemex:

- E. PEP-DG-SSE-GSIAP-CSIAPZN-168-2018 dated March 22, 2018;
- F. DCAP-DOPA-CDRPC-GIC-SPR-421-2018 dated April 3, 2018; and

and the contractors following a case of "*fuera mayor*" (*force majeure*) i.e. flooding caused by a tropical depression, but considers that this, by itself, does not render *a priori* irrelevant for this arbitration the information potentially contained in the documents requested.

Bearing that in mind, the Tribunal orders Respondent to produce any documents under its possession, custody, or control which are responsive to the request. However, as foreseen in article 9.5 of the IBA Rules, the Tribunal authorizes Respondent to produce the documents in redacted form, to the extent strictly necessary to preserve the commercial interests of the two Mexican companies involved, while at the same time allowing Claimants to compare relevant aspects of the processes applied by Pemex to Contracts 809 and 821.

	G. DCAS-DOPA-CDRPC-GIC-SPR-422-2018 dated April 3, 2018.	
16.	<p>Claimants request documents and communications related to and reflecting any compromises by Pemex with oilfield services companies owned by Mexican nationals that were performing work in Chictontepec between 2012 and 2021 (other than Integradora de Perforaciones y Servicios, S.A. de C.V. and Zapata Internacional, S.A. de C.V.).</p> <p>In particular, if Pemex entered into any such compromises with oilfield services companies owned by Mexican nationals, Claimants request:</p> <p>A. Pemex’s underlying contracts with those companies.</p> <p>B. Pemex’s administrative file for those contracts.</p> <p>C. Pemex’s internal communications related to the compromise.</p> <p>D. Pemex’s external communications with the companies with which Pemex compromised.</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes Respondent’s statement that the request may be too burdensome. It further notes that Claimants base their claim concerning Contract 821, <i>inter alia</i>, in a breach of the standard of National Treatment under NAFTA Article 1102 and USMCA Article 14.4.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, the Tribunal orders Respondent to produce any documents under its possession, custody, or control which are responsive to the request. However, as foreseen in article 9.5 of the IBA Rules, the Tribunal authorizes Respondent to produce the documents in redacted form, to the extent strictly necessary to preserve the commercial interests of the Mexican companies involved.</p>
17.	<p>Pemex officials made at least two visits to Finley and MWS’s offices in Fort Worth to promote investing in Mexico.</p> <p>Claimants request Pemex’s internal communications about these meetings. This Request includes communications about (1) the meeting that took place on or around February 14, 2012 and (2) the meeting that took place on or around October 27, 2012.</p> <p>The time period for this Request ranges from approximately early 2012 (when MWS and Bisell entered into the 803 Contract) to approximately early 2014 (when Finley and Drake-Mesa entered into the 821 Contract).</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Respondent has stated that after an exhaustive search “no information or documentation was located”.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>
18.	<p>Pemex officials had numerous communications with Claimants about their initial investments in Mexico to perform under the 803 Contract and, later, expanding their investments in Mexico to perform work under the 804 and 821 Contracts.</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Respondent has stated that after an exhaustive search, “no information or documentation was located”.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by</p>

<p>Claimants request Pemex's internal communications related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A. Claimants' initial investments in Mexico to perform under the 803 Contract.</li><li>B. Claimants' later investments in Mexico to perform work under the 804 and 821 Contracts.</li><li>C. Any communications with Claimants about investing in Mexico.</li><li>D. Any meetings with Claimants about investing in Mexico.</li></ul> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, this Request includes communications to and from the following Pemex officials: (a) Juan José Suárez Coppel (Pemex's CEO from 2009 to late 2012), (b) Emilio Lozoya (Pemex's CEO from 2012 to 2016), (c) Fryolan Gracia (Pemex's General Directorate Office), (d) Sergio Guaso (President of Finance and Administration at Pemex), (e) Carlos Morales Gil (Director General of PEP), (f) José López (led Pemex's efforts to workover existing wells in Chicontepec), and (g) Plácido Gerardo Reyes Reza (Pemex Chicontepec manager).</p> <p>The time period for this Request ranges from approximately early 2012 (when MWS and Bisell entered into the 803 Contract) to approximately early 2014 (when Finley and Drake-Mesa entered into the 821 Contract).</p>	<p>the Tribunal is required.</p>
---	----------------------------------

ANNEX 2

TRIBUNAL'S DECISION ON RESPONDENT'S REQUESTS

No.	Request	Tribunal
1.	<p>Copia de los documentos constitutivos o equivalentes (e.g., actas constitutivas, “shareholders’ registries”, “articles of incorporation”, contratos de sociedad, “partnership agreements”, by laws) y cualquier modificación que hayan tenido de: i) Drake-Mesa; ii) Drake-Finley; iii) Bisell; iv) Royal Shale Holdings; v) Royal Shale Corporation; vi) Drake-Mesa Big Sky; vii) MWS; viii) Prize y ix) Finley.</p> <p>Esta solicitud incluye todos los documentos en la fecha en que se constituyeron las entidades anteriormente señaladas hasta la última modificación que hayan tenido tales documentos.</p>	<p>The Tribunal takes note of Claimants’ statement that they “will disclose documents sufficient to prove that US investors brought the claims on behalf of Drake-Mesa, Drake Finley, and Bisell”. It also takes note Claimants’ statements in response to Requests # 4 and 5 that they “will disclose proof of organization for Drake Mesa Big Sky”.</p> <p>Without limiting the scope of Claimants’ commitments resulting from such statements, the Tribunal orders Claimants to disclose specifically all the relevant legal and corporate documents, whatever their nature,</p> <p>i) which are relevant to determine and prove:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Who were the shareholders and persons or legal entities in control (either direct or indirect); and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">What changes have occurred over time in such structure of shareholding or control</p> <p>ii) for the following entities mentioned in the Statement of Claim (and its exhibits):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Finley Resources; Prize Holdings; MWS; Drake Mesa; Drake Finley; Bisell; and Drake Mesa Big Sky.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Were the entities <i>Royal Shale Holdings</i> or <i>Royal Shale Corporation</i> either owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by any of the Claimants, the same information mentioned in i) above should be</p>



		<p>provided for them.</p> <p>iii) for the following period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) From the time when the purported investments or transactions being at the base of the claims in this arbitration were made; until</li> <li>b) The time when the request for arbitration was filed (i.e. 25 March, 2021)</li> </ul> <p>Thus, Claimants are ordered to disclose all the documents necessary, beyond those already provided, to determine and prove how the structure of ownership and control of all the entities owned or controlled by Claimants evolved from the time when the purported investments were made until the time when the request for arbitration was filed.</p>
<p><b>2.</b></p>	<p>Copia de los libros corporativos de Bisell, Drake-Mesa, Drake-Finley, Royal Shale Holdings, Royal Shale Corporation y Drake Mesa Big Sky, i.e., i) libros de registros de acciones, ii) libros de actas de asamblea, iii) libros de sesiones del Consejo de Administración y iv) libros de variaciones de capital, o documentos equivalentes en Estados Unidos.</p> <p>Esta solicitud incluye todos los asientos o registros disponibles desde la constitución de las empresas hasta el 2 de diciembre de 2022.</p>	<p>The request is rejected, for they lack enough relevance to the case or materiality to its outcome, except to the extent covered by the Tribunal’s decision concerning Request # 1.</p>
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p>Copia de todas las resoluciones, adoptadas de forma unánime o por mayoría, por los respectivos Consejos de Administración de Drake-Mesa, Drake-Finley, Royal Shale Corporation, Royal Shale Holdings y Bisell; asentadas o no en el libro de sesiones del Consejo de Administración de dichas empresas o su equivalente en el extranjero.</p> <p>Esta solicitud está limitada al periodo comprendido desde la constitución de las empresas al 2 de diciembre de 2022.</p>	<p>The request is rejected, for it lacks enough relevance to the case or materiality to its outcome, except to the extent covered by the Tribunal’s decision concerning Request # 1.</p> <p>The Tribunal further notes that Claimants have argued that they are not aware of any documents responsive to this Request.</p>

4.	<p>Copia de todas las resoluciones, adoptadas de forma unánime o por mayoría, de los “Boards”, General Partners”, “Board of Managers” o equivalentes en el extranjero, de Finley, Prize, MWS y Drake Mesa Big Sky.</p> <p>Esta solicitud está limitada al periodo comprendido del momento en que se incorporaron dichas empresas al 2 de diciembre de 2022.</p>	<p>The request is rejected, for it lacks enough relevance to the case or materiality to its outcome, except to the extent covered by the Tribunal’s decision concerning Request # 1.</p>
5.	<p>Copia de i) la solicitud de Drake Mesa Big Sky para registrarla como “LLC” en Estados Unidos, incluida la lista de sus dueños/socios, y ii) copia de las “U.S. tax returns” de Drake Mesa Big Sky en caso que hayan sido realizadas.</p> <p>Esta solicitud está limitada al periodo comprendido del momento en que se incorporaron dichas empresas al 2 de diciembre de 2022.</p>	<p>The request is rejected, for it lacks enough relevance to the case or materiality to its outcome, except to the extent covered by the Tribunal’s decision concerning Request # 1.</p>
6.	<p>Copia de los contratos de compraventa de acciones o partes sociales o documentos equivalentes (<i>i.e.</i>, “share purchase agreements” o “unit share purchase agreement”), relacionado con <i>i)</i> Drake-Mesa; <i>ii)</i> Drake-Finley; <i>iii)</i> Bisell; <i>iv)</i> Royal Shale Holdings, <i>v)</i> Royal Shale Corporation; y <i>vi)</i> Drake-Mesa Big Sky.</p> <p>Esta solicitud está limitada al periodo comprendido del 1 de enero de 2012 al 29 de julio de 2020 (fecha de la presentación de la NOI de las Demandantes al amparo del TLCAN).</p>	<p>The request is rejected, for it lacks enough relevance to the case or materiality to its outcome, except to the extent covered by the Tribunal’s decision concerning Request # 1.</p>
7.	<p>Copia del pasaporte mexicano y credencial de elector vigente del Sr. Luis Oseguera Kernion.</p>	<p>The Tribunal takes note of Claimants’ commitment to “produce the documents responsive to this request in its possession, custody, and control”.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>
8.	<p>Copia de la cédula fiscal emitida por el Servicio de Administración Tributaria (SAT), comprobantes de situación fiscal, o cualquier comprobante de situación fiscal emitido por autoridades tributarias mexicanas en favor del Sr. Luis Oseguera Kernion.</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Claimants have stated that they “are not in possession of a current tax ID for Luis Oseguera Kernion nor are they in the possession of a proof of fiscal situation for the relevant time period”.</p>

	<p>Esta solicitud está limitada al periodo comprendido entre el 2012 (año en el que iniciaron las operaciones de Bisell) y el 25 de marzo de 2021, fecha en la que se presentó la Solicitud de Arbitraje de las Demandantes.</p>	<p>The Tribunal further observes that the documents requested lack enough relevance to the case or materiality to its outcome.</p>
<p><b>9.</b></p>	<p>Documentos y Comunicaciones elaborados por las Demandantes, sus subsidiarias o terceros en los que se haya discutido, analizado o comentado cualquier análisis, valuación, reporte o due diligence, previo a celebrar los Contratos 803, 804 y 821.</p> <p>Esta solicitud está limitada al periodo comprendido entre 2011 (periodo en el que aparentemente Pemex comenzó a dirigirse a empresas prestadoras de servicios petroleros para aumentar su producción) a 2014 (año en el que se celebró el Contrato 821).</p>	<p>Claimants are ordered to produce all the non-privileged documents in their possession, custody or control responsive to this request.</p>
<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p>Documentos relacionados con las supuestas inversiones realizadas por las Demandantes al amparo del Contrato 803, particularmente relacionados con:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Órdenes de compra y facturas de MWS y Bisell que demuestren la adquisición inicial de 3 equipos de perforación para llevar a cabo las reparaciones que solicitaría Pemex.</li> <li>b. Órdenes de compra y facturas de MWS y Bisell que demuestren la compra de más plataformas que supuestamente compraron e importaron a México.</li> <li>c. Órdenes de compra y facturas de MWS y Bisell que reflejen la adquisición e instalación de equipo de perforación (<i>e.g.</i>, equipos y materiales, tuberías de acero, bombas, generadores de tanques, eslabones giratorios, control de la cabeza del pozo, torres eléctricas/luminarias, herramientas de pesca, cables y numerosos camiones y remolques).</li> <li>d. Documentación detallada (órdenes de compra, facturas, contratos, escrituras públicas, entre otros) que refleje el arrendamiento y posterior adquisición de tierras en el pueblo de Poza Rica, Veracruz conocido como el “Patio”.</li> </ul>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Claimants have committed to “produce documents responsive to this request that are in its possession, custody and control”.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>

	<p>e. Documentación detallada (órdenes de compra, facturas, contratos, etc.) que reflejen la adquisición de MWS y Bisell de tierras en la ciudad de Tamos, al norte de México y cerca de Tampico, que aparentemente compraron para almacenar su equipo.</p> <p>f. Documentación detallada (órdenes de compra, facturas, contratos, etc.) que refleje el alquiler de un almacén en Poza Rica para guardar los equipos y materiales más caros;</p> <p>g. Documentación detallada (órdenes de compra, facturas, contratos, etc.) que reflejen la importación de equipo adicional en septiembre de 2012;</p> <p>h. Documentación detallada (órdenes de compra, facturas, contratos, etc.) que demuestre la obtención de la garantía de cumplimiento de aproximadamente US\$ 5 millones.</p> <p>i. Documentación detallada (órdenes de compra, facturas, contratos, etc.) que respalde todas las inversiones que realizaron las Demandantes para cumplir con el Contrato 803.</p> <p>Esta solicitud abarca desde el 1º de enero de 2011 (un año antes de celebrar el Contrato 803) hasta el 10 de febrero de 2015 (fecha del finiquito del Contrato 803).</p>	
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p>Documentos relacionados con la permanencia en México de las supuestas inversiones realizadas por las Demandantes al amparo del Contrato 803.</p> <p>Esta solicitud abarca desde el 10 de febrero de 2015 (fecha del finiquito del Contrato 803) al 2 de diciembre de 2022.</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Claimants have stated that they will disclose documents in their possession, custody or control that show in what particular place their assets are located.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p>Documentos relacionados con las supuestas inversiones realizadas por las Demandantes al amparo del Contrato 804, particularmente relacionados con:</p> <p>a. Documentación detallada (órdenes de compra, facturas, contratos, etc.)</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Claimants have committed to “produce documents responsive to this request that are in its possession, custody and control”.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the</p>

	<p>que reflejen la adquisición de MWS y Bisell de equipos adicionales y suministro de materiales.</p> <p>b. Documentación detallada (órdenes de compra, facturas, contratos, etc.) que demuestren la adquisición de MWS y Bisell de importación de nuevos equipos de perforación para realizar los trabajos que solicitaría Pemex.</p> <p>c. Documentación detallada (órdenes de compra, facturas, contratos, etc.) que reflejen la obtención de una garantía de cumplimiento por aproximadamente US\$ 5.5 millones.</p> <p>d. Documentación detallada (órdenes de compra, facturas, contratos, etc.) que respalde todas las inversiones que realizaron las Demandantes para cumplir con el Contrato 804.</p> <p>Esta solicitud abarca desde el 1º de enero de 2012 (un año antes de celebrar el Contrato 804) hasta el 10 de abril de 2015 (fecha del finiquito del Contrato 804).</p>	<p>Tribunal is required.</p>
<p><b>13.</b></p>	<p>Documentos relacionados con la permanencia en México de las supuestas inversiones realizadas por las Demandantes al amparo del Contrato 804.</p> <p>Esta solicitud abarca del 10 de abril de 2015 (fecha del finiquito del Contrato 804) al 2 de diciembre de 2022.</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Claimants have stated that they will disclose documents in their possession, custody or control that show in what particular place their assets are located.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>
<p><b>14.</b></p>	<p>Documentos relacionados con <i>i</i>) las supuestas inversiones realizadas por las Demandantes al amparo del Contrato 821, particularmente relacionados con:</p> <p>a. Documentación detallada (órdenes de compra, facturas, contratos, etc.) que refleje la compra de materiales y equipos por Finley y Drake-Mesa (incluyendo una plataforma de 1,000 caballos de fuerza, dos bombas de perforación de 1,00 caballos de fuerza, tanques, unidades de mezcla, agitadores, generadores, mesa giratoria, control de cabezal de pozo,</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Claimants have committed to “produce documents responsive to this request that are in its possession, custody and control”.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>

	<p>torres de iluminación, tanques de combustible, tuberías de perforación, empleados, remolques de oficinas portátiles y remolques de alojamiento).</p> <p>b. Documentación detallada (órdenes de compra, facturas, contratos, etc.) que refleje la adquisición de Finley y Drake-Mesa equipos de perforación especiales.</p> <p>c. Documentación detallada (órdenes de compra, facturas, contratos, etc.) que reflejen la obtención de una garantía de cumplimiento por aproximadamente \$41.8 millones de dólares;</p> <p>d. Documentación detallada (órdenes de compra, facturas, contratos, etc.) que respalde todas las inversiones que realizaron las Demandantes para cumplir con el Contrato 821.</p> <p>Esta solicitud abarca desde el 1º de enero de 2013 (un año antes de la celebración del Contrato 821) hasta el 28 de agosto de 2017 (fecha en la que fue rescindido por PEP).</p>	
15.	<p>Documentos relacionados con la permanencia en México de las supuestas inversiones realizadas por las Demandantes al amparo del Contrato 821.</p> <p>Esta solicitud abarca del 28 de agosto de 2017 (fecha en la que fue rescindido por PEP) al 2 de diciembre de 2022.</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Claimants have stated that they will disclose documents in their possession, custody or control that show in what particular place their assets are located.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>
16.	<p>Documentos Internos y Comunicaciones de las Demandantes que contengan información, análisis, opinión o discusión sobre alguno de los siguientes temas:</p> <p>a. Las reclamaciones y juicio de Halliburton iniciado en Estados Unidos contra de las Demandantes.</p> <p>b. Las reclamaciones y juicio de Halliburton de México, S. de R.L. de C.V.</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Claimants have committed to “produce non-privileged and public materials regarding the legal proceedings described in the Request that explain the claims made against Claimants and are in their possession, custody or control”.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>

	<p>c. Las reclamaciones y juicio de CALFRAC de México, S.A. de C.V. iniciado en contra de las Demandantes.</p> <p>d. Las reclamaciones y juicio de Transportes Hidrorisa, S.A. de C.V. iniciado en contra de las Demandantes.</p> <p>e. Las reclamaciones y juicio de Grupo Veracruz Servicios Rental, S.A. de C.V. iniciado en contra de las Demandantes.</p> <p>f. Las reclamaciones y juicio de HA Global, S.A. de C.V. iniciado en contra de las Demandantes.</p> <p>g. Las denuncias por el delito de fraude en 2016 presentadas por subcontratistas en contra de Finley y Drake-Mesa derivado de la falta de pago por trabajos realizados en favor de Pemex.</p> <p>Esta solicitud está limitada al periodo comprendido del 1 de enero de 2013 (un año antes de la celebración del Contrato 821) al 29 de julio de 2020 (fecha de la presentación de la NOI de las Demandantes al amparo del TLCAN).</p>	
17.	<p>Documentos Internos y Comunicaciones creadas al interior de las Demandantes, intercambiados y/o elaborados por asesores externos que contengan información, análisis, opinión o discusión sobre alguno de los siguientes litigios:</p> <p>i) la rescisión del Contrato 821; ii) el Juicio Civil 200/2016; iii) las Apelaciones 898/2017 y 899/2917; iii) los Amparos Directos 425/2018 y 426/2018; iv) el Amparo Directo 306/2019; v) el Amparo Directo 783/2019; vi) el Amparo Directo 875/2019; vii) el Amparo Directo 540/2020; viii) el Juicio de Nulidad 2017; ix) el Amparo Directo 74/2019, y x) el Recurso de Revisión 1685/2020.</p> <p>El periodo de búsqueda de esta solicitud se limita del 29 de abril de 2016 al 25 de marzo de 2021.</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Claimants have committed to “produce non-privileged and public materials regarding the legal proceedings described in the Request that are in their possession, custody or control”.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>

<p><b>18.</b></p>	<p>Documentos Internos y Comunicaciones creadas al interior de las Demandantes, intercambiados y/o elaborados por asesores externos que contengan información, análisis, opinión o discusión sobre alguno de los siguientes litigios:</p> <p>i) terminación del Contrato 803; ii) el Juicio Civil 75/2015; iii) la Apelación 35/2015; iv) el incidente de incompetencia planteado por PEP; v) la Apelación 30/2016; vi) la Apelación 36/2016; vii) el Amparo Indirecto 4/2017; viii) el Recurso de Revisión 233/2017 y ix) la Apelación 1/2020.</p> <p>El periodo de búsqueda de esta solicitud se limita del 13 de octubre de 2015 al 25 de marzo de 2021.</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Claimants have committed to “produce non-privileged and public materials regarding the legal proceedings described in the Request that are in their possession, custody or control”.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>
<p><b>19.</b></p>	<p>Documentos Internos y Comunicaciones creadas al interior de las Demandantes, intercambiados y/o elaborados por asesores externos que contengan información, análisis, opinión o discusión sobre alguno de los siguientes litigios:</p> <p>i) terminación del Contrato 804; ii) el Juicio Civil 120/2015; iii) la Apelación 1/2016; iv) el Amparo Directo 214/2016; y v) el Juicio de Nulidad 2019 (incluyendo los recursos de reclamación interpuestos por PEP y MWS y Bisell).</p> <p>El periodo de búsqueda de esta solicitud se limita del 8 de diciembre de 2015 al 25 de marzo de 2021.</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Claimants have committed to “produce non-privileged and public materials regarding the legal proceedings described in the Request that are in their possession, custody or control”.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>
<p><b>20.</b></p>	<p>Copia de los contratos, incluido cualquier convenio modificatorio, celebrados por las Demandantes (o alguna de sus filiales o subsidiarias) y/o Holland &amp; Knight con cualquier tercer financista (“third party funding”), para financiar</p> <p>los servicios legales obtenidos por las Demandantes para iniciar y participar en el Caso ARB/21/25.</p> <p>Esta solicitud está limitada al periodo comprendido entre el 1º de enero de 2019 al 2 de diciembre de 2022.</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Claimants have stated that “no such documents exist”.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>



<p><b>21.</b></p>	<p>Copia de los estados financieros auditados (incluidas las notas a los mismos) de i) Finley, ii) MWS, iii) Prize, iv) Bisell, iv) Drake-Mesa, v) Drake-Finley, vi) Royal Shale Holdings, vii) Royal Shale Corporation y viii) Drake-Mesa Big Sky, o en caso de existir copia de los estados financieros consolidados de Finley, MWS y Prize y sus empresas subsidiarias/filiales.</p> <p>En caso de que no existan estados financieros auditados, se solicita la producción de los estados financieros no auditados con las notas a los mismos.</p> <p>Esta solicitud abarca del 2011 al último estado financiero que haya sido realizado.</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Claimants have stated that “[other] than financial documents that might have been prepared with respect to obtaining the 803, 804, or 821 Contracts, which are already in the possession, custody and control of Mexico, Claimants do not have documents responsive to this request in its possession, custody, or control”.</p> <p>In the Tribunal’s understanding, such statement implies that Claimants do not have any financial statement, either audited or unaudited, for any of the companies mentioned in Respondent’s request, for any of the periods subsequent to the time when the Contracts were obtained up to the present. Hence, on the basis of such understanding, no document production order by the Tribunal is required.</p>
<p><b>22.</b></p>	<p>Copia del (los) plan(es) de negocio de MWS, Prize y/o Finley para la puesta en marcha de sus actividades en México. Esta solicitud incluye cualquier modificación al plan de negocios, documentos adjuntos o cualquier documentación de soporte.</p> <p>Esta solicitud abarca del 1 de enero de 2011 al 29 de julio de 2020.</p>	<p>The Tribunal notes that Claimants have stated that “they recall one, perhaps two, presentations regarding their investment in Mexico and will disclose such documents”.</p> <p>Bearing that in mind, to the extent that they exist, the Tribunal orders Claimants to disclose any business plans or presentations in their possession, custody or control regarding Claimant’s activities in Mexico from January 1, 2011, to July 29, 2020.</p>
<p><b>23.</b></p>	<p>Documentos Internos que contengan cualquiera de los siguientes análisis, opiniones o discusión de la decisión de las Demandantes de invertir en México:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. el mercado de servicios en el sector energético en México;</li> <li>b. Análisis de riesgo;</li> <li>c. Análisis de competencia o de empresas nacionales e internacionales</li> </ul>	<p>The request is rejected, as it lacks sufficient relevance to the case or materiality to its outcome, except to the extent already covered by the Tribunal’s decision concerning Request # 9.</p>

competidoras.

Esta solicitud se limita al periodo comprendido entre el 1° de enero de 2012 al 29 de julio de 2020.