) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confidential Revised		13 Decemt Vienna,
Pages 528 - 781 INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR SETTLEMENT OF INVESTMENT DISPUTES ICSID Case No ARB/16/8 between ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT AND OTHERS Claimants - V - REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA Respondent The Arbitral Tribunal The Hon L Yves Fortier CC, OQ, QC - Arbitrator Professor Dr Rolf Knieper - Arbitrator Professor Dr Rolf Knieper - Arbitrator HEARING VIENNA, AUSTRIA Wednesday, 13 December 2017	TO THE CO ANI LUC GIE GIE The 161 Der Unii todd ted. core Also ZBI VMT ZBI VAL ZBI VAL	LIST OF PARTICIPANTS behalf of Claimants: DD ALLEN WELLS EODORE GLEASON REN HINKLE DREW ASTUNO CIA CRACIUNEANU DRESTASIUNAITE EASON WELLS a Colorado Building 15 California Street, Suite 616 typer, CO 80202 de States of America d.wells@gleasonwells.com en.hinkle@gleasonwells.com en.hinkle@gleasonwells.com o present from the parties: IGNIEW PIOTR GROT, Claimant TNESSES: IGNIEW PIOTR GROT, Claimant TNESSES: IGNIEW PIOTR GROT LERIU BERIL PERTS: GER GLADEI, Gladei & Assoc tAIL RURAC, Agricultural expert DREI GUMOVSCHI, Agricultural expert RS WIECHEN, Deloitte	
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS The Tribunal: The President: PROFESSOR PHILIPPE SANDS Matrix Chambers Gray's Inn London WC1R 5LN United Kingdom philippesands@matrixlaw.co.uk philippesands@	LEC CHI VIC ANI FEL SC Sch 101 Rep I.ko c.lir v.pe ANI ANI ANI ANI ANI ANI ANI ANI ANI EXE	LIST OF PARTICIPANTS behalf of Respondent: DN KOPECKY RISTOPH LINDINGER TORIA PERNT TORIA PERNT SSA ACHABOU LIX SCHNEIDER HÖNHERR RECHTSANWÄLTE GMBH notterning 19 OV Vienna public of Austria pecky@schoenherr.eu tdinge@schoenherr.eu ent@schoenherr.eu ent@schoenherr.eu NA CUSNIR (remotely) DRIAN GUZUN HÖNHERR MOLDOVA xandru cel Bun 51 sinau 2012 public of Moldova usnir@schoenherr.eu uzun@schoenherr.eu PERTS: OFESSOR VIOREL RUSU, Legal expert CHAEL PEER, KPMG RTIN KOZAK, KPMG	

SID ARB 16 8 bigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confidenti Revised	al 13 Decem Vienna	
INDEX INDEX MIHAIL RURAC and ANDREI GUMOVSCH33&ontinued. Re-examination by Claimant 541 Questions by the Arbitral Tribunal 552 Re-examination by Claimant 582 LARS WIECHEN 584 Examination by Claimants 585 Cross-examination by Respondent 605	Revised 532 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8	Wienna MR GLEASON: First and foremost, I want to be completely transparent about this. Last night unfortunately Mr Rurac had a hotel reservation problem. He arrived and there was no room available for him, so he did communicate with our team about this particular issue. I wanted to be fully transparent about this. We have discussed this with the Respondent. The email communications are	a, Aus 534
Re-examination by Claimants632Questions by the Arbitral Tribunal635MICHAEL PEER639Examination by Respondent639Cross-examination by Claimant659Re-examination by Respondent679LARS WIECHEN and MICHAEL PEER680Questions by the Arbitral Tribunal680Re-examination by Claimant712Closing submission by Claimant720Closing Submission by Respondent752Closing remarks and future timetable774	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	available upon request, just to get that on the record that that did happen unfortunately, but we found him a place to stay, so all is well that ends well. THE PRESIDENT: He didn't sleep in the street? MR GLEASON: I don't think so. I haven't talked to him today. THE PRESIDENT: You didn't sleep in the street? MR RURAC: No. THE PRESIDENT: Respondent, do you have a reaction? MR KOPECKY: No problem. THE PRESIDENT: I express my gratitude to Claimant for its transparency and Respondent for flexibility and decency. I hope you got a good	
1 (9.32 am Wednesday, 13 December 2017) 2 MIHAIL RURAC and ANDREI GUMOVSCHI, continued. 3 THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, everybody. 4 I hope everyone had a fine evening. I hope you got 5 to enjoy Vienna last night. We are so sorry to have 6 kept you overnight, but it is very important and we 7 are grateful for you being back with us. We 8 continue with your cross-examination, there will 9 then be some re-direct and the Tribunal may well 10 have a few questions for you. 11 Just before we start, a couple of 12 housekeeping matters. The only outstanding issue 13 that I have is new titles for CH-7 and CH-8 14 MR GLEASON: I have those documents for 15 you right here. I am happy to pass those out to you 16 and to opposing counsel. (Same handed) 17 THE PRESIDENT: We have revised copies of 18 CH-7 and CH-8 with new headline. CH-7, table 4 19 Recommended fertilizers dosage and priceconsidered 20 to achieve average yields in Floresti, and CH-8, 21 table 5, Plant protection products used and related <td>533 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</td> <td>night's sleep wherever you slept. MR GLEASON: There are a couple of other issues for the record. I will let Mr Kopecky have his say on this issue as well, but one is related to the translation of C-94. Respondent had provided their updated version of the translation and we have looked at it and we agree, so there is agreement on that particular issue. THE PRESIDENT: Could that be submitted as C-94 Rev? There is agreement on a revised translation of C-94. Just for information, have you just translated additional parts or the whole? MR GLEASON: Additional parts. THE PRESIDENT: Is it marked clearly which are the additional bits? MR GLEASON: It is red-lined. THE PRESIDENT: Excellent. Thank you very much. We will have copies of those, will we? Or is it on the hyperlink straightaway? MR GLEASON: In the course of the day. There are a few more exhibits we would like to formally introduce to the record which have been formally discussed. We would like to make sure they are formally put on the record. It is C-142, C-143, C-144 and C-145. These are documents</td> <td>535 09:35</td>	533 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	night's sleep wherever you slept. MR GLEASON: There are a couple of other issues for the record. I will let Mr Kopecky have his say on this issue as well, but one is related to the translation of C-94. Respondent had provided their updated version of the translation and we have looked at it and we agree, so there is agreement on that particular issue. THE PRESIDENT: Could that be submitted as C-94 Rev? There is agreement on a revised translation of C-94. Just for information, have you just translated additional parts or the whole? MR GLEASON: Additional parts. THE PRESIDENT: Is it marked clearly which are the additional bits? MR GLEASON: It is red-lined. THE PRESIDENT: Excellent. Thank you very much. We will have copies of those, will we? Or is it on the hyperlink straightaway? MR GLEASON: In the course of the day. There are a few more exhibits we would like to formally introduce to the record which have been formally discussed. We would like to make sure they are formally put on the record. It is C-142, C-143, C-144 and C-145. These are documents	535 09:35

-	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confider Revise			nber 2017 a, Austria
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 22 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	pertaining to issues concerning Moldovan agriculture which were raised in Michael Peer's report. Thus, we believe they are responsive to Mr Peer's report. I have discussed this with Mr Kopecky and I turn the word over to him. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? MR KOPECKY: We agree with that with the exception of C-144, which is a video. As far as I understood, it concerns beets. Mr Grot didn't farm beets. THE PRESIDENT: Beet as in beetroot? Maybe it is not beetroot. It is sugar. MR KOPECKY: Mr Grot did not farm beets. It is not responsive per se to the report of Mr Peer and therefore we object to it being onthe record. THE PRESIDENT: What is the timing? This is likely to come in this morning so we need to take a decision pretty much straightaway, because Claimant is planning to rely on C-144, which is a video, did you say? MR GLEASON: We are discussing a video of former Prime Minister Vlad Filat in the year 2011 meeting with local agricultural producers, sure, in the context of sugar beets, the overall general underreporting of yields in the agricultural	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	that the statement does represent the broader trend of underreporting of yields in Moldovan agriculture as recognised by the Prime Minister. THE PRESIDENT: Could we have a moment to confer so we can take a decision now. (The Tribunal conferred off the record) THE PRESIDENT: In the interests of just taking a speedy decision our feeling is we take the point of Respondent that it may relate to a crop that is not directly in issue, but since it is broadly responsive to a matter that is addressed in Mr Peer's report, and against the background that it is perhaps unlikely that this single document will form the basis for the decision that will be taken at some point, our inclination is to let it in, but under reserve, I would say, that if upon viewing it we discover that indeed Respondent is right, that it bears no relation to the subject that is being discussed, then we will revisit our inclination. The decision is, with that reserve, we admit it for the purpose of the next phase of the arbitration and the hearing of the quantum experts, but you are free, Respondent, to make your points as to the weight to be given to this newly introduced document in due course and we will listen to those	538 09:39
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	industry. It is a video but we have a transcript in Romanian with an English translation. It is just additional support for this – THE PRESIDENT: Your reason for tendering it is it goes to the question of the underreporting by agricultural producers of their total annual production? That is the rationale for introducing it? MR GLEASON: Yes. That is the rationale. It is just additional support for the proposition that there is widespread underreporting of agricultural yields. THE PRESIDENT: Although I have read Mr Peer's report, I have to confess I haven't memorised it, but I do recall it does address that question of underreporting, does it not? MR KOPECKY: With respect to the crops that Mr Grot planted, not beets. It is a different product. THE PRESIDENT: Is it Claimant's position that C-144 does or does not relate only to beets, or does it go more broadly? MR GLEASON: The statement was given in the context of a conversation with sugar beet producers, that is true, but Claimants would submit	2 2 3 4 4 5 7 8 9 7 8 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 2 2 3 4	arguments. Very good. Any other questions from Claimant? MR GLEASON: No not at this time. THE PRESIDENT: Respondent? MR KOPECKY: Just one point of order. We discussed this with counsel for Claimants just before the hearing. The final report of Mr Wiechen was submitted to us just after midnight this morning, and therefore without any further commenting on that, we agreed with Claimants that Mr Peer will be given additional time in his presentation to address that. We spoke of 15 minutes extra, but the general consensus, because we are good on time, is just to let them speak as long as they need to get everything they need to get on record, on record. THE PRESIDENT: Just to understand, I have not seen this new document. I think we have not seen this, so we are not in a position to know what its contents are or are not, so subject to that and reserve to that, are you saying that the parties are agreed that this can be introduced but you would like more time to be able to address the new document?	539 09:41

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v F	epublic of Moldova	Confide Revis			nber 201 a, Austr
1 MR KOPECK 2 already. 3 THE PRESIDEN 4 The only thing I am h 5 it is completely opener 6 MR KOPECKY 7 runs over by a minute 8 acceptable. 9 THE PRESID 10 flexible on that. If that 11 parties, then the record 12 are we calling it? 13 MR GLEASC 14 that Mr Wiechen will I 15 was a last minute chat 16 presentation, so we end 17 to discussions yester 18 over to Respondent by 19 do that, but in review 20 to fix something", so 21 THE PRESID 22 document is in and y 23 be able to address th 24 MR KOPECI	 Y: We had agreed more time II: You have agreed more time. esitating slightly about it is ided. We said 15 minutes and if we is or two that will be DENT: The Tribunal will be at is the agreement of the d shows that that new what DN: It is just the presentation be using. Unfortunately there ange, we could say, to the couraged Mr Wiechen, pursuant day, to get the presentation y lunchtime, he worked hard to ing his work he said "I need that is what he did yesterday. DENT: On that basis that purchase the presentation of the did yesterday. 	540 09:42	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 5 16 7 8 9 20 11 22 3 4 15 16 7 18 19 20 1 22 3 4	yesterday, he does not speak English, but Mr Rurac, we normally communicate in English, right? MR RURAC: Sure, yes. MR GLEASON: So you understand the parts of the reports which were shown to you yesterday which were in English? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If you are working with Mr Gumovschi on a project, and something is in English, you would explain it to him? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: Now you worked closely with the team from Deloitte in Bucharest, correct? THE PRESIDENT: If you could maybe question slightly less leading? MR GLEASON: Sure. No problem. Who did you work with to create this report? MR RURAC: I worked with Deloitte experts, Marius and Athena. Marius and Athena from Deloitte. MR GLEASON: These are the Marius and Athena that you mentioned yesterday, correct? MR RURAC: Yes. The same people. MR GLEASON: Where do they work? I want to confirm this point.	542
3of the cross-examinat4MS PERNT:5I have no further que6THE PRESID7Claimant?8MR GLEASON9It will not be very long10Re-examination by Cla11MR GLEASON12MR RURAC:13MR GLEASON14just to preserve the in15and I do hope you und16much for your toleran17staying this unforese18I think both sides app19the Tribunal, so than20I just want to21translations are okay22everything I say? Do y23MR RURAC:24MR GUMOVS	 ack to you for the continuation tion. Thank you. Upon reflection stions. Thank you. DENT: Thank you, Ms Pernt. DENT: Thank you, Ms Pernt. We will have a few questions. aimant N: Good morning. Good morning. N: We can talk again. That is integrity of these proceedings erstand and I do thank you very the of these procedures and en extra time here in Vienna. areciate it very much, as do < you. b confirm that the , that you are hearing ou understand me? 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 7 18 9 20 21	MR RURAC: They work for Deloitte, Bucharest. MR GLEASON: I would just like to look at some of the parts of your original Romanian reports which were in English. This should only take a minute. This is your original report, the Romanian version. As Ms Pernt pointed out yesterday, there are some paragraphs in English. I would like to focus on paragraph 4 to begin, and I would like to focus on paragraph 4 to begin, and I would like to read that paragraph, if I may. It says, "I confirm that I have no conflict of interest relating to any of the parties in this matter". Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: Mr Gumovschi, do you agree with that? MR GLEASON: I would like to look at paragraph 5. "I understand that my overriding duty is to assist the Arbitral Tribunal on matters within my expertise and that this duty overrides any obligation to Laguardia or its legal advisers". Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR RURAC: Yes.	543 09:46

www.dianaburden.com

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi		al 13 Decen Vienna	
-		544	4	the second s	546
 2	MR GLEASON: And, finally, paragraph 6,	09:48			09:50
	"I have made clear which facts and matters referred			worked together to provide your own joint	
5	to in this report are within my own knowledge and		3 4	independent analysis of Laguardia's operations? MR RURAC: Yes.	
-	which are not. Those that are within my own		4 5	_	
5	knowledge I confirm to be true. The opinions I have		6	MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes, certainly. MR GLEASON: I would like to talk about.	
5 7	expressed represent my true and complete professional opinions on the matters to which they		7	the Visoca centre for a minute. Let me turn to the	
7 3	refer".			relevant paragraph in your report. I will use the	
,)	Do you agree with that?			English version for this part. In paragraph 30 of	
, 0	MR RURAC: Yes.			your expert report you state that "the harvest in	
1	MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes, of course.			the testing sectors is by 20 per cent on average	
2	MR GLEASON: Did you agree with all these			higher than the harvest on the farmers' lands".	
3	statements on the date that you submitted your		13	What farmers' lands are you referring to	
4	report?			in paragraph 30?	
5	MR RURAC: Yes, of course.		15	MR RURAC: This is a statement I will say	
6	MR GUMOVSCHI: Certainly.			in English. This is a scientific statement. It is	
7	MR GLEASON: We are almost done with this			in a science community there is a lot of	
8	part. I would also like to turn to the very end of			information, a lot of data, that confirms that the	
9	your reports, paragraphs 46 and 47. Again these are			yield in science plots are higher than in farmers'	
0	paragraphs which are in English. I want to read		20	plots. This is a common world in science.	
1	these paragraphs and confirm whether you understand		21	MR GLEASON: It is a common what?	
2	or not. Paragraph 46 says, "I confirm that, at the		22	MR RURAC: It is a common science	
3	time of providing this expert report, I consider it		23	information. It is not something concerning	
4	to be accurate and constitute my true professional			Moldova.	
	opinion".		25	MR GLEASON: You are not comparing the	
5					
		545			
5 	Do you agree with that?	545 09:49		state centre to Moldovan averages?	547 09:53
1	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes.		2	MR RURAC: No.	
1	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes.		2 3	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the	
1 2 3 4	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm		2 3 4	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to?	
1 2 3 4 5	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion		2 3 4 5	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both.	
 2 3 4 5	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or		2 3 4 5 6	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in	
1 2 3 4 5 5 7	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this		2 3 4 5 6 7	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice	
1 2 3 4 5 7 3	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from	
23455739	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we have three arbitrators in this case "forthwith".		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are	
	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions the farmers	
	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we have three arbitrators in this case "forthwith". Do you agree with that?		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions the farmers had, and we needed arguments to show how that yield	
	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we have three arbitrators in this case "forthwith". Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions the farmers	
	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we have three arbitrators in this case "forthwith". Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions the farmers had, and we needed arguments to show how that yield could be adjusted, and scientific literature enabled	
	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we have three arbitrators in this case "forthwith". Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: And you agreed with both		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions the farmers had, and we needed arguments to show how that yield could be adjusted, and scientific literature enabled us to say that the test fields yielded 20 per cent	
	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we have three arbitrators in this case "forthwith". Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: And you agreed with both paragraphs 46 and 47 at the time you submitted this		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions the farmers had, and we needed arguments to show how that yield could be adjusted, and scientific literature enabled us to say that the test fields yielded 20 per cent on average higher crops than the fields of the	547 09:53
	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we have three arbitrators in this case "forthwith". Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: And you agreed with both paragraphs 46 and 47 at the time you submitted this report?		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions the farmers had, and we needed arguments to show how that yield could be adjusted, and scientific literature enabled us to say that the test fields yielded 20 per cent on average higher crops than the fields of the farmers.	
12345673901234567	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we have three arbitrators in this case "forthwith". Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: And you agreed with both paragraphs 46 and 47 at the time you submitted this report? MR RURAC: Yes, of course.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions the farmers had, and we needed arguments to show how that yield could be adjusted, and scientific literature enabled us to say that the test fields yielded 20 per cent on average higher crops than the fields of the farmers. MR GLEASON: But the question is which	
123156739012345678	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we have three arbitrators in this case "forthwith". Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: And you agreed with both paragraphs 46 and 47 at the time you submitted this report? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions the farmers had, and we needed arguments to show how that yield could be adjusted, and scientific literature enabled us to say that the test fields yielded 20 per cent on average higher crops than the fields of the farmers. MR GLEASON: But the question is which farmers? 20 per cent better than which farmers?	
1234567390123456789	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we have three arbitrators in this case "forthwith". Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: And you agreed with both paragraphs 46 and 47 at the time you submitted this report? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Now I am sure you did not		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 16 7 8 9 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions the farmers had, and we needed arguments to show how that yield could be adjusted, and scientific literature enabled us to say that the test fields yielded 20 per cent on average higher crops than the fields of the farmers. MR GLEASON: But the question is which farmers? 20 per cent better than which farmers? The average Moldovan farmer or the worldwide	
12345673901234567890	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we have three arbitrators in this case "forthwith". Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: And you agreed with both paragraphs 46 and 47 at the time you submitted this report? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Now I am sure you did not expect to spend so much time talking about the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 16 7 8 9 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions the farmers had, and we needed arguments to show how that yield could be adjusted, and scientific literature enabled us to say that the test fields yielded 20 per cent on average higher crops than the fields of the farmers. MR GLEASON: But the question is which farmers? 20 per cent better than which farmers? The average Moldovan farmer or the worldwide MR RURAC: No, not just the Moldovan	
	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we have three arbitrators in this case "forthwith". Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: And you agreed with both paragraphs 46 and 47 at the time you submitted this report? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Now I am sure you did not expect to spend so much time talking about the English language when you came to Vienna and I am		$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions the farmers had, and we needed arguments to show how that yield could be adjusted, and scientific literature enabled us to say that the test fields yielded 20 per cent on average higher crops than the fields of the farmers. MR GLEASON: But the question is which farmers? 20 per cent better than which farmers? The average Moldovan farmer or the worldwide MR RURAC: No, not just the Moldovan farmers. In order to determine the productive	
1234567390123456789012	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we have three arbitrators in this case "forthwith". Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: And you agreed with both paragraphs 46 and 47 at the time you submitted this report? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: Now I am sure you did not expect to spend so much time talking about the English language when you came to Vienna and I am sure you expected to talk a lot about farming, so		$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions the farmers had, and we needed arguments to show how that yield could be adjusted, and scientific literature enabled us to say that the test fields yielded 20 per cent on average higher crops than the fields of the farmers. MR GLEASON: But the question is which farmers? 20 per cent better than which farmers? The average Moldovan farmer or the worldwide MR RURAC: No, not just the Moldovan farmers. In order to determine the productive potential of the hybrids we used various approaches	
1	Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. MR GLEASON: Paragraph 47. "I confirm that if, subsequently, I consider this opinion requires any correction, modification or qualification, I will notify the parties to this arbitration and the Sole Arbitrator" although we have three arbitrators in this case "forthwith". Do you agree with that? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: And you agreed with both paragraphs 46 and 47 at the time you submitted this report? MR GLEASON: Now I am sure you did not expect to spend so much time talking about the English language when you came to Vienna and I am sure you expected to talk a lot about farming, so I would like to do some of that just for a few		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MR RURAC: No. MR GLEASON: What are you comparing the state centre to? MR RURAC: Both. MR GLEASON: You can answer either in Romanian or in English, it is your choice MR RURAC: When we had the data from Floresti with small yields in productions, we are farmers, so we know what productions the farmers had, and we needed arguments to show how that yield could be adjusted, and scientific literature enabled us to say that the test fields yielded 20 per cent on average higher crops than the fields of the farmers. MR GLEASON: But the question is which farmers? 20 per cent better than which farmers? The average Moldovan farmer or the worldwide MR RURAC: No, not just the Moldovan farmers. In order to determine the productive potential of the hybrids we used various approaches and research works are being conducted. The	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi		al 13 Decem Vienna	
4		548	4		550
1	Visoca centre was not irrigated. This made us think	09:54	1	and that is why we left a minus 20 per cent compared	09:58
2	that the Visoca centre could not yield the maximum		2	to Visoca, because we understand that that is	
3 ⊿	production.		3 4	possible there.	
4 5	In addition to that, Visoca did not apply		4 5	MR GLEASON: And you agree, Mr Gumovschi?	
5	phytosanitary products, so perhaps the production there could be under-evaluated. In order to plan		5 6	MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes, I do agree. MR GLEASON: How did you arrive at that	
6 7	the yield for Laguardia we needed to collect several		7	20 per cent figure?	
r B	points of view in order to draw a final conclusion.		8	MR RURAC: It is not my number.	
3 9	MR GLEASON: Just to confirm. the		9	MR GLEASON: Whose number is it? Is it	
9 0	20 per cent higher than average that you refer to in		9 10	your professional opinion?	
1	this paragraph does not refer to 20 per cent higher		10	MR RURAC: No, it is not my professional	
2	than Moldovan averages, but rather worldwide		12	opinion. Several authors declared that this is the	
∠ 3	averages? Is that fair to say?		12	median.	
4	MR RURAC: Yes, right. Farmers worldwide.		14	MR GLEASON: This is a number that you	
5	MR GLEASON: I would like to turn to the		15	took from literature?	
6	next paragraph 31. Actually, before we move on,		16	MR RURAC: Yes.	
7	I would like to ask Mr Gumovschi if you agree with		17	MR GLEASON: Then you also include a	
' 8	what Mr Rurac just said. Do you agree with what		18	15 per cent reduction for corn from the Visoca	
o 9	your colleague has just said?		10 19	centre number. Can you explain how you got that	
9	MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes, I agree with what he		20	15 per cent number?	
1	said.		20 21	MR RURAC: The corn in Moldova normally	
2	MR GLEASON: I would like to look at the		22	does not get aggressive pests or diseases, and that	
23	next paragraph, paragraph 31. The Visoca centre,		23	is why, even though there was in Visoca no use of	
4	you say does not use pesticides or plant protection		23 24	pesticides, that means that, because of what	
				I mentioned before, that would have no impact on the	
25	products, but Laguardia uses pesticides. Is that an		-		
	products, but Laguardia uses pesticides. Is that an	549	_		551
1	accurate understanding of what your report says?	549 09:56	1	crops.	551 09:59
5 1 2	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course.		1 2	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the	
1 2 3	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides		1 2 3	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where	
5 1 2 3 4	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher		1 2 3 4	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent?	
1 2 3 4 5	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia		1 2 3 4 5	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not	
5 1 2 3 4 5 6	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not		1 2 3 4	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used	
1 2 3 4 5 7	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your		1 2 3 4 5 6	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages.	
5	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used	
	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat?		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these	
5 1 2 3 1 5 7 3 9 0	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat? MR GLEASON: Maybe there was a translation		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these numbers? MR RURAC: Yes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0 1	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat? MR GLEASON: Maybe there was a translation problem. In your report it says that Laguardia uses		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these numbers? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: I just have one last	
5 1 2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0 1 2	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat? MR GLEASON: Maybe there was a translation problem. In your report it says that Laguardia uses pesticides and the Visoca centre does not use		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these numbers? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: I just have one last question. You guys are almost done.	
5 1 2 3 1 5 7 3 9 0 1 2 3	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat? MR GLEASON: Maybe there was a translation problem. In your report it says that Laguardia uses		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these numbers? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: I just have one last	
	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat? MR GLEASON: Maybe there was a translation problem. In your report it says that Laguardia uses pesticides and the Visoca centre does not use pesticides, and normally, you say, pesticides lead		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these numbers? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: I just have one last question. You guys are almost done. I would like to turn to table 7, very	
5 123455739012345	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat? MR GLEASON: Maybe there was a translation problem. In your report it says that Laguardia uses pesticides and the Visoca centre does not use pesticides, and normally, you say, pesticides lead to higher yields, correct?		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these numbers? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: I just have one last question. You guys are almost done. I would like to turn to table 7, very quickly.	551 09:59
5	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat? MR GLEASON: Maybe there was a translation problem. In your report it says that Laguardia uses pesticides, and normally, you say, pesticides lead to higher yields, correct? MR RURAC: Yes.	09:56	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these numbers? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: I just have one last question. You guys are almost done. I would like to turn to table 7, very quickly. THE PRESIDENT: Old or new?	
5 12345673901234567	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat? MR GLEASON: Maybe there was a translation problem. In your report it says that Laguardia uses pesticides, and normally, you say, pesticides lead to higher yields, correct? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides	09:56	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these numbers? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: I just have one last question. You guys are almost done. I would like to turn to table 7, very quickly. THE PRESIDENT: Old or new? MR GLEASON: The old table 7 in the	
5 123456739012345678	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat? MR GLEASON: Maybe there was a translation problem. In your report it says that Laguardia uses pesticides and the Visoca centre does not use pesticides, and normally, you say, pesticides lead to higher yields, correct? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides but the Visoca centre does not use pesticides, why	09:56	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these numbers? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: I just have one last question. You guys are almost done. I would like to turn to table 7, very quickly. THE PRESIDENT: Old or new? MR GLEASON: The old table 7 in the original report. Thank you for your clarification.	
	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat? MR GLEASON: Maybe there was a translation problem. In your report it says that Laguardia uses pesticides and the Visoca centre does not use pesticides, and normally, you say, pesticides lead to higher yields, correct? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides but the Visoca centre does not use pesticides, why did you not calculate Laguardia's yields to be	09:56	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these numbers? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: I just have one last question. You guys are almost done. I would like to turn to table 7, very quickly. THE PRESIDENT: Old or new? MR GLEASON: The old table 7 in the original report. Thank you for your clarification. Although I don't think there is a new table 7.	
5 12345673901234567890	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat? MR GLEASON: Maybe there was a translation problem. In your report it says that Laguardia uses pesticides and the Visoca centre does not use pesticides, and normally, you say, pesticides lead to higher yields, correct? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides but the Visoca centre does not use pesticides, why did you not calculate Laguardia's yields to be higher than the Visoca centre? Why did you	09:56	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these numbers? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: I just have one last question. You guys are almost done. I would like to turn to table 7, very quickly. THE PRESIDENT: Old or new? MR GLEASON: The old table 7 in the original report. Thank you for your clarification. Although I don't think there is a new table 7. There is a new table 4, 5 and 6. My apologies	
5 1234567890123456789	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat? MR GLEASON: Maybe there was a translation problem. In your report it says that Laguardia uses pesticides and the Visoca centre does not use pesticides, and normally, you say, pesticides lead to higher yields, correct? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides but the Visoca centre does not use pesticides, why did you not calculate Laguardia's yields to be higher than the Visoca centre? Why did you calculate them to be equal? Can you explain?	09:56	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these numbers? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: I just have one last question. You guys are almost done. I would like to turn to table 7, very quickly. THE PRESIDENT: Old or new? MR GLEASON: The old table 7 in the original report. Thank you for your clarification. Although I don't think there is a new table 7. There is a new table 4, 5 and 6. My apologies This table 7 is rent payments which were,	
5 123456739012345678901	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat? MR GLEASON: Maybe there was a translation problem. In your report it says that Laguardia uses pesticides and the Visoca centre does not use pesticides, and normally, you say, pesticides lead to higher yields, correct? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides but the Visoca centre does not use pesticides, why did you not calculate Laguardia's yields to be higher than the Visoca centre? Why did you calculate them to be equal? Can you explain? MR RURAC: Yes, of course I can. In	09:56	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these numbers? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: I just have one last question. You guys are almost done. I would like to turn to table 7, very quickly. THE PRESIDENT: Old or new? MR GLEASON: The old table 7 in the original report. Thank you for your clarification. Although I don't think there is a new table 7. There is a new table 4, 5 and 6. My apologies This table 7 is rent payments which were, as the source says, presumably calculated from the	
5 1234567390123456789012	accurate understanding of what your report says? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides and pesticides normally would provide for a higher yield, why did you calculate yields for Laguardia which are equal to the Visoca centre which does not use pesticides? Maybe you can explain your methodology. MR RURAC: I want you to repeat? MR GLEASON: Maybe there was a translation problem. In your report it says that Laguardia uses pesticides and the Visoca centre does not use pesticides, and normally, you say, pesticides lead to higher yields, correct? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: If Laguardia uses pesticides but the Visoca centre does not use pesticides, why did you not calculate Laguardia's yields to be higher than the Visoca centre? Why did you calculate them to be equal? Can you explain? MR RURAC: Yes, of course I can. In Visoca the processing takes part on small plots of	09:56	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR GLEASON: But a similar question to the one I asked you to the 20 per cent question. Where did you get that number, that 15 per cent? MR RURAC: This 15 per cent was not calculated by myself. These are the commonly used percentages. MR GLEASON: Are you confident in these numbers? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: I just have one last question. You guys are almost done. I would like to turn to table 7, very quickly. THE PRESIDENT: Old or new? MR GLEASON: The old table 7 in the original report. Thank you for your clarification. Although I don't think there is a new table 7. There is a new table 4, 5 and 6. My apologies This table 7 is rent payments which were, as the source says, presumably calculated from the Laguardia lease agreements. How did you calculated	

-) ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			nber 201 a, Austria
Zbign 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the lease. There is a 6 per cent adjustment for inflation. MR GLEASON: And you agree with that, Mr Gumovschi? MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes, I do agree. That is how we calculated. We took out the average figure for inflation and we calculated this rent every year and we added the inflation MR GLEASON: Yesterday you were talking about the lease agreements with Ms Pernt and you said we never saw the contracts, so I want to know how did you arrive at these numbers? You have to have this number from somewhere, where did you get it? Not the inflation rate, but the actual numbers? MR RURAC: We had the data from Deloitte.	Revis	ed 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Vienn expert reports as agronomists? MR RURAC: Yes, I did. Yes, of course. MR FORTIER: Do you farm land yourselves? Starting with Mr Gumovschi, do you farm land in Moldova? MR GUMOVSCHI: Honestly, if I am honest with you, I did a lot after I graduated. I was a chief agronomist and afterwards I was leading a section in an agricultural college and I worked as an agronomist. This was a very prosperous farm, and there there was like a school or a university team. We had 1200 ha and I was a deputy director there. I was heading, monitoring and managing all the processes. The students would work with their hands and would practise everything from sowing,	a, Austri 554 ^{10:06}
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	MR GLEASON: I have no further questions. Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr Gleason. I think there may be questions from the Tribunal. Questions by the Arbitral Tribunal MR FORTIER: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Gentlemen, you are both graduates of the Agricultural State University of Moldova, you are both agronomists, and you both have PhDs in Agricultural Sciences and Associate Professor. That		17 18 19 20 21 22 23	processing the fields and harvesting. That is how we were training them. I have to say I am very proud that some of those graduates have done very well and they are now developing the agriculture of Moldova. MR FORTIER: Very good. And you, Mr Rurac, have you ever farmed land in Moldova and, if so, have you been successful? MR RURAC: I remember when I was working	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 24 25	is very impressive. Have you ever done this sort of work for other clients in your experience? One after the other. Mr Gumovschi? MR GUMOVSCHI: I acted when there were some differences between a German company called Europlant and the farmers, and there I acted as an expert to prove that the potatoes were infected by the farmer because the seeds were not brought from Germany. Otherwise, if there were some differences or disputes between the firms, between the inputs or between the seeds that were sown in various fields, and that there were problems and issues amongst them, I would do an expertise and explain scientifically what the correct result would be. I was just trying to be fair. MR FORTIER: And you were acting as an expert? MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes, I was acting as an expert then. MR FORTIER: And you, Mr Rurac? MR RURAC: Yes, of course, I acted as an expert. I taught the experts how they have to calculate all sorts of things. I have never been before a Tribunal. MR FORTIER: No, but you have prepared		$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 12 \\ 22 \\ 22 \end{array}$	in the co-horse in the tobacco fields, I started together with my siblings when I was six. Afterwards, of course, we didn't have any land, we didn't own any land. I have been with the university for 25 years. There was always research and consultancy work. In the last two years I was a Dean of the faculty. I left the administrative duties and I am working part time in agrobusiness. I am even closer to the farmers and the producers, and had I written the report now it probably would have been different. I am convinced that Moldovan farmers make more money. MR FORTIER: If you were doing the report now in what way would it be different? You have opened that door: I have to step in! MR RURAC: Moldovan farmers take advantage of the existing legislation. We have very fertile lands in Moldova. They use less fertilizers and yet they have good yields good crops. MR FORTIER: So Moldovan lands are very fertile. They produce, if well managed, good crops. Would you say it was a good idea for Mr Grot to invest in farming when he did in Moldova? MR RURAC: Absolutely, yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I am sorry to	555

www.dianaburden.com

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi			nber 2017 a, Austria
1	interrupt, but I was a little bit surprised about	556 10:11	1	in Europe the average is 45 kilograms. In other	558
2	what you say now because, when I read your report,	10:11	2	countries, in western countries, they even add 160	10:15
3	in particular paragraph 27, I have the impression		2	fertilizers as an average. Our soils are rich but	
4	that this paragraph 27 contradicts completely what		4	the farmers get the crops due to the humus	
5	you say right now.		5	percentage that is contained in the soil.	
6	Do we have the Romanian version?		6	The problem is phosphorous, and I have	
7	Paragraph 27 says, "Currently most of the arable		7	that in paragraph 26. Our soils have a low content	
8	surface is poor and very poorly provided with"		8	of phosphorous which is why these fertilizers need	
9	and then all kinds of things.		9	to be introduced. If Mr Grot had followed our	
10	MR FORTIER: The witness said if I had to		10	recommendation his yields would have been very high,	
11	write it today, it would be different. That is why		11	even higher than the ones in Visoca	
	I		12	MR FORTIER: So it was a good investment	
13	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: That is true but it is		13	for Mr Grot?	
14	strange that the quality of the land changes.		14	MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. It would have been a	
15	MR FORTIER: Very well, I will continue,		15	very good investment for Mr Grot. He was an example	
16	if I may, Mr Chairman, with my questions.		16	for other farmers as well, because he had the	
17	MR GLEASON: Can the witness perhaps		17	technology, he had representatives there, and his	
18	respond to that?		18	technology had a higher performance, and then if he	
19	THE PRESIDENT: Professor Knieper just put		19	had used the fertilizers and the plant protection	
20	a question to you on paragraph 27, so it would be		20	measures, he would have had fairly high crops.	
20	sensible just to hear your response as to why the		20	MR FORTIER: I have one question. I need	
22	apparent contradiction between what you just told		22	to be told how this score is performed.	
23	Mr Fortier that land was good, but as		23	In paragraph 16 you see there you have	
24	Professor Knieper says in paragraph 27 you say land		23 24	reliability score 75, reliability score 66. How are	
25	is poor. Could you explain what your position is?		25	we to understand the way these scores are arrived	
		557			559
1	MR GLEASON: Can I ask them to read paragraph 27 first?	10:12	1 2	at? Either one of you; the one who knows! MR RURAC: This is soil description. It	10:18
3	MR RURAC: I can read all that. Yes.		3	is just the quality of the soil. It is not our	
4	Normally according to science there is		4	data. It is average data.	
5	a big problem, namely the problem with the loss of		5	MR FORTIER: Coming from where?	
6	fertility of the soil, but in practice we see that		6	MR RURAC: From the soils of Moldova. It	
7	the farmers get big crops, and they are increasing		7	is a book, it is a monogram, it is a study. It is a	
8	every year. In Moldova no one is leaving the plots		8	specialised study on agrochemicals.	
9	of land. Everybody wants more land. Everybody		9	MR FORTIER: These are not your numbers?	
10	wants to be in agrobusiness, because 80 per cent		10	These are numbers that you have picked up?	
11	from the soil are chernozem soils which are the most		11	MR RURAC: Yes, that is right.	
12	fertile soils in the world.		12	MR FORTIER: And you have inserted them in	
13	MR FORTIER: Would you like to comment on		13	your report?	
14	that, Mr Gumovschi? Do you agree with Mr Rurac?		14	MR RURAC: Yes.	
15	Would you like to expand?		15	MS CRACIUNEANU: Mr Gumovschi actually	
16	MR GUMOVSCHI: I agree with what he said		16	mentioned that he took this data from the Institute	
17	but I would like to add something. Normally Moldova		17	of Agronomists and Scientific Institute of Agronomy,	
18	soils come from the Steppes. Mr Grot comes from		18	and the translation was not so clear about this.	
19	there where he rented this land. But I would like		19	MR FORTIER: How would you get a score of	
20	to add something. In 1991, for example, when we		20	100?	
21	transitioned from the collective farms and we		21	MS CRACIUNEANU: He didn't hear the	
22	divided the lands, had we then introduced, we said		22	translation.	
23	36 kilograms of fertilizers, nitrogen and phosphate,		23	MR FORTIER: My question is simple. How	
24	there were only 19 kilograms added to the fields the		24	would you arrive at a reliability score of 100?	
25	next year this is an average for 1 ha whereas		25	MR GUMOVSCHI: How we would get to one	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confidenti Revised	al 13 December 20 Vienna, Aust
		560	the sidelines 562
1	hundred percent? I am sorry the translation is not 1		the sidelines. 10:25
2	clear.	2	MS CRACIUNEANU: It is not an answer. It
3 ⊿	This reliability can be done in the	3	is a lack of translation. He said "I don't think it has a foreign capital because it is a limited"
4 5	following way: First of all, organic fertilizers have to be used in order to form the structure and	4	
5 6		-	THE INTERPRETER: Yes, that was translated. I heard that.
6 7	the humus of the soil. Then there needs to be	6 7	MR FORTIER: Mr Gumovschi, do you know the
7 8	mineral fertilizers that I have mentioned recently. Until 1991, we always used for a hectare		
o 9	of arable land up to 5 tons. During these last	8	company? MR GUMOVSCHI: I have heard about this
9 10	years when we carried out research there were used	9 10	company on the media, the television. I haven't
10	only 40-50 kg for 1 ha of arable land. Why?	10	been there, I haven't visited. I don't know the
12	Because the firms disappeared, the cows went back to	12	results. There is not much I can say about them.
13	the village, the cattle numbers decreased, so the	13	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: After your first
14	fertilizers were thrown away in ditches, so we had	13	answers I was a little bit confused about these
15	problems with medium, with the protection of the	14	parts in English in your report. My question is
16	medium because there was pollution in the water, in	16	very simple: did you write the English parts or were
17	the fountains. 80 per cent of the fountain water is	10	they sent to you and you integrated them after
18	polluted, and it is not drinkable water.	18	having understood what was said in the English parts
19	Mr Grot I believe intended to include all	10	of your report?
20	these scientific recommendations and to introduce	20	MR RURAC: We integrated our part.
21	also organic fertilizers, vegetable waste, as	21	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So it was sent by
22	I said, which was used to feed the animals, or they	22	somebody?
23	were just burnt. I believe he would have introduced	23	MR RURAC: We worked with Deloitte. We
	mineral and organic fertilizers, and he would have	24	made or formulated the paragraphs. The English part
24	5		
24 25	used advanced current technology so that the	25	we needed to have translated so we asked them to
25		561	563
1	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think	561 0:23 1	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. 10:27
25 1 2	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think 1 it would have been very good, and it would have been	561 0:23 1 2	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. 10:27 There are some things we don't have. The agronomy
1 2 3	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to	561 0:23 1 2 3	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it
25 1 2 3 4	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow.	561 0:23 2 3 4	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part.
1 2 3 4 5	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much.	561 0:23 1 2 3 4 5	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my
1 2 3 4 5 6	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta?	561 0:23 1 2 3 4 5 6	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know.	561 0:23 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit.	561 0:23 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know.	561 23 4 5 6 7 8 9	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit. MR FORTIER: What do you know?	561 0:23 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as hypothetical investments. You said right now he
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit. MR FORTIER: What do you know? MR RURAC: I know that in Balti in	561 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit. MR FORTIER: What do you know? MR RURAC: I know that in Balti in Floresti there is an agricultural company called	561 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as hypothetical investments. You said right now he would have used this and he would have done that and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit. MR FORTIER: What do you know? MR RURAC: I know that in Balti in Floresti there is an agricultural company called Bio-Alianta.	561 0:23 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as hypothetical investments. You said right now he would have used this and he would have done that and he would have improved. When you talk about
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit. MR FORTIER: What do you know? MR RURAC: I know that in Balti in Floresti there is an agricultural company called Bio-Alianta. MR FORTIER: It is a Moldovan company?	561 0:23 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as hypothetical investments. You said right now he would have used this and he would have done that and he would have improved. When you talk about "Laguardia's operations" or "Laguardia's yields,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit. MR FORTIER: What do you know? MR RURAC: I know that in Balti in Floresti there is an agricultural company called Bio-Alianta. MR FORTIER: It is a Moldovan company? MR RURAC: From what I know it is a	561 0:23 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as hypothetical investments. You said right now he would have used this and he would have done that and he would have improved. When you talk about "Laguardia's production", "Laguardia's performance",
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit. MR FORTIER: What do you know? MR RURAC: I know that in Balti in Floresti there is an agricultural company called Bio-Alianta. MR FORTIER: It is a Moldovan company? MR RURAC: From what I know it is a limited company. I don't think it has foreign	561 0:23 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	563 give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as hypothetical investments. You said right now he would have used this and he would have done that and he would have improved. When you talk about "Laguardia's operations" or "Laguardia's yields, "Laguardia's production", "Laguardia's performance", you always talk about possible production and performance and yields. You never looked into the reality of Laguardia's business. Is that correct?
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit. MR FORTIER: What do you know? MR RURAC: I know that in Balti in Floresti there is an agricultural company called Bio-Alianta. MR FORTIER: It is a Moldovan company? MR RURAC: From what I know it is a limited company. I don't think it has foreign capital.	561 0:23 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as hypothetical investments. You said right now he would have used this and he would have done that and he would have improved. When you talk about "Laguardia's operations" or "Laguardia's yields, "Laguardia's production", "Laguardia's performance", you always talk about possible production and performance and yields. You never looked into the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit. MR FORTIER: What do you know? MR RURAC: I know that in Balti in Floresti there is an agricultural company called Bio-Alianta. MR FORTIER: It is a Moldovan company? MR RURAC: From what I know it is a limited company. I don't think it has foreign capital. MR FORTIER: What do you know about it,	561 0:23 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	563 give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as hypothetical investments. You said right now he would have used this and he would have done that and he would have improved. When you talk about "Laguardia's operations" or "Laguardia's yields, "Laguardia's production", "Laguardia's performance", you always talk about possible production and performance and yields. You never looked into the reality of Laguardia's business. Is that correct?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit. MR FORTIER: What do you know? MR RURAC: I know that in Balti in Floresti there is an agricultural company called Bio-Alianta. MR FORTIER: It is a Moldovan company? MR RURAC: From what I know it is a limited company. I don't think it has foreign capital. MR FORTIER: What do you know about it, Mr Rurac?	561 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as hypothetical investments. You said right now he would have used this and he would have done that and he would have improved. When you talk about "Laguardia's operations" or "Laguardia's yields, "Laguardia's production", "Laguardia's performance", you always talk about possible production and performance and yields. You never looked into the reality of Laguardia's business. Is that correct? MR GUMOVSCHI: In general in our agronomy
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit. MR FORTIER: What do you know? MR RURAC: I know that in Balti in Floresti there is an agricultural company called Bio-Alianta. MR FORTIER: It is a Moldovan company? MR RURAC: From what I know it is a limited company. I don't think it has foreign capital. MR FORTIER: What do you know about it, Mr RURAC: I know that this company has 4	561 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as hypothetical investments. You said right now he would have used this and he would have done that and he would have improved. When you talk about "Laguardia's operations" or "Laguardia's yields, "Laguardia's production", "Laguardia's performance", you always talk about possible production and performance and yields. You never looked into the reality of Laguardia's business. Is that correct? MR GUMOVSCHI : In general in our agronomy science and practice you have to know that from a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit. MR FORTIER: What do you know? MR RURAC: I know that in Balti in Floresti there is an agricultural company called Bio-Alianta. MR FORTIER: It is a Moldovan company? MR RURAC: From what I know it is a limited company. I don't think it has foreign capital. MR FORTIER: What do you know about it, Mr RURAC: I know that this company has 4 or 6,000 ha. I know that this company is quite	561 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as hypothetical investments. You said right now he would have used this and he would have done that and he would have improved. When you talk about "Laguardia's operations" or "Laguardia's yields, "Laguardia's productior!, "Laguardia's performance", you always talk about possible production and performance and yields. You never looked into the reality of Laguardia's business. Is that correct? MR GUMOVSCHI: In general in our agronomy science and practice you have to know that from a small plot of land where all the nutrients have been
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 22 1 12 14 15 16 17 18 19 22 1 14 15 16 17 18 19 22 1 14 15 16 17 18 19 12 14 15 16 16 17 18 19 12 14 15 16 16 16 17 18 19 12 14 15 16 16 17 18 12 14 15 16 16 16 16 16 17 18 10 12 14 15 16	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit. MR FORTIER: What do you know? MR RURAC: I know that in Balti in Floresti there is an agricultural company called Bio-Alianta. MR FORTIER: It is a Moldovan company? MR RURAC: From what I know it is a limited company. I don't think it has foreign capital. MR FORTIER: What do you know about it, Mr RuraC? MR RURAC: I know that this company has 4 or 6,000 ha. I know that this company is quite mechanised. I visited this company with my work in	561 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as hypothetical investments. You said right now he would have used this and he would have done that and he would have improved. When you talk about "Laguardia's operations" or "Laguardia's yields, "Laguardia's production", "Laguardia's performance", you always talk about possible production and performance and yields. You never looked into the reality of Laguardia's business. Is that correct? MR GUMOVSCHI: In general in our agronomy science and practice you have to know that from a small plot of land where all the nutrients have been extracted, there is a period of two or three years
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22	reliability could have reached up to 100. I think it would have been very good, and it would have been a benchmark, an example, for other farmers to follow. MR FORTIER: Thank you very much. Do you know the company Bio-Alianta? MR RURAC: I know. MR GUMOVSCHI: Just a little bit. MR FORTIER: What do you know? MR RURAC: I know that in Balti in Floresti there is an agricultural company called Bio-Alianta. MR FORTIER: It is a Moldovan company? MR RURAC: From what I know it is a limited company. I don't think it has foreign capital. MR FORTIER: What do you know about it, Mr Rurac? MR RURAC: I know that this company has 4 or 6,000 ha. I know that this company is quite mechanised. I visited this company with my work in agrobusiness, so I have seen this company.	561 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	give it to us so that we could put it in our report. There are some things we don't have. The agronomy part I know, but the other part I don't know, but it is our part. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is not really my point of interest. What I am interested in actually is that in your report, and Mr Gumovschi you impressively repeated this just now, you described the investments of Laguardia and Mr Grot as hypothetical investments. You said right now he would have used this and he would have done that and he would have improved. When you talk about "Laguardia's operations" or "Laguardia's yields, "Laguardia's production", "Laguardia's performance", you always talk about possible production and performance and yields. You never looked into the reality of Laguardia's business. Is that correct? MR GUMOVSCHI: In general in our agronomy science and practice you have to know that from a small plot of land where all the nutrients have been extracted, there is a period of two or three years that is needed in order to reach a certain

-) ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confident Revised		iber 2013 a, Austria
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	way which is now being used in our country, and then two or three years later it could get these particular crops we that mentioned. So what we calculated is what the crops would have been during the first two or three years and there was a forecast for these two years. For the future had he used these technologies, then the forecast would have been higher. Had our forecast covered five or six years, then the crops would have been calculated at a higher level. I would like to tell you this, that the famous agronomist member of the academy, Dimtri Bereshnikov (?), he said that the mistakes of agronomists sometimes could be remedied by the introduction of fertilizers. I believe and my forecast is that other elements besides the fertilizers could have been introduced in Mr Grot's enterprise. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So if you had been his adviser you would have advised him scientifically to use technology and fertilizers and pesticides, and under these conditions he would then have made better yields, better productivity, but the question is it is only under these hypotheses that you work.	564 1 10:29 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Moldova again had a loss of 1,250,000,000 USD because of the drought. The district of Soroca Floresti were affected to a lesser extent by drought. We researched the studies, we compared data that were given by the state, the state data from Soroca, and the data coming from Floresti, because they are located in the same geographical area. By using these data that we retrieved from the institute and the data that we obtained locally, we noticed what it was and we wrote about this in the report, but drought affected these two districts less. It was the autumn of 2011 when the cereals, the grains, were quite dry. Wheat, for instance. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: But I didn't really understand completely because you are talking here in your report, as I understood, about hypothetical production. How, then, did you reflect the reality of the drought into this hypothetical production? I simply want to understand how you did that? MR GUMOVSCHI: Scientifically and from the State Commission of Visoca, and the average figures from the two districts, from Soroca and from Floresti. We took the average figures and then we calculated further on from the scientific point of	566
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	It is not the real business of Laguardia that you describe. You describe a possible scenario which could have happened if everything had gone right. Is that correct? MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes. It is true. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you very much. For me that is important My next and last question goes to the same direction. We were told in the submissions that in, I think, 2012 there was an exceptional drought in Moldova. Is that reflected somewhere, this reality of an exceptional drought in Moldova? I know that at the beginning of your report you talk about climatic conditions, but then when I looked into the figures I didn't find anything which would make reference to this exceptional drought which brought Laguardia into difficulties in 2012. Did you integrate the reality of the climatic conditions of 2012 into your report or not? MR GUMOVSCHI: In general, in 2007 and 2012, we faced the biggest drought in Eastern Europe. The Republic of Moldova in 2007, as regards agriculture, underwent losses of 1 billion USD. In 2012, agriculture in the Republic of	565 10:31 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	view the agricultural yield, and we mentioned that in the report. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can you take me to one of these tables where you can explain to me where this is reflected in your tables? MR GUMOVSCHI: These are the data in English. In table 2, in 2012, 2011 and in 2014 you have the figures. The average figures for the crops sunflower, corn, wheat, soya and rape, and data from the testing and experimental centres of Soroca, the average figures for the district of Floresti. The average figures are also ranged for Soroca. From these figures we calculated the crops, the harvest, within the range of 2011 to 2014 for Laguardia. You may notice that we did that per plant that is sunflower, corn, wheat, soya, so you can see that the figures are equal or similar to the figures of the State Institute of Visoca. In the sunflower or in other grains, such as soya or rape, we took up the figures from Visoca. Just a couple of minutes ago my colleague mentioned why is this the situation. Because for smaller areas the harvest is bigger than the crop on bigger areas. You can see on the last row where everything is in bold the figures and compare them,	567 10:36

-	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confiden Revised		
1	the annual harvest :	568 10:39 1	MR RURAC: Yes.	570
		10:39 1	THE PRESIDENT: I would find it helpful	10:43
2	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: But these figures that			
3	you have put here as planned, hypothetical figures	3	not today but in due course to have a copy of	
4	for Laguardia are identical to the figures of	4	that original publication in full to be able to	
5	Visoca, except for the maize. Is that correct?	5	ascertain exactly what this information provides.	
6	MR GUMOVSCHI: Yes.	6	Let me explain why: I am not a farmer,	
7	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: What I do not see is	7	I am just a lawyer, but I assume that the cost of	
8	any effect of climatic extreme conditions, but that	8	farming an area will depend on a number of	
9	cannot be extrapolated from these figures? Or is it	9	variables, including the size being farmed. We	
10	my fault not to understand it?	10	learn constantly about cost benefits of farming very	
11	MR GUMOVSCHI: Drought effects are visible	11	large farms, so we are dealing here with a total	
12	for some crops in Floresti for the average figures.	12	area of 2830 ha. I appreciate it is spread over	
13	If you look at soya, for instance, soya requires a	13	three areas, and we have also had evidence that it	
14	lot of humidity, so the average figure is 0.53. In	14	is in different parcels, so it is not necessarily a	
15	Soroca it was a bit higher, 1.15, while in Visoca it	15		
16	was 2.2, 2.08.	16	Am I right in thinking that the average	
17	What we did was to take average figures	17		
18	for several years, because in Moldova in the past	18	ha is going to be less, and significantly less, than	
19	out of five, one year was a drought year, but now it	19	farming an area of 25 ha per hectare? Is that	
20	so happens that there are two years that have	20	correct?	
21	climatic droughty periods of time, so what we did	21	MR RURAC: Yes, it is correct, but it also	
22	was to take over the average figures for several	22	depends on the technology to be used for the 25 ha	
23	0 0	23		
	years.		area or for the much bigger area.	
24	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you very much.	24 25	THE PRESIDENT: Mr Fortier makes a point that in asking to see the underlying document it is	
25				
25	THE PRESIDENT: I just have a couple of			
1		569		571 10:45
_	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14	569	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today.	
1	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a	569 10:41 1 2	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today.	
1 2 3	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could	569 10:41 1 2 3	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the	
1 2 3 4	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is?	569 10:41 1 2 3 4	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before	
1 2 3 4 5	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after	
1 2 3 4	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of	569 10:41 1 2 3 4	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing	
1 2 3 4 5 6	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing – THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in	571 10:45
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to traditional technologies by use of multiple	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am just saying that I think the Tribunal will find it	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to traditional technologies by use of multiple technological procedures, or means, including Soviet	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am just saying that I think the Tribunal will find it helpful now. Let me explain why I am interested.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to traditional technologies by use of multiple technological procedures, or means, including Soviet technology.	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am just saying that I think the Tribunal will find it helpful now. Let me explain why I am interested. It may be that it is not necessary, but I am trying	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to traditional technologies by use of multiple technological procedures, or means, including Soviet technology. THE PRESIDENT: That is a local land	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am just saying that I think the Tribunal will find it helpful now. Let me explain why I am interested. It may be that it is not necessary, but I am trying to work out my logic here.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to traditional technologies by use of multiple technological procedures, or means, including Soviet technology. THE PRESIDENT: That is a local land publication?	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am just saying that I think the Tribunal will find it helpful now. Let me explain why I am interested. It may be that it is not necessary, but I am trying to work out my logic here. Going straight to the question, this cost	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to traditional technologies by use of multiple technological procedures, or means, including Soviet technology. THE PRESIDENT: That is a local land publication? MR RURAC: Yes, this is a local	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am just saying that I think the Tribunal will find it helpful now. Let me explain why I am interested. It may be that it is not necessary, but I am trying to work out my logic here. Going straight to the question, this cost of mechanised works by year was originally in lei,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to traditional technologies by use of multiple technological procedures, or means, including Soviet technology. THE PRESIDENT: That is a local land publication? MR RURAC: Yes, this is a local publication.	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am just saying that I think the Tribunal will find it helpful now. Let me explain why I am interested. It may be that it is not necessary, but I am trying to work out my logic here. Going straight to the question, this cost of mechanised works by year was originally in lei, it has been converted into USD, it is produced in	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to traditional technologies by use of multiple technological procedures, or means, including Soviet technology. THE PRESIDENT: That is a local land publication? MR RURAC: Yes, this is a local publication. THE PRESIDENT: I see that what it does is	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am just saying that I think the Tribunal will find it helpful now. Let me explain why I am interested. It may be that it is not necessary, but I am trying to work out my logic here. Going straight to the question, this cost of mechanised works by year was originally in lei, it has been converted into USD, it is produced in 2007. How do we know whether this relates to	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to traditional technologies by use of multiple technological procedures, or means, including Soviet technology. THE PRESIDENT: That is a local land publication? MR RURAC: Yes, this is a local publication. THE PRESIDENT: I see that what it does is it comes up with a figure of the cost in USD per	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am just saying that I think the Tribunal will find it helpful now. Let me explain why I am interested. It may be that it is not necessary, but I am trying to work out my logic here. Going straight to the question, this cost of mechanised works by year was originally in lei, it has been converted into USD, it is produced in 2007. How do we know whether this relates to average costs for a small area, 20-30 ha, or very	10:45
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to traditional technologies by use of multiple technological procedures, or means, including Soviet technology. THE PRESIDENT: That is a local land publication? MR RURAC: Yes, this is a local publication. THE PRESIDENT: I see that what it does is it comes up with a figure of the cost in USD per hectare, for example.	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am just saying that I think the Tribunal will find it helpful now. Let me explain why I am interested. It may be that it is not necessary, but I am trying to work out my logic here. Going straight to the question, this cost of mechanised works by year was originally in lei, it has been converted into USD, it is produced in 2007. How do we know whether this relates to average costs for a small area, 20-30 ha, or very large areas of nearly 3000 ha? How do we know that?	10:45
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 18 19 0 21	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to traditional technologies by use of multiple technological procedures, or means, including Soviet technology. THE PRESIDENT: That is a local land publication? MR RURAC: Yes, this is a local publication. THE PRESIDENT: I see that what it does is it comes up with a figure of the cost in USD per hectare, for example. MR RURAC: No, it is in lei. It is	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing – THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity –- this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am just saying that I think the Tribunal will find it helpful now. Let me explain why I am interested. It may be that it is not necessary, but I am trying to work out my logic here. Going straight to the question, this cost of mechanised works by year was originally in lei, it has been converted into USD, it is produced in 2007. How do we know whether this relates to average costs for a small area, 20-30 ha, or very large areas of nearly 3000 ha? How do we know that? MR RURAC: In the guidelines the figures	10:45
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 20 11 12 13 4 15 6 17 8 9 20 12 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to traditional technologies by use of multiple technological procedures, or means, including Soviet technology. THE PRESIDENT: That is a local land publication? MR RURAC: Yes, this is a local publication. THE PRESIDENT: I see that what it does is it comes up with a figure of the cost in USD per hectare, for example. MR RURAC: No, it is in lei. It is transferred. It is converted into Moldovan lei.	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am just saying that I think the Tribunal will find it helpful now. Let me explain why I am interested. It may be that it is not necessary, but I am trying to work out my logic here. Going straight to the question, this cost of mechanised works by year was originally in lei, it has been converted into USD, it is produced in 2007. How do we know whether this relates to average costs for a small area, 20-30 ha, or very large areas of nearly 3000 ha? How do we know that? MR RURAC: In the guidelines the figures are given for small areas and for big areas. There	10:45
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 18 19 0 21	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to traditional technologies by use of multiple technological procedures, or means, including Soviet technology. THE PRESIDENT: That is a local land publication? MR RURAC: Yes, this is a local publication. THE PRESIDENT: I see that what it does is it comes up with a figure of the cost in USD per hectare, for example. MR RURAC: No, it is in lei. It is transferred. It is converted into Moldovan lei. THE PRESIDENT: The original document is	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am just saying that I think the Tribunal will find it helpful now. Let me explain why I am interested. It may be that it is not necessary, but I am trying to work out my logic here. Going straight to the question, this cost of mechanised works by year was originally in lei, it has been converted into USD, it is produced in 2007. How do we know whether this relates to average costs for a small area, 20-30 ha, or very large areas of nearly 3000 ha? How do we know that? MR RURAC: In the guidelines the figures are given for small areas and for big areas. There is a sort of gradient. In fact, there are three	10:45
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 20 11 12 13 4 15 6 17 8 9 20 12 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22	questions. Could I take you to table 6 at page 14 in the report? At the bottom of table 6 you have a source: Costs tariffs in agriculture, 2007. Could you tell us what that is? MR RURAC: This source is a guideline for the farmers which was done by the Institute of Statistics and Technology. They calculated maps with all expenditures and costs for certain quoted areas of arable land, et cetera, et cetera. So all these figures are calculated according to traditional technologies by use of multiple technological procedures, or means, including Soviet technology. THE PRESIDENT: That is a local land publication? MR RURAC: Yes, this is a local publication. THE PRESIDENT: I see that what it does is it comes up with a figure of the cost in USD per hectare, for example. MR RURAC: No, it is in lei. It is transferred. It is converted into Moldovan lei.	569 10:41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a request not to you, but in fact to the Claimant. We do not need it today. MR KOPECKY: Mr President, you see the problem? We were never given this document before the hearing and if it is given to the Tribunal after the hearing THE PRESIDENT: We will deal with that in due course, but you had an opportunity this document has been available for a long time you had an opportunity to ask for the document. I am just saying that I think the Tribunal will find it helpful now. Let me explain why I am interested. It may be that it is not necessary, but I am trying to work out my logic here. Going straight to the question, this cost of mechanised works by year was originally in lei, it has been converted into USD, it is produced in 2007. How do we know whether this relates to average costs for a small area, 20-30 ha, or very large areas of nearly 3000 ha? How do we know that? MR RURAC: In the guidelines the figures are given for small areas and for big areas. There	10:45

www.dianaburden.com

bign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			iber 20 a, Austi
4		572	4		574
1	с с с	10:46	1	machinery, and you have expressed a view on it. Just for me to understand, how much equipment would	10:51
2	average cost per year of 300 USD per ha, that is a		2	· · · · ·	
3 4	rough back-of-the-envelope average. That takes you to a mechanised cost per year of about 840,000 USD.		3 4	you need to engage in the sowing and harvesting of 2830 ha?	
4 5	That seems to be approximately the total 840,000		4 5	MR RURAC: 2800, you said? Sorry, sir?	
6	USD.		6	THE PRESIDENT: If you go back to	
7	Could you tell us how that 840,000 is		7	paragraph 21 of your report, we have the areas	
8	allocated? How much of that is in relation to		8	occupied by Laguardia, and at paragraph 21 you say	
9	capital cost of equipment, depreciating or		9	the total leased area is 2830 ha. My question is,	
10	otherwise, rented, and how much is in relation to		10	and I have explained that I am not a farmer, I have	
11	the operating costs, diesel, petrol, whatever? How		11	no idea how much equipment you need, but you have	
12	does that 840,000 per annum break down?		12	helpfully explained you need sowing equipment and	
13	MR RURAC: I can only say that the tariffs		13	you need harvesting equipment. How much equipment	
14	indicated in the guidelines are exceedingly high,		14	do you need?	
15	exaggerated. We have technologies in Moldova which		15	MR RURAC: Mr President, we have three	
16	use approximately up to 14 technological procedures,		16	different plantations. They refer to different	
17	or means, but we had no other solution for coping		17	procedures of sowing and harvesting. When we	
18	with the farm areas besides the technology we had.		18	harvest wheat then we only harvest wheat. We don't	
19	For instance, Semanatoaea, Great Plains,		19	harvest sunflower. Sunflower comes in autumn. Do	
20	sells grains without any prior farm works, so we had		20	you understand, sir?	
21	no motivation to diminish the costs.		21	THE PRESIDENT: Even I understand that!	
22	THE PRESIDENT: We have had evidence		22	My question is what is the total equipment you would	
23	before us that Laguardia and Mr Grot made capital		23	need to engage in this activity, these different	
24	investments. In CEX-2, the report of Lars Wiechen,		24	crops, over these areas? You told me you were given	
25	we had evidence that there were capital investments,		25	a list. What did the list say in terms of the	
20					
		573			575
1	costs for the acquisition of equipment and vehicles	10:49	1	technologies?	575 10:52
1 2	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to	10:49	2	The reason I am asking is you say at	
1 2 3	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did	10:49	2 3	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information –	
1 2 3 4	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment	10:49	2 3 4	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information –- "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a	
1 2 3 4 5	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm?	10:49	2 3 4 5	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information – "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My	
1 2 3 4 5 6	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the	10:49	2 3 4 5 6	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know that? What did you see?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing	10:49	2 3 4 5 6 7	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know tha? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments,	10:49	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know tha? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked In	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the	10:49	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information – "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know that? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the technical equipment was enough, the productivity was	10:49	2 4 5 7 8 9	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information – "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know that? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they had. They had a highly competent performing type of	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the technical equipment was enough, the productivity was enough, and the technology would cost at least	10:49	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know that? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they had. They had a highly competent performing type of technological	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the technical equipment was enough, the productivity was enough, and the technology would cost at least half	10:49	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know that? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they had. They had a highly competent performing type of technological THE PRESIDENT: I would like details.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the technical equipment was enough, the productivity was enough, and the technology would cost at least half THE INTERPRETER: I don't understand what	10:49	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know that? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they had. They had a highly competent performing type of technological THE PRESIDENT: I would like details. What did they have?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the technical equipment was enough, the productivity was enough, and the technology would cost at least half THE INTERPRETER: I don't understand what "half" is.	10:49	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know that? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they had. They had a highly competent performing type of technological THE PRESIDENT: I would like details. What did they have? MR RURAC: I cannot recall everything.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the technical equipment was enough, the productivity was enough, and the technology would cost at least half THE INTERPRETER: I don't understand what	10:49	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know that? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they had. They had a highly competent performing type of technological THE PRESIDENT: I would like details. What did they have?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the technical equipment was enough, the productivity was enough, and the technology would cost at least half THE INTERPRETER: I don't understand what "half" is. THE PRESIDENT: I think we need some help	10:49	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know tha? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked. In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they had. They had a highly competent performing type of technological THE PRESIDENT: I would like details. What did they have? MR RURAC: I cannot recall everything. There were three caterpillar combines. I don't remember about tractors, two sowing machines, very	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the technical equipment was enough, the productivity was enough, and the technology would cost at least half THE INTERPRETER: I don't understand what "half" is. THE PRESIDENT: I think we need some help on what "half" means. We don't understand.	10:49	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know tha? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked. In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they had. They had a highly competent performing type of technological THE PRESIDENT: I would like details. What did they have? MR RURAC: I cannot recall everything. There were three caterpillar combines. I don't remember about tractors, two sowing machines, very modern ones. Ploughs with discs. Highly performing	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 15 16 17 18	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the technical equipment was enough, the productivity was enough, and the technology would cost at least half THE INTERPRETER: I don't understand what "half" is. THE PRESIDENT: I think we need some help on what "half" means. We don't understand. MR RURAC: If we hypothesise, if we refer	10:49	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 5 16 7 10 11 2 12 11 12 14 15 10 10 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know tha? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked. In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they had. They had a highly competent performing type of technological THE PRESIDENT: I would like details. What did they have? MR RURAC: I cannot recall everything. There were three caterpillar combines. I don't remember about tractors, two sowing machines, very	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the technical equipment was enough, the productivity was enough, and the technology would cost at least half THE INTERPRETER: I don't understand what "half" is. THE PRESIDENT: I think we need some help on what "half" means. We don't understand. MR RURAC: If we hypothesise, if we refer to the table wheat 313.84 what is calculated	10:49	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know tha? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked. In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they had. They had a highly competent performing type of technological THE PRESIDENT: I would like details. What did they have? MR RURAC: I cannot recall everything. There were three caterpillar combines. I don't remember about tractors, two sowing machines, very modern ones. Ploughs with discs. Highly performing tools or mechanised equipment. We do not have	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the technical equipment was enough, the productivity was enough, and the technology would cost at least half THE INTERPRETER: I don't understand what "half" is. THE PRESIDENT: I think we need some help on what "half" means. We don't understand. MR RURAC: If we hypothesise, if we refer to the table wheat 313.84 what is calculated here is a lot of procedures, a lot of traditional	10:49	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 10 11 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information – "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know that? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they had. They had a highly competent performing type of technological –- THE PRESIDENT: I would like details. What did they have? MR RURAC: I cannot recall everything. There were three caterpillar combines. I don't remember about tractors, two sowing machines, very modern ones. Ploughs with discs. Highly performing tools or mechanised equipment. We do not have normative bases for that. That is why we used the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the technical equipment was enough, the productivity was enough, and the technology would cost at least half THE INTERPRETER: I don't understand what "half" is. THE PRESIDENT: I think we need some help on what "half" means. We don't understand. MR RURAC: If we hypothesise, if we refer to the table wheat 313.84 what is calculated here is a lot of procedures, a lot of traditional technological procedures. Wheat, judging by the	10:49	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 20	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know that? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they had. They had a highly competent performing type of technological THE PRESIDENT: I would like details. What did they have? MR RURAC: I cannot recall everything. There were three caterpillar combines. I don't remember about tractors, two sowing machines, very modern ones. Ploughs with discs. Highly performing tools or mechanised equipment. We do not have normative bases for that. That is why we used the costs coming from the guidelines.	10:52
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the technical equipment was enough, the productivity was enough, and the technology would cost at least half THE INTERPRETER: I don't understand what "half" is. THE PRESIDENT: I think we need some help on what "half" means. We don't understand. MR RURAC: If we hypothesise, if we refer to the table wheat 313.84 what is calculated here is a lot of procedures, a lot of traditional technological procedures. Wheat, judging by the present technology, costs that is the mechanical	10:49	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 9\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know that? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they had. They had a highly competent performing type of technological THE PRESIDENT: I would like details. What did they have? MR RURAC: I cannot recall everything. There were three caterpillar combines. I don't remember about tractors, two sowing machines, very modern ones. Ploughs with discs. Highly performing tools or mechanised equipment. We do not have normative bases for that. That is why we used the costs coming from the guidelines. THE PRESIDENT: You have described three	10:52
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22	necessary in the period 2009-2012 which came to 887,000 USD. That is the evidence before us. Did you ask to see any information as to the equipment that Laguardia had purchased for this farm? MR RURAC: We received a list of the equipment that Laguardia had. We saw the sowing machines, the threshing machines, the equipments, and I can confirm that for the respective area the technical equipment was enough, the productivity was enough, and the technology would cost at least half THE INTERPRETER: I don't understand what "half" is. THE PRESIDENT: I think we need some help on what "half" means. We don't understand. MR RURAC: If we hypothesise, if we refer to the table wheat 313.84 what is calculated here is a lot of procedures, a lot of traditional technological procedures. Wheat, judging by the present technology, costs that is the mechanical equipment could cost or could imply two	10:49	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 12\\ 21\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22$	The reason I am asking is you say at paragraph 43 – but you don't give us information "When the lands were leased, ICS Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". My question is how do you know that? What did you see? How are you able to express that opinion? MR RURAC: In simple terms we looked In my case, agricultural farming, I looked at what they had. They had a highly competent performing type of technological THE PRESIDENT: I would like details. What did they have? MR RURAC: I cannot recall everything. There were three caterpillar combines. I don't remember about tractors, two sowing machines, very modern ones. Ploughs with discs. Highly performing tools or mechanised equipment. We do not have normative bases for that. That is why we used the costs coming from the guidelines. THE PRESIDENT: You have described three caterpillars, two sowing machines, ploughs and other	10:52

-) ARB 16 8	Confidenti	al 13 December 20
	niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Revised	Vienna, Aus
bigr 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 22 23 24 25	agronomist, I know them. I know what they are, so I can say. THE PRESIDENT: You see, what you say at paragraph 43 is that "Laguardia had a high productivity agricultural technology". To be shown a picture that indicates this is the technology they were going to use is a different thing from knowing that they actually had that available. What I am trying to get at is how you have understood all you have seen is a photograph. I can show you a photograph, this is my caterpillar, but in fact I don't have one. You have understood? Just showing you a photograph does not establish that is what they actually had, not only available to them in principle, but had purchased, had brought to the land, and it was there about to be used. MR RURAC: To me I understand that a caterpillar combine is just for harvesting. It cannot serve any other purpose. When I saw these highly performing harvesting machines, of course if they are not correctly used, not a good harvest can be obtained. But we, as agronomists, what we think is how to do well, how to obtain a good harvest, not a bad harvest.	576	578 MR FORTIER: You said that you saw the 10:58 photos of this machinery on site. What site are you referring to? MR RURAC: Pictures had been taken in a certain place. We received them from Mr Grot's representative in Moldova. We received those pictures. MR FORTIER: And they were on the site on some of the lots that he had leased. Is that correct? MR RURAC: Yes, or even all. The whole equipment. That is all the machinery. Because we asked for the list of the technology, that is all the technological equipment in order for us know all the equipment in order to calculate the mechanisation costs. But, as I said before, we don't have a normative basis for that. That is why we used the figures in the guideline. THE PRESIDENT: Did you visit the sites at Cosernita, at Varvareuca and Rosietici? MR RURAC: No. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Gumovschi? MR GUMOVSCHI: I was in Rosietici, but I did not know exactly what lands they were, which land was which, so to say. I went to Floresti and
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 31 4 15 16	a bad harvest. THE PRESIDENT: I understand, but what I am putting to you is that you never saw the machines. You saw photographs of the machines? MR RURAC: Only in the picture. THE PRESIDENT: Did the picture show the equipment present and ready to be used or being used at the site? Or were they catalogue-type photographs? I am just curious to know what you had seen. MR RURAC: No. They were pictures taken on site. They were not catalogue-type. It was a list with all types; that is, these pictures were followed by a list. They are not coming from a catalogue. THE PRESIDENT: And, Claimant, do we have that in evidence?	577 10:57 10:57 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Iand was which, so to say. I went to Floresti and 579 to Soroca and to Visoca. As to the farmlands, 11:00 I just saw all the farmlands 11:00 MR KOPECKY: Just a general note, I know 11 is not exactly responsive to what has just been said, but I think it needs to be clarified for the public record of this hearing that there were certain cut-off dates for putting in evidence, and I do agree that Respondent did not put in a rebuttal report. However, to put in evident was on Claimants and we have been extremely liberal and flexible with evidence being presented later on, before and during this hearing, but I would strongly object to the Tribunal asking for any evidence to be put in at or after the hearing, even though Respondent did not submit a rebuttal report here, because those are unrelated issues and it is the issue of the burden
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	MR GLEASON: No, we do not. The list and	17	of proof.
	the pictures?	18	THE PRESIDENT: We take your point and it
	THE PRESIDENT: The list and the pictures	19	is on the record. We will take it under advisement
	that was made available as the basis for the report?	20	MR KOPECKY: Only for the record. Thank
	MR GLEASON: I don't believe that is on	21	you.
	record.	22	THE PRESIDENT: You will be aware that in
	THE PRESIDENT: We will confer, but we may	23	2011 this project fell into difficulty, and in none
	well have further requests in relation to that	24	of these three areas Cosernita, Varvareuca,
	issue.	25	Rosietici was there ever actually any harvesting.

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi			nber 2017 a, Austria
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	What would happen, for example, to the harvesting equipment that is said to have been purchased? Do you just throw it away, or do you just sell it? MR GUMOVSCHI: What I know is that Mr Grot's representative displayed them for sale to be sold. That is what I know. How many machines were sold we don't know. We have the list in our computer, the pictures of where they had been stored, these machines. We can leave that with you. That is what we know. THE PRESIDENT: Your testimony is that the machinery that you had identified in photographs and on lists was put up for sale. Do you know when it was put up for sale? Do you recall? I realise it is some years ago. Do you have a rough recollection? MR GUMOVSCHI: It was one year and a half, maybe two years before. At that time approximately that we learnt about it, one and a half years back or so. THE PRESIDENT: Would it be possible, having regard to practice in Moldova, to find out what happened to this equipment? Is there a central register, for example, of such equipment so we are able to ascertain whether or not it was sold or	580	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 8 19 20 12 22 24 25	issue as to what the value of the equipment presently is, how much of it was sold. Those are open questions still. To generally claim that all the equipment was sold pursuant to Respondent's cited exhibit is an open issue in our minds THE PRESIDENT: That is understood. The purpose of my question was only we have these two gentlemen with us, they are experts in this field, they know how things work in Moldova in this domain, I have no idea. I was trying to benefit and get a sense of what equipment was available and what had happened to it. I think we have taken that as far as we can go. I am very grateful to you. I don't know whether there are questions from my colleagues, or any follow up in relation to the Tribunal's questions from the Claimant, very briefly? MR GLEASON: If I may just ask a follow up question. Re-examination by Claimant MR GLEASON: There was some concern about the figures you used in table 2 not taking into consideration a drought year. I would like to put table 2 back up for you. You calculate these numbers using a forward-looking approach. In other	582 11:05
$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\2\\3\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\32\\4\\25\end{array}$	whether it remains unsold? MR GUMOVSCHI: There is no such register or evidence. It is only the selling companies, those companies which sell the equipment and that purchase new equipment who may have such lists, or maybe the taxation agency would have this data. We don't have such data. MR FORTIER: I recall that the Respondent talked specifically about the machinery in their pleadings and they said they could not be claimed by Mr Grot because they belonged to the company, right? MR KOPECKY: Yes, and further there is evidence on the record in the form of exhibits R-9 and R-11 that the equipment was sold and when it was sold and to whom and under what conditions. THE PRESIDENT: I appreciate that. MR ASTUNO: If Claimants might respond? THE PRESIDENT: I was trying to get from the experts here, who have given expert opinion including on aspects of equipment, what they know. I appreciate that, I want to understand what they know about this equipment and what happened to it. I am grateful for your honest answers. MR ASTUNO: Mr President, if we might also be on the record on this point, it is still an open		$1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \ 7 \ 8 \ 9 \ 10 \ 11 \ 12 \ 13 \ 14 \ 15 \ 16 \ 17 \ 18 \ 19 \ 20 \ 22 \ 22 \ 22 \ 25 \ 25 \ 25 \ 25$	words, you were asked to put yourself in the shoes of Laguardia in 2011 and calculate the potential yields looking forward from that point. Is that an accurate description of what you were asked to do? MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: So you used the figures of 2007-2010 for the Floresti and Soroca average yields, and 2006-2010 for the Visoca centre yield, as the table clearly shows. MR RURAC: Yes. MR GLEASON: So those periods do take into consideration drought conditions, true? MR RURAC: Yes, of course. In 2007, when average figures were obtained, that year was also very droughty. It was a drought year. When we planned and programmed everything, again, we did take into consideration drought. The harvest for sunflower 2.87, we can say that in a regular year the harvest is even 4.5, but 2.85 is a year which does include the drought year. There are years when peasants, when farmers, obtained even a harvest of 4.5, but the 2.85 reflects the fact that there was a drought year.	583

) ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			iber 201 a, Austri
		Revis	ed 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 2 13 14		a, Austr 586
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, I think we have reached the end. We are very grateful to you for making your time available and coming to Vienna. Enjoy the rest of your visit here. You are now released. Let's take a 15 minute break to rearrange the room. We will resume at 25 past 11 to hear Mr Wiechen. (Short break from 11.10 am to 11.28 am) LARS WIECHEN	1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	for simplicity reasons and to be more conservative, not to confuse operating expenses with capital expenditure. Capital expenditures is kind of exclusive for the investment in fixed assets, and we excluded the operating expenses from my original calculation. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. As we can see here, for fiscal years 2009 and 2010 there are denominated amounts. How were those numbers justified?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE PRESIDENT: Mr Wiechen, welcome. My name is Philippe Sands. I have the privilege to chair this Tribunal. I sit with Mr Fortier and Professor Knieper. Could you begin by simply reading out the declaration in front of you? MR WIECHEN: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Welcome to this proceedings. I think we will begin with presentations, questions, introductory statement or a mix of all of the above, and Mr Astuno will commence. MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. Examination by Claimants MR ASTUNO: Mr Wiechen, thank you for being with us here today. Could you start by briefly explaining this presentation that is now appearing on screen, CH-9? MR WIECHEN: This presentation basically provides just a brief background of myself, of what I have been asked to do. That means to provide an independent, objective assessment of potential		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 15 16 7 8 9 20 21 22 3	MR WECHEN: Basically what we did was we had a field team travelling to Moldova and identifying or verifying the existence of the equipment. Secondly, from an accounting point of view, we investigated their fixed asset registers, basically the financial statements of Laguardia, and looked for entries in the fixed asset register which are investments for the years 2009 and 2010. We cross-referenced the financial entries with custom documents to ensure that only the equipment which has been contributed by the company before September 2010 are included in our calculations. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. My next question pertains to a request on allocation of damages that Claimants have filed in this case. You do not need to know about the details of that but I wanted to put that on the record before I make this question. What do the financial records indicate insofar as who was the party that paid for this equipment and vehicles? MR WIECHEN: We made an analysis of pertaining documents, like copies of bills of sale, sales invoices and certificates of transfer, which clearly evidenced that either Mr Grot or one of his	587 10:31

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi			a, Austi
		588			590
1		10:33		don't have any inventories, and it was too	10:36
2	capital of the Moldovan entity, Laguardia SRL.			simplified and also incorporating the criticism from	
3	MR ASTUNO: I now want to turn our			KPMG's report I concluded that working capital is	
4 7	attention to the forward-looking damages analysis			indeed a very, very important variable in	
5	that was applied by both experts in this case.		5	calculating a DCF, so this was an omission I regret,	
6 7	Would you care to comment why you believe that a		6 7	yes.	
7	forward-looking lost profits analysis was justified		7	MR ASTUNO: That has now been correctly	
8	in this matter?		8	calculated, just to be clear, and that has been	
9	MR WIECHEN: Considering this investment,		9 10	updated as of today? MR WECHEN: Yes.	
10	I would not classify it as a newly-established business due to the fact that we had accounting		10	MR ASTUNO: I would now like to, first of	
11	6				
12	records proving that Mr Grot ran quite successfully			all, identify this slide. If you could just	
13	farming operations in Poland. We have been provided			identify what this number represents, particularly	
4	with documentation from his accountants which prove			the number that is highlighted [slide 13)	
15 16	that he generated net or profit margins even close to 50 per cent in Poland, and secondly, even if you		15 16	MR WIECHEN: Basically we calculated potential damages for each location separately based	
16 17	to 50 per cent in Poland, and secondly, even if you analyse the financial statements of Laguardia SPI		16 17		
-	analyse the financial statements of Laguardia SRL, you see that 2010 was guite a successful year where		17 18	on an income approach, applying the discounted cash	
8 9	the company also had a profit margin I think even		18 19	flow method separately for each location. What you can see here is basically the sum of potential	
9	above 30 per cent, which made me reasonably believe		20		
			20 21	damages resulting from each location summing up in 2.75 million USD.	
21 22	that Mr Grot is a capable businessman in agriculture.		21	MR ASTUNO: That does not account for	
3	Secondly, we consulted with agricultural		23	interest. Is that correct?	
.3	experts and, based on our discussions with the		23 24	MR WIECHEN: Correct (slide 15)	
- -	•		25	MR ASTUNO: Regarding pre-judgment	
25	agricultural experts, and they have decades of				
		589			591
1	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt	589 10:35		interest, could you explain to the Tribunal why you	591 10:37
1	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking		2	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted	591 10:37
1 2 3	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case.		2 3	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital?	591 10:37
1 2 3 4	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked		2 3 4	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important	591 10:37
1 2 3 4 5	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they		2 3 4 5	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking	591 10:37
1 2 3 4 5 6	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked		2 3 4	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of	591 10:37
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante		2 3 4 5 6 7	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking	591 10:37
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes.		2 3 4 5 6 7	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case	591 10:37
	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct?		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should	591 10:37
	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: And as of the year 2010?		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should be at minimum be rewarded for the opportunity cost	591 10:37
	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: And as of the year 2010? Approximately the valuation date		2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should be at minimum be rewarded for the opportunity cost of capital which is basically the next best	591 10:37
	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: And as of the year 2010? Approximately the valuation date MR WIECHEN: The valuation date which is		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should be at minimum be rewarded for the opportunity cost of capital which is basically the next best alternative which has been foregone.	591 10:37
1234557390123	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: And as of the year 2010? Approximately the valuation date MR WIECHEN: The valuation date which is clearly stated in our reports was February 2011 for		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should be at minimum be rewarded for the opportunity cost of capital which is basically the next best alternative which has been foregone. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now direct the	591 10:37
	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: And as of the year 2010? Approximately the valuation date MR WIECHEN: The valuation date which is clearly stated in our reports was February 2011 for the location Cosernita, and 10 March for the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should be at minimum be rewarded for the opportunity cost of capital which is basically the next best alternative which has been foregone. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now direct the parties and the Tribunal's attention to the slides	591 10:37
123456739012345	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: And as of the year 2010? Approximately the valuation date MR WIECHEN: The valuation date which is clearly stated in our reports was February 2011 for the location Cosernita, and 10 March for the locations in Varvareuca and Rosietici		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should be at minimum be rewarded for the opportunity cost of capital which is basically the next best alternative which has been foregone. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now direct the parties and the Tribunal's attention to the slides in our presentation which updates the numbers after	591 10:37
1234567890123456	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: And as of the year 2010? Approximately the valuation date MR WIECHEN: The valuation date which is clearly stated in our reports was February 2011 for the location Cosernita, and 10 March for the locations in Varvareuca and Rosietici MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now would like		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should be at minimum be rewarded for the opportunity cost of capital which is basically the next best alternative which has been foregone. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now direct the parties and the Tribunal's attention to the slides in our presentation which updates the numbers after applying pre-judgment interest.	591 10:37
12345678901234567	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: And as of the year 2010? Approximately the valuation date MR WIECHEN: The valuation date which is clearly stated in our reports was February 2011 for the location Cosernita, and 10 March for the locations in Varvareuca and Rosietici MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now would like to turn to an issue that was raised by Respondent's		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should be at minimum be rewarded for the opportunity cost of capital which is basically the next best alternative which has been foregone. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now direct the parties and the Tribunal's attention to the slides in our presentation which updates the numbers after applying pre-judgment interest. Mr Wiechen, I now would like to discuss in	591 10:37
123456789012345678	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: And as of the year 2010? Approximately the valuation date MR WIECHEN: The valuation date which is clearly stated in our reports was February 2011 for the location Cosernita, and 10 March for the locations in Varvareuca and Rosietici MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now would like to turn to an issue that was raised by Respondent's expert report in that report and that pertains to		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 7 18	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should be at minimum be rewarded for the opportunity cost of capital which is basically the next best alternative which has been foregone. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now direct the parties and the Tribunal's attention to the slides in our presentation which updates the numbers after applying pre-judgment interest. Mr Wiechen, I now would like to discuss in particular the expert report prepared by	591 10:37
1234567890123456789	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: And as of the year 2010? Approximately the valuation date MR WIECHEN: The valuation date which is clearly stated in our reports was February 2011 for the location Cosernita, and 10 March for the locations in Varvareuca and Rosietici MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now would like to turn to an issue that was raised by Respondent's expert report in that report and that pertains to one of the variables that is part of the stated DCF		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 7 18	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should be at minimum be rewarded for the opportunity cost of capital which is basically the next best alternative which has been foregone. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now direct the parties and the Tribunal's attention to the slides in our presentation which updates the numbers after applying pre-judgment interest. Mr Wiechen, I now would like to discuss in particular the expert report prepared by Mr Michael Peer on behalf of the Respondent in this	10:37
12345678901234567890	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: And as of the year 2010? Approximately the valuation date MR WIECHEN: The valuation date which is clearly stated in our reports was February 2011 for the location Cosernita, and 10 March for the locations in Varvareuca and Rosietici MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now would like to turn to an issue that was raised by Respondent's expert report in that report and that pertains to one of the variables that is part of the stated DCF calculation known as a change in working capital		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should be at minimum be rewarded for the opportunity cost of capital which is basically the next best alternative which has been foregone. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now direct the parties and the Tribunal's attention to the slides in our presentation which updates the numbers after applying pre-judgment interest. Mr Wiechen, I now would like to discuss in particular the expert report prepared by Mr Michael Peer on behalf of the Respondent in this matter. Before we get into any specifics, would you	10:37
123456739012345678901	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: And as of the year 2010? Approximately the valuation date MR WIECHEN: The valuation date which is clearly stated in our reports was February 2011 for the location Cosernita, and 10 March for the locations in Varvareuca and Rosietici MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now would like to turn to an issue that was raised by Respondent's expert report in that report and that pertains to one of the variables that is part of the stated DCF calculation known as a change in working capital. Can you explain our current insertion of this		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should be at minimum be rewarded for the opportunity cost of capital which is basically the next best alternative which has been foregone. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now direct the parties and the Tribunal's attention to the slides in our presentation which updates the numbers after applying pre-judgment interest. Mr Wiechen, I now would like to discuss in particular the expert report prepared by Mr Michael Peer on behalf of the Respondent in this matter. Before we get into any specifics, would you care to generally summarise your impressions of this	10:37
1234567890123456789012	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: And as of the year 2010? Approximately the valuation date MR WIECHEN: The valuation date which is clearly stated in our reports was February 2011 for the location Cosernita, and 10 March for the locations in Varvareuca and Rosietici MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now would like to turn to an issue that was raised by Respondent's expert report in that report and that pertains to one of the variables that is part of the stated DCF calculation known as a change in working capital Can you explain our current insertion of this variable and how that came to be.		$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should be at minimum be rewarded for the opportunity cost of capital which is basically the next best alternative which has been foregone. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now direct the parties and the Tribunal's attention to the slides in our presentation which updates the numbers after applying pre-judgment interest. Mr Wiechen, I now would like to discuss in particular the expert report prepared by Mr Michael Peer on behalf of the Respondent in this matter. Before we get into any specifics, would you care to generally summarise your impressions of this report and some of the main points you would like to	10:37
	experience in agriculture in Moldova, I felt reasonably satisfied in applying a forward-looking DCF analysis in this case. MR ASTUNO: To be clear you worked alongside the local agricultural experts, they forecasted the damages in this case on an ex ante basis. Is that correct? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: And as of the year 2010? Approximately the valuation date MR WIECHEN: The valuation date which is clearly stated in our reports was February 2011 for the location Cosernita, and 10 March for the locations in Varvareuca and Rosietici MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now would like to turn to an issue that was raised by Respondent's expert report in that report and that pertains to one of the variables that is part of the stated DCF calculation known as a change in working capital Can you explain our current insertion of this variable and how that came to be. MR WIECHEN: Basically in my First Expert		$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 1\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	thought it was appropriate to apply the weighted average cost of capital? MR WIECHEN: Basically one important component to take into consideration when talking about pre-award interest rates is the element of opportunity costs and especially in an investor case like this on hand, I believe that an investor should be at minimum be rewarded for the opportunity cost of capital which is basically the next best alternative which has been foregone. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I now direct the parties and the Tribunal's attention to the slides in our presentation which updates the numbers after applying pre-judgment interest. Mr Wiechen, I now would like to discuss in particular the expert report prepared by Mr Michael Peer on behalf of the Respondent in this matter. Before we get into any specifics, would you care to generally summarise your impressions of this report and some of the main points you would like to address today?	10:37

-) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia rised	al 13 Decem Vienna	
1	That means he used many times information which	592	1	Would you care to describe how he relied upon their	594
2	became known or knowledgeable after the valuation	20100	2	work for some of the inputs, but not all?	10112
3	date.		3	MR WECHEN: Analysing Mr Peer's	
4	I would like to highlight at this point		4	assumptions, I have not seen the consistency in	
5	that we performed an ex ante analysis. This		5	applying the yields, that means tons per hectare,	
6	analysis requires that we take only into		6	for each crop. Sometimes he uses national averages	
7	consideration that information known or		7	from one area, then national averages from the other	
8	knowledgeable until the valuation date, or the date		8	area, and sometimes he uses the expert numbers	
9	of injury which is equal to the valuation date.		9	One of the overriding principles applied	
10	MR ASTUNO: Was there a difference in		10	in business valuation is to be consistent in the	
11	methodology in regards to where information was		11	source from which you derive your information.	
12	derived from, especially as it pertains to costs?		12	I have not read any substantiation for the	
13	MR WECHEN: If you refer to underlying		13	assumptions Mr Peer took as regards the yields per	
14	information, for example, if you refer to the		14	crop.	
15	agricultural report, for instance, although this		15	MR ASTUNO: Do you think there is a	
16	report has been dated 5 January 2017, it only took		16	difference between being an expert in valuation and	
17	into consideration information which has been		17	being an expert in the specific company or industry	
18	available as of the date of revocation of lease		18	that is being valued?	
19	agreements in the respective locations.		19	MR WECHEN: There is a huge difference.	
20	MR ASTUNO: I would like to discuss your		20	MR ASTUNO: Can you explain how that	
21	collaboration a bit with the local agricultural		21	difference affects the credibility of Mr Peer's	
22	experts who just testified. Can you explain why you		22	report insofar as he does not rely upon a local	
23	believe it is more reliable to rely on the input of		23	expert, for yields as least?	
24	local experts when conducting a business valuation?		24	MR WIECHEN: Apparently, as I have used	
25	MR WECHEN: I believe that agriculture is		25	the inputs from the agricultural experts, I strongly	
	a very specific and particular business, and that	593 10:41	1	believe that this is the right methodology rather	595 10:44
1 2	a very specific and particular business, and that pretty much depends on the location. You cannot	593 10:41	1	believe that this is the right methodology rather than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics	
1	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot			than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics	
1	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another.		2	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the	
1 2 3	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to		2 3	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics	
1 2 3 4	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another.		2 3 4	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent	
1 2 3 4 5	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost		2 3 4 5	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable.	
1 2 3 4 5 6	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for		2 3 4 5 6	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have		2 3 4 5 6 7	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case. I discussed, or the team discussed, with		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions? THE PRESIDENT: I think if you could	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case. I discussed, or the team discussed, with the two experts and we gained reasonable certainty		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions? THE PRESIDENT: I think if you could rephrase the question and continue with I think	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case. I discussed, or the team discussed, with the two experts and we gained reasonable certainty as regards to the quality of the information		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions? THE PRESIDENT: I think if you could rephrase the question and continue with I think you recognised it was leading.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case. I discussed, or the team discussed, with the two experts and we gained reasonable certainty as regards to the quality of the information provided by them, and we relied on the information		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions? THE PRESIDENT: I think if you could rephrase the question and continue with I think you recognised it was leading. MR ASTUNO: Would you please explain the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case. I discussed, or the team discussed, with the two experts and we gained reasonable certainty as regards to the quality of the information provided by them, and we relied on the information provided by those experts.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions? THE PRESIDENT: I think if you could rephrase the question and continue with I think you recognised it was leading. MR ASTUNO: Would you please explain the methodology that Mr Peer used when calculating	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case. I discussed, or the team discussed, with the two experts and we gained reasonable certainty as regards to the quality of the information provided by them, and we relied on the information provided by those experts. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to contrast		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions? THE PRESIDENT: I think if you could rephrase the question and continue with I think you recognised it was leading. MR ASTUNO: Would you please explain the methodology that Mr Peer used when calculating Laguardia's costs?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case. I discussed, or the team discussed, with the two experts and we gained reasonable certainty as regards to the quality of the information provided by them, and we relied on the information provided by these experts. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to contrast that methodology to the one employed by Mr Peer?		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions? THE PRESIDENT: I think if you could rephrase the question and continue with I think you recognised it was leading. MR ASTUNO: Would you please explain the methodology that Mr Peer used when calculating Laguardia's costs? MR WIECHEN: Mr Peer actually used the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 11 12 3 14 15 16 17 11 12 3 14 15 16 17 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case. I discussed, or the team discussed, with the two experts and we gained reasonable certainty as regards to the quality of the information provided by them, and we relied on the information provided by these experts. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to contrast that methodology to the one employed by Mr Peer? MR WIECHEN: In principle, Mr Peer applied		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions? THE PRESIDENT: I think if you could rephrase the question and continue with I think you recognised it was leading. MR ASTUNO: Would you please explain the methodology that Mr Peer used when calculating Laguardia's costs? MR WIECHEN: Mr Peer actually used the operating costs which have been used also in	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case. I discussed, or the team discussed, with the two experts and we gained reasonable certainty as regards to the quality of the information provided by them, and we relied on the information provided by those experts. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to contrast that methodology to the one employed by Mr Peer? MR WIECHEN: In principle, Mr Peer applied a very extensive benchmarking analysis using		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions? THE PRESIDENT: I think if you could rephrase the question and continue with I think you recognised it was leading. MR ASTUNO: Would you please explain the methodology that Mr Peer used when calculating Laguardia's costs? MR WIECHEN: Mr Peer actually used the operating costs which have been used also in Deloitte's report.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case. I discussed, or the team discussed, with the two experts and we gained reasonable certainty as regards to the quality of the information provided by them, and we relied on the information provided by those experts. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to contrast that methodology to the one employed by Mr Peer? MR WIECHEN: In principle, Mr Peer applied a very extensive benchmarking analysis using guideline companies which are stock-listed entities		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions? THE PRESIDENT: I think if you could rephrase the question and continue with I think you recognised it was leading. MR ASTUNO: Would you please explain the methodology that Mr Peer used when calculating Laguardia's costs? MR WIECHEN: Mr Peer actually used the operating costs which have been used also in Deloitte's report. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to comment on	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 16 17 18 19	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case. I discussed, or the team discussed, with the two experts and we gained reasonable certainty as regards to the quality of the information provided by them, and we relied on the information provided by those experts. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to contrast that methodology to the one employed by Mr Peer? MR WIECHEN: In principle, Mr Peer applied a very extensive benchmarking analysis using guideline companies which are stocklisted entities operating in different countries, operating		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions? THE PRESIDENT: I think if you could rephrase the question and continue with I think you recognised it was leading. MR ASTUNO: Would you please explain the methodology that Mr Peer used when calculating Laguardia's costs? MR WIECHEN: Mr Peer actually used the operating costs which have been used also in Deloitte's report. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to comment on the assumption that the costs would remain as	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case. I discussed, or the team discussed, with the two experts and we gained reasonable certainty as regards to the quality of the information provided by them, and we relied on the information provided by those experts. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to contrast that methodology to the one employed by Mr Peer? MR WIECHEN: In principle, Mr Peer applied a very extensive benchmarking analysis using guideline companies which are stock-listed entities operating in different countries, operating different business models, some of them are even		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions? THE PRESIDENT: I think if you could rephrase the question and continue with I think you recognised it was leading. MR ASTUNO: Would you please explain the methodology that Mr Peer used when calculating Laguardia's costs? MR WIECHEN: Mr Peer actually used the operating costs which have been used also in Deloitte's report. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to comment on the assumption that the costs would remain as predicted by the local experts, but at the same time	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22 23	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case. I discussed, or the team discussed, with the two experts and we gained reasonable certainty as regards to the quality of the information provided by them, and we relied on the information provided by these experts. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to contrast that methodology to the one employed by Mr Peer? MR WIECHEN: In principle, Mr Peer applied a very extensive benchmarking analysis using guideline companies which are stocklisted entities operating in different countries, operating different business models, some of them are even traders or have different business models, rather than the production and sale of agricultural products.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions? THE PRESIDENT: I think if you could rephrase the question and continue with I think you recognised it was leading. MR ASTUNO: Would you please explain the methodology that Mr Peer used when calculating Laguardia's costs? MR WIECHEN: Mr Peer actually used the operating costs which have been used also in Deloitte's report. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to comment on the assumption that the costs would remain as predicted by the local experts, but at the same time the yields would be used based on national average data? MR WIECHEN: It is a matter of fact that	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 8 9 20 21 22	pretty much depends on the location. You cannot simply copy and paste from one country to another. You cannot even copy and paste from one district to the other in a country. I think it is of utmost importance to have the input of local experts for agriculture, and Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi have decades of experience in this case. I discussed, or the team discussed, with the two experts and we gained reasonable certainty as regards to the quality of the information provided by them, and we relied on the information provided by these experts. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to contrast that methodology to the one employed by Mr Peer? MR WIECHEN: In principle, Mr Peer applied a very extensive benchmarking analysis using guideline companies which are stocklisted entities operating in different countries, operating different business models, some of them are even traders or have different business models, rather than the production and sale of agricultural		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	than relying on averages from Moldovan statistics which are basically, as we learn from the agricultural experts, not one hundred percent reliable. MR ASTUNO: And isn't it true, though, that Mr Peer did rely upon the local experts for cost assumptions? THE PRESIDENT: I think if you could rephrase the question and continue with I think you recognised it was leading. MR ASTUNO: Would you please explain the methodology that Mr Peer used when calculating Laguardia's costs? MR WIECHEN: Mr Peer actually used the operating costs which have been used also in Deloitte's report. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to comment on the assumption that the costs would remain as predicted by the local experts, but at the same time the yields would be used based on national average data?	

oign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi		al 13 Decem Vienna	
		596			598
1	hand, using more input factors with higher cost will	10:45	1	Denmark, Russia.	10:49
2	directly lead to higher revenues		2	MR ASTUNO: And the industries that these	
3	MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I would now like		3	companies operate in?	
4 =	to focus on the emphasis the KPMG report places on		4	MR WIECHEN: They are different.	
5 6	guideline companies.		5	MR ASTUNO: Do any one of these companies	
7	First of all, can you explain where these guideline companies are derived? Where KPMG found		6 7	represent the cost structure in the specific business model that Laguardia had in place as of	
' 3	this information?		8	2010?	
))	MR WIECHEN: Those guideline companies		9	MR WIECHEN: No.	
0	Deloitte used for calculating the cost of capital,		10	(Slide 21)	
1	particularly the beta factor and the debt to equity		11	MR ASTUNO: I would like to turn our	
2	ratio.		12	attention to the next slide regarding some conflicts	
3	MR ASTUNO: Your reliance on these		13	or disagreements that the two respective expert	
4	companies, was that limited to the beta calculation?		14	reports had. What is being assessed generally on	
5	MR WECHEN: Beta and debt to equity, and		15	this slide, Mr Wiechen?	
6	the cost of capital calculation.		16	MR WIECHEN: This is basically a	
7	MR ASTUNO: Did that comparison at all		17	methodical error or calculation error Mr Peer did.	
8	relate to your calculation of projected revenue?		18	He did not deduct the appreciation to arrive at his	
9	MR WECHEN: No.		19	operating profit, namely the EBITDA, but he added	
0	MR ASTUNO: Projected costs?		20	the depreciation expenses to derive at the	
1	MR WIECHEN: No.		21	discounted cash flows which somehow is an adjustment	
2	MR ASTUNO: Does Mr Peer, however, use		22	or creates a positive cash inflow with no economic	
3	these guideline companies when discussing		23	basis.	
	profitability?		24	MR ASTUNO: Thank you. Could you please	
4			25	briefly describe Mr Peer's calculation of income tax	
24 25	MR WIECHEN: He used those companies, as		-		
	MR WIECHEN: He used those companies, as	597	-		599
25	you can see on this slide (20) to make a	597 10:47	1	in this calculation?	599 10:50
25 1 2	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis.		1 2	MR WIECHEN: As you can see, the operating	
25 1 2	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a		1 2 3	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making.	
25 1 2 3 4	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach?		1 2 3 4	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which	
1 2 3 4 5 -	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide		1 2 3 4 5	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus	
1 2 3 4 5 6	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business.		1 2 3 4 5 6	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MR WIECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the	599 10:50
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 3	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you	
1 2 3 4 5 7 3 9	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis?		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You	
	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis? MR WIECHEN: As to the profit margins, as		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You need profits to pay taxes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0 1	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis? MR WIECHEN: As to the profit margins, as we can see on this slide 20 are also historical		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You need profits to pay taxes. MR ASTUNO: To be clear, under Mr Peer's	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0 1 2	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis? MR WIECHEN: As to the profit margins, as we can see on this slide 20 are also historical ones, it is not a violation of the ex ante approach.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You need profits to pay taxes. MR ASTUNO: To be clear, under Mr Peer's analysis, Laguardia was cash negative, or had	
	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis? MR WIECHEN: As to the profit margins, as we can see on this slide 20 are also historical ones, it is not a violation of the ex ante approach. The point I would like to make on this slide is		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You need profits to pay taxes. MR ASTUNO: To be clear, under Mr Peer's analysis, Laguardia was cash negative, or had negative earnings. Is that the case?	
	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis? MR WIECHEN: As to the profit margins, as we can see on this slide 20 are also historical ones, it is not a violation of the ex ante approach. The point I would like to make on this slide is basically if you just look for the standard		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You need profits to pay taxes. MR ASTUNO: To be clear, under Mr Peer's analysis, Laguardia was cash negative, or had negative earnings. Is that the case? MR WIECHEN: The earnings are negative in	
	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis? MR WIECHEN: As to the profit margins, as we can see on this slide 20 are also historical ones, it is not a violation of the ex ante approach. The point I would like to make on this slide is basically if you just look for the standard deviation of those two margins, gross and EBITDA		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You need profits to pay taxes MR ASTUNO: To be clear, under Mr Peer's analysis, Laguardia was cash negative, or had negative earnings. Is that the case? MR WIECHEN: The earnings are negative in this.	
1234567390123456	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis? MR WIECHEN: As to the profit margins, as we can see on this slide 20 are also historical ones, it is not a violation of the ex ante approach. The point I would like to make on this slide is basically if you just look for the standard deviation of those two margins, gross and EBITDA margins, you can see that it is immense. There is a		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You need profits to pay taxes MR ASTUNO: To be clear, under Mr Peer's analysis, Laguardia was cash negative, or had negative earnings. Is that the case? MR WIECHEN: The earnings are negative in this. MR ASTUNO: Could you briefly describe, in	
12345673901234567	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis? MR WIECHEN: As to the profit margins, as we can see on this slide 20 are also historical ones, it is not a violation of the ex ante approach. The point I would like to make on this slide is basically if you just look for the standard deviation of those two margins, gross and EBITDA margins, you can see that it is immense. There is a big variety from margins for the gross margin from		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You need profits to pay taxes. MR ASTUNO: To be clear, under Mr Peer's analysis, Laguardia was cash negative, or had negative earnings. Is that the case? MR WECHEN: The earnings are negative in this. MR ASTUNO: Could you briefly describe, in your experience, is it common to see a historically	
123456739012345678	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis? MR WIECHEN: As to the profit margins, as we can see on this slide 20 are also historical ones, it is not a violation of the ex ante approach. The point I would like to make on this slide is basically if you just look for the standard deviation of those two margins, gross and EBITDA margins, you can see that it is immense. There is a big variety from margins for the gross margin from 52 to minus 37 per cent, which indicates that those		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You need profits to pay taxes MR ASTUNO: To be clear, under Mr Peer's analysis, Laguardia was cash negative, or had negative earnings. Is that the case? MR WECHEN: The earnings are negative in this. MR ASTUNO: Could you briefly describe, in your experience, is it common to see a historically profitable enterprise suddenly then begin to incur	
5 1234567890123456789	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis? MR WIECHEN: As to the profit margins, as we can see on this slide 20 are also historical ones, it is not a violation of the ex ante approach. The point I would like to make on this slide is basically if you just look for the standard deviation of those two margins, gross and EBITDA margins, you can see that it is immense. There is a big variety from margins for the gross margin from		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You need profits to pay taxes. MR ASTUNO: To be clear, under Mr Peer's analysis, Laguardia was cash negative, or had negative earnings. Is that the case? MR WECHEN: The earnings are negative in this. MR ASTUNO: Could you briefly describe, in your experience, is it common to see a historically	
1	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis? MR WIECHEN: As to the profit margins, as we can see on this slide 20 are also historical ones, it is not a violation of the ex ante approach. The point I would like to make on this slide is basically if you just look for the standard deviation of those two margins, gross and EBITDA margins, you can see that it is immense. There is a big variety from margins for the gross margin from 52 to minus 37 per cent, which indicates that those averages derived cannot be reliable Because at the end of the day they are not directly comparable		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You need profits to pay taxes. MR ASTUNO: To be clear, under Mr Peer's analysis, Laguardia was cash negative, or had negative earnings. Is that the case? MR WECHEN: The earnings are negative in this. MR ASTUNO: Could you briefly describe, in your experience, is it common to see a historically profitable enterprise suddenly then begin to incur negative earnings without making any adjustment to its cost structure?	
5 123456739012345678901	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis? MR WIECHEN: As to the profit margins, as we can see on this slide 20 are also historical ones, it is not a violation of the ex ante approach. The point I would like to make on this slide is basically if you just look for the standard deviation of those two margins, gross and EBITDA margins, you can see that it is immense. There is a big variety from margins for the gross margin from 52 to minus 37 per cent, which indicates that those averages derived cannot be reliable Because at the		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You need profits to pay taxes. MR ASTUNO: To be clear, under Mr Peer's analysis, Laguardia was cash negative, or had negative earnings. Is that the case? MR WIECHEN: The earnings are negative in this. MR ASTUNO: Could you briefly describe, in your experience, is it common to see a historically profitable enterprise suddenly then begin to incur negative earnings without making any adjustment to its cost structure? MR WIECHEN: (Shrugged)	
5 1234567390123456789012	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis? MR WIECHEN: As to the profit margins, as we can see on this slide 20 are also historical ones, it is not a violation of the ex ante approach. The point I would like to make on this slide is basically if you just look for the standard deviation of those two margins, gross and EBITDA margins, you can see that it is immense. There is a big variety from margins for the gross margin from 52 to minus 37 per cent, which indicates that those averages derived cannot be reliable Because at the end of the day they are not directly comparable companies. Those are stock listed companies. MR ASTUNO: Would you care to comment		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You need profits to pay taxes. MR ASTUNO: To be clear, under Mr Peer's analysis, Laguardia was cash negative, or had negative earnings. Is that the case? MR WECHEN: The earnings are negative in this. MR ASTUNO: Could you briefly describe, in your experience, is it common to see a historically profitable enterprise suddenly then begin to incur negative earnings without making any adjustment to its cost structure?	
25 12345678901234567890	you can see on this slide (20) to make a profitability analysis. MR ASTUNO: Do you think that was a reasonable approach? MR WIECHEN: I think this does not provide a value added for the valuation of the business. MR ASTUNO: Is that related to the fact that the valuation study is done on an ex ante basis? MR WIECHEN: As to the profit margins, as we can see on this slide 20 are also historical ones, it is not a violation of the ex ante approach. The point I would like to make on this slide is basically if you just look for the standard deviation of those two margins, gross and EBITDA margins, you can see that it is immense. There is a big variety from margins for the gross margin from 52 to minus 37 per cent, which indicates that those averages derived cannot be reliable Because at the end of the day they are not directly comparable companies. Those are stock listed companies.		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MR WECHEN: As you can see, the operating profit is negative, so the business is loss-making. Then Mr Peer deducted taxes from this amount which basically is a positive impact, that means minus plus minus makes plus, and implies it is a business which actually saved money by paying taxes, so the right amount of taxes would be zero, because you don't pay taxes on negative results, right? You need profits to pay taxes. MR ASTUNO: To be clear, under Mr Peer's analysis, Laguardia was cash negative, or had negative earnings. Is that the case? MR WIECHEN: The earnings are negative in this. MR ASTUNO: Could you briefly describe, in your experience, is it common to see a historically profitable enterprise suddenly then begin to incur negative earnings without making any adjustment to its cost structure? MR WIECHEN: (Shrugged) MR ASTUNO: Is that common for you to see	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi		al 13 Decem Vienna	
1	cost structure?	600	4	To be door there is an amount that was	602
1 2		10:52	1	To be clear there is an errata that was	10:55
2 3	MR WECHEN: Rarely the case.		2	prepared by Mr Peer recently submitted to you. Were	
	MR ASTUNO: I know it is very technical,		3 4	any of these aforementioned issues cured?	
1 =	but would you care to describe some of the primary issues that you found in Mr Peer's calculation of		4 5	MR WIECHEN: The working capital issues? No.	
5	-		6	MR ASTUNO: The assumption that the costs	
5 7	the net working capital variable? MR WIECHEN: Working capital, as we		7	would remain high and the yield inputs would remain	
' 3	previously acknowledged, is an important factor to		8	average?	
) 9	consider when applying a discounted cash flow		9	MR WIECHEN: No.	
9 0	method. These are basically data derived from table		9 10	MR FORTIER: Where is that in your paper	
1	F2 in the KPMG report.		11	submission? What you have just underlined as being	
2	If you just look at this table (slide 23)		12	one of the most severe errors made by Mr Peer.	
3	there is one line popping up into the eye of the		13	MR WECHEN: It is on page 24.	
4	educated reader which is basically the inventory		14	MR FORTIER: Thank you. We can read it	
5	balance, which is much, much bigger than the trades		15	for ourselves.	
6	receivable balance, which is usually not the case.		16	MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I believe we might	
7	Here Mr Peer did a calculation error because he		17	have a couple of remaining minutes, Mr Wiechen.	
8	calculated the inventory balance by using revenues		18	Would you care to defend why you believe the	
9	and multiplying the revenues with the days inventory		19	weighted average cost of capital is the correct	
0	outstanding. He should have multiplied the cost of		20	discount rate to apply in this matter?	
1	goods sold or direct input costs and multiplied them		21	MR WECHEN: One of the elemental steps in	
2	by the days inventory outstanding, so this led to a		22	performing a business valuation in general is to set	
3	complete overestimation of inventory and a		23	a standard of value. That means the question value	
4	significant downward adjustment to potential		24	to whom? I believe that the standard fair market	
	cash flow.		25	value is the most frequent standard of value used in	
25					
-		601	1	business valuation and also in the context of loss	603
1	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe	601 10:53	1		603 10:56
1	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing	601 10:53	2	of business value calculations	
1 2 3	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate?	601 10:53	2 3	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies	
1 2 3 4	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would	601 10:53	2 3 4	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between	
1 2 3 4 5	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because	601 10:53	2 3 4 5	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length	
1 2 3 4 5 6	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would	601 ^{10:53}	2 3 4	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between	10:56
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to	601 10:53	2 3 4 5 6	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business	10:56
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 3	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see.	601 10:53	2 3 4 5 6 7	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market	10:56
I 2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask	601 10:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital	10:56
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask Ms Nitschke, what is my time?	601 10:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital structure, and on the other hand this would also	10:56
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0 1	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask Ms Nitschke, what is my time? Perhaps a note for the record, if the	601 10:53	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital structure, and on the other hand this would also maximise the business value. That capital is	10:56
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0 1 2	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask Ms Nitschke, what is my time? Perhaps a note for the record, if the Tribunal could review the particular analysis	601 10:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital structure, and on the other hand this would also maximise the business value. That capital is usually less expensive than equity capital. That	10:56
1 2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0 1 2 3	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask Ms Nitschke, what is my time? Perhaps a note for the record, if the Tribunal could review the particular analysis regarding the working capital? I am afraid we don't	601 10:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital structure, and on the other hand this would also maximise the business value. That capital is usually less expensive than equity capital. That means you would induce more debt into your company	10:56
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0 1 2 3 4	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask Ms Nitschke, what is my time? Perhaps a note for the record, if the Tribunal could review the particular analysis regarding the working capital? I am afraid we don't have time to review this analysis further.	601 10:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital structure, and on the other hand this would also maximise the business value. That capital is usually less expensive than equity capital. That means you would induce more debt into your company until you reached the minimum point which maximises	10:56
1234567390123456	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask Ms Nitschke, what is my time? Perhaps a note for the record, if the Tribunal could review the particular analysis regarding the working capital? I am afraid we don't have time to review this analysis further. MR WIECHEN: Honestly, I want to help, and this is a significant valuation error here, because although Mr Peer has calculated the working capital	601 10:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital structure, and on the other hand this would also maximise the business value. That capital is usually less expensive than equity capital. That means you would induce more debt into your company until you reached the minimum point which maximises the business value, and this is the reason why we	10:56
1234567390123456	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask Ms Nitschke, what is my time? Perhaps a note for the record, if the Tribunal could review the particular analysis regarding the working capital? I am afraid we don't have time to review this analysis further. MR WIECHEN: Honestly, I want to help, and this is a significant valuation error here, because although Mr Peer has calculated the working capital as outlined in the previous slide, he does not apply	601 10:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital structure, and on the other hand this would also maximise the business value. That capital is usually less expensive than equity capital. That means you would induce more debt into your company until you reached the minimum point which maximises the business value, and this is the reason why we use an optimal capital structure, that means the weighted average capital structure of debt and equity.	10:56
123456789012345678	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask Ms Nitschke, what is my time? Perhaps a note for the record, if the Tribunal could review the particular analysis regarding the working capital? I am afraid we don't have time to review this analysis further. MR WIECHEN: Honestly, I want to help, and this is a significant valuation error here, because although Mr Peer has calculated the working capital as outlined in the previous slide, he does not apply the working capital and changes of working capital	601 10:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital structure, and on the other hand this would also maximise the business value. That capital is usually less expensive than equity capital. That means you would induce more debt into your company until you reached the minimum point which maximises the business value, and this is the reason why we use an optimal capital structure, that means the weighted average capital structure of debt and equity. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I understand that	10:56
1234567390123456789	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask Ms Nitschke, what is my time? Perhaps a note for the record, if the Tribunal could review the particular analysis regarding the working capital? I am afraid we don't have time to review this analysis further. MR WIECHEN: Honestly, I want to help, and this is a significant valuation error here, because although Mr Peer has calculated the working capital as outlined in the previous slide, he does not apply the working capital and changes of working capital in his own DCF calculation, because he uses the	601 10:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital structure, and on the other hand this would also maximise the business value. That capital is usually less expensive than equity capital. That means you would induce more debt into your company until you reached the minimum point which maximises the business value, and this is the reason why we use an optimal capital structure, that means the weighted average capital structure of debt and equity. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I understand that you have a lot of experience in collaborating and	10:56
12345678901234567890	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask Ms Nitschke, what is my time? Perhaps a note for the record, if the Tribunal could review the particular analysis regarding the working capital? I am afraid we don't have time to review this analysis further. MR WIECHEN: Honestly, I want to help, and this is a significant valuation error here, because although Mr Peer has calculated the working capital as outlined in the previous slide, he does not apply the working capital and changes of working capital in his own DCF calculation, because he uses the operating expenses of the following year as working	601 10:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital structure, and on the other hand this would also maximise the business value. That capital is usually less expensive than equity capital. That means you would induce more debt into your company until you reached the minimum point which maximises the business value, and this is the reason why we use an optimal capital structure, that means the weighted average capital structure of debt and equity. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I understand that you have a lot of experience in collaborating and working alongside local experts. Would you care to	10:56
123456739012345678901	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask Ms Nitschke, what is my time? Perhaps a note for the record, if the Tribunal could review the particular analysis regarding the working capital? I am afraid we don't have time to review this analysis further. MR WIECHEN: Honestly, I want to help, and this is a significant valuation error here, because although Mr Peer has calculated the working capital as outlined in the previous slide, he does not apply the working capital and changes of working capital in his own DCF calculation, because he uses the operating expenses of the following year as working capital balance, which leads to a complete	601 10:53	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital structure, and on the other hand this would also maximise the business value. That capital is usually less expensive than equity capital. That means you would induce more debt into your company until you reached the minimum point which maximises the business value, and this is the reason why we use an optimal capital structure, that means the weighted average capital structure of debt and equity. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I understand that you have a lot of experience in collaborating and working alongside local experts. Would you care to comment on your particular experience working with	10:56
1234567390123456789012	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask Ms Nitschke, what is my time? Perhaps a note for the record, if the Tribunal could review the particular analysis regarding the working capital? I am afraid we don't have time to review this analysis further. MR WIECHEN: Honestly, I want to help, and this is a significant valuation error here, because although Mr Peer has calculated the working capital as outlined in the previous slide, he does not apply the working capital and changes of working capital in his own DCF calculation, because he uses the operating expenses of the following year as working capital balance, which leads to a complete understatement of cashflows. This is a capital	601 10:53	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital structure, and on the other hand this would also maximise the business value. That capital is usually less expensive than equity capital. That means you would induce more debt into your company until you reached the minimum point which maximises the business value, and this is the reason why we use an optimal capital structure, that means the weighted average capital structure of debt and equity. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I understand that you have a lot of experience in collaborating and working alongside local experts. Would you care to comment on your particular experience working with Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi, and just to generally	10:56
	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask Ms Nitschke, what is my time? Perhaps a note for the record, if the Tribunal could review the particular analysis regarding the working capital? I am afraid we don't have time to review this analysis further. MR WIECHEN: Honestly, I want to help, and this is a significant valuation error here, because although Mr Peer has calculated the working capital as outlined in the previous slide, he does not apply the working capital and changes of working capital in his own DCF calculation, because he uses the operating expenses of the following year as working capital balance, which leads to a complete understatement of cashflows. This is a capital mistake, I think even the biggest in the entire	601 10:53	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital structure, and on the other hand this would also maximise the business value. That capital is usually less expensive than equity capital. That means you would induce more debt into your company until you reached the minimum point which maximises the business value, and this is the reason why we use an optimal capital structure, that means the weighted average capital structure of debt and equity. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I understand that you have a lot of experience in collaborating and working alongside local experts. Would you care to comment on your particular experience working with Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi, and just to generally describe how you perceive the reliability and	10:56
1234567390123456789012	MR ASTUNO: Would you now care to describe an issue or issues that you discovered in reviewing Mr Peer's calculation of the discount rate? MR WIECHEN: If you don't mind, I would like to continue with the working capital because I believe this is very important for the Tribunal to see. MR ASTUNO: Of course. If I may ask Ms Nitschke, what is my time? Perhaps a note for the record, if the Tribunal could review the particular analysis regarding the working capital? I am afraid we don't have time to review this analysis further. MR WIECHEN: Honestly, I want to help, and this is a significant valuation error here, because although Mr Peer has calculated the working capital as outlined in the previous slide, he does not apply the working capital and changes of working capital in his own DCF calculation, because he uses the operating expenses of the following year as working capital balance, which leads to a complete understatement of cashflows. This is a capital	601 10:53	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	of business value calculations This standard of fair market value implies that we are talking here about a price between knowledgeable willing partners in an arm's length transaction which are engaged to transfer business in between themselves, and those hypothetical market participants would strive to optimise the capital structure, and on the other hand this would also maximise the business value. That capital is usually less expensive than equity capital. That means you would induce more debt into your company until you reached the minimum point which maximises the business value, and this is the reason why we use an optimal capital structure, that means the weighted average capital structure of debt and equity. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. I understand that you have a lot of experience in collaborating and working alongside local experts. Would you care to comment on your particular experience working with Mr Rurac and Mr Gumovschi, and just to generally	10:56

∠bign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi			nber 2017 a, Austria
1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	604 10:58	1	1-16, it is effectively a new report, and only pages	606
2	I am reasonably satisfied with all the input data	10:28	2	17 and following are in fact a reaction to Mr Peer's	
3	I received from them on areas where I am not an		3	report. I understand we agreed for an extension on	
4	expert – I am not an agricultural expert – and		4	time, but I would like to put it on record that this	
5	yes, it was a fruitful collaboration.		5	was done without Tribunal approval because there	
6	MR ASTUNO: I apologise we have limited		6	was, as you yesterday clarified, Mr President, only	
7	time, but thank you for being here and for your		7	a reservation on that and not an allowance to submit	
8	presentation. I believe there will be some further		8	a new report.	
9	questions. Thank you.		9	THE PRESIDENT: Let's proceed.	
10	THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky?		10	MR KOPECKY: Just a point of order.	
11	MR KOPECKY: Thank you.		11	Good morning, Mr Wiechen. Before we start	
12	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Mr Wiechen, I have one		12	with specific questions I would like to tell you, as	
13	technical question. I worked with your initial		13	you have heard, we received your new report ten	
14	report. When you go to page 8 of your initial		14	hours ago, so many of my questions will be	
15	report you have the capital expenditure. There is a		15	pertaining to your original report and if your	
16	table, table No 1. This table No 1 talks about		16	answer would be "I have addressed this in the	
17	equipment and vehicles for fiscal year 9 and 10. In		17	supplemental report", just bear with me, we will get	
18	your new report the figures do not match. Why is		18	there, and if I do not get there you will be able to	
19	that? It cannot be that you excluded the operating		19	clarify. I only worked with what I had and that was	
20	expenses because that is a different line. When you		20	your original report.	
21	look up on table		21	MR WIECHEN: So the report filed at the	
22	MR WIECHEN: I do not have my original		22	beginning of the year?	
23	report here.		23	MR KOPECKY: Correct.	
24 25	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Perhaps with your permission, we can hand it to you. (Same handed)		24 25	MR WIECHEN: Okay. MR FORTIER: To be clear, that is the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR WIECHEN: It is different. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: How does that come? MR WIECHEN: First of all, there was not the exclusion of operating expenses. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: That comes later. MR WIECHEN: But you are referring to the first line? PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Yes. MR WIECHEN: This was basically an additional recalculation of the initial investment costs. We revisited our analysis when again, after filing the initial report, we went again through the fixed asset registers of the company, identified again, and this is the reason why we have these	605 11:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	 16 January 2017 report, right? MR KOPECKY: 16 January, correct. MR ASTUNO: Would it be okay to approach Mr Wiechen with a copy of that report for the purposes of this line of questioning? MR KOPECKY: He must have it. THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely. (Same handed) MR KOPECKY: I would like to turn to table 1 in that report on page 8, which is the alleged actual investment cost, and there I would like to turn to Capex, which you indicated for the first four years being 09, 10, 11 and 12 as 451,711, 389,528, 204, and 46,032. If I may turn you to paragraph 18 of your First Report, which is on page 5, you say that "Deloitte team members have visited the Republic of Moldova (Floresti district) where they have inspected the equipment, (ie 	607 11:04
15 16 17 18	differences in the numbers PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Slightly lower? MR WECHEN: Yes, they are slightly lower. PROFESSOR KNIEPEP: Thenk you		18	tractors and machines), and had discussions with the	
16 17 18 19	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Slightly lower? MR WIECHEN: Yes, they are slightly lower. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you.		18 19	local administrator of Laguardia SRL".	
16 17 18 19 20	PROFESSOR KNIEPER:Slightly lower?MR WIECHEN:Yes, they are slightly lower.PROFESSOR KNIEPER:Thank you.Cross-examination by Respondent		18 19 20	local administrator of Laguardia SRL". Could you confirm that those assets were	
16 17 18 19 20 21	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Slightly lower? MR WIECHEN: Yes, they are slightly lower. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: MR KOPECKY: Good morning, Dr Wiechen.		18 19 20 21	local administrator of Laguardia SRL". Could you confirm that those assets were still owned by Laguardia, meaning under Claimant's	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Slightly lower? MR WECHEN: Yes, they are slightly lower. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good morning, Dr Wiechen. Before I get to you, I would like to address one		18 19 20 21 22	local administrator of Laguardia SRL". Could you confirm that those assets were still owned by Laguardia, meaning under Claimant's control? Is that your expert assertion?	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Slightly lower? MR WIECHEN: Yes, they are slightly lower. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good morning, Dr Wiechen. Before I get to you, I would like to address one point of order. I understand that the Tribunal		18 19 20 21 22 23	local administrator of Laguardia SRL". Could you confirm that those assets were still owned by Laguardia, meaning under Claimant's control? Is that your expert assertion? MR WIECHEN: This is not an assertion	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Slightly lower? MR WECHEN: Yes, they are slightly lower. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good morning, Dr Wiechen. Before I get to you, I would like to address one		18 19 20 21 22	local administrator of Laguardia SRL". Could you confirm that those assets were still owned by Laguardia, meaning under Claimant's control? Is that your expert assertion?	

) ARB 16 8 C niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confidentia Revised	al 13 Decemb Vienna,	
-		608	-	610
1	assumption was that Mr Grot did not have physical 11			11:08
2	control over the assets.	2	that correct?	
3	MR KOPECKY: Yet they are included in the	3	MR WIECHEN: This is correct.	
4	report. I would like you to explain where you note	4	MR KOPECKY: Is it also correct that you	
5	that the Claimants still own these assets for which	5	did not include any evidence, any of those documents	
6	they purportedly claim value? Because they own	6	just mentioned, with your expert report? You said	
7	these assets still, as we have just established, so	7	you reviewed them but they are not included with	
8	where do you indicate that in your report?	8	your report.	
9	MR ASTUNO: Pardon me. I don't believe we	9	MR WIECHEN: We filed the financial	
10	have established ownership or entitlement to assets	10	statements of Laguardia. We filed the fixed asset	
11	or anything along those lines. I believe that is an	11	register, so all necessary accounting records.	
12	open issue.	12	MR KOPECKY: Mr Wiechen, are you aware	
13	. MR KOPECKY: Well, that is a conflicting	13	that the portion of the machinery owned by Laguardia	
14	position. Who has them now?	14	was contributed to another company, Laguardia	
15	THE PRESIDENT: We have noted your	15	Agribusiness Ltd's share capital?	
16	objection, Mr Astuno. Why don't you continue with	16	MR ASTUNO: Mr President, I thought we	
17	the questioning, but be particularly careful not to	10	just established	
	put words into the mouth of the expert in the sense	17	MR KOPECKY: It is just a question.	
18		18		
19	of making questions which are premised on a matter		I will put a document to him later on	
20	which is not addressed. I have paragraph 18 in	20	THE PRESIDENT: Why don't you put the	
21	front of me. It doesn't actually say anything in	21	document to him now?	
22	terms about who owns what and who has title.	22	MR KOPECKY: I want to know if he knows of	
23	MR KOPECKY: I apologise for that. We	23	it before I show him the document	
24	have not established that with you or in your	24	THE PRESIDENT: Frame the question very	
	report \N/e had actablished that before	25	neutrally, if you could.	
25	report. We had established that before.			
_	6	:09		611
1	6 The question would be how you made sure 11	509 07 1	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion	611 11 : 10
1	6 The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the	009 107 1 2	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed	611 11:10
1	6 The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants?	009 107 2 3	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion 1 of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital?	611 11:10
1 2 3 4	The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as	009 107 2 3 4	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do	611 11:10
1 2 3 4	6 The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants?	009 107 2 3	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction	611 11:10
1 2 3 4 5	The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as	009 107 2 3 4	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do	611 11:10
1 2 3 4 5 6	6 The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation,	509 107 2 3 4 5	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction	611 11:10
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	6 The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of	509 107 2 3 4 5 6	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is	611 11:10
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	6 The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We	509 12 3 4 5 6 7	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case?	611 11:10
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	6 The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset	009 123 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9.	611 11:10
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs	009 1234 5 6 7 8 9	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and	611 11:10
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs documents, and achieved from an accounting point of	2009 107 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and show it? He is entitled to see it	611 11:10
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs documents, and achieved from an accounting point of view reasonable certainty as regards the existence of those assets based on the accounting records	009 127 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and show it? He is entitled to see it MR KOPECKY: It is coming. (Displayed) I appreciate you won't be able to read all of this,	611 11:10
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs documents, and achieved from an accounting point of view reasonable certainty as regards the existence of those assets based on the accounting records THE PRESIDENT: Reasonable certainty they	009 107 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and show it? He is entitled to see it MR KOPECKY: It is coming. (Displayed) I appreciate you won't be able to read all of this, but if we scroll through it and if we go to the list	611 11:10
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs documents, and achieved from an accounting point of view reasonable certainty as regards the existence of those assets based on the accounting records THE PRESIDENT: Reasonable certainty they had been purchased?	009 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and show it? He is entitled to see it MR KOPECKY: It is coming. (Displayed) I appreciate you won't be able to read all of this, but if we scroll through it and if we go to the list of assets here, it mentions on the first page	611
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The question would be how you made sure 113 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs documents, and achieved from an accounting point of view reasonable certainty as regards the existence of those assets based on the accounting records THE PRESIDENT: Reasonable certainty they had been purchased? MR WIECHEN: They have been purchased.	009 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and show it? He is entitled to see it MR KOPECKY: It is coming. (Displayed) I appreciate you won't be able to read all of this, but if we scroll through it and if we go to the list of assets here, it mentions on the first page sprinklers, disc harrows, harvesters of certain	611
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The question would be how you made sure 11. you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs documents, and achieved from an accounting point of view reasonable certainty as regards the existence of those assets based on the accounting records THE PRESIDENT: Reasonable certainty they had been purchased? MR WIECHEN: They have been purchased. THE PRESIDENT: But no expression of you	009 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and show it? He is entitled to see it MR KOPECKY: It is coming. (Displayed) I appreciate you won't be able to read all of this, but if we scroll through it and if we go to the list of assets here, it mentions on the first page sprinklers, disc harrows, harvesters of certain brands, truck-lift Volvo, and so on and so forth, so	611
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	The question would be how you made sure 113 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs documents, and achieved from an accounting point of view reasonable certainty as regards the existence of those assets based on the accounting records THE PRESIDENT: Reasonable certainty they had been purchased? MR WIECHEN: They have been purchased. THE PRESIDENT: But no expression of you as to what has happened to them subsequently?	009 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and show it? He is entitled to see it MR KOPECKY: It is coming. (Displayed) I appreciate you won't be able to read all of this, but if we scroll through it and if we go to the list of assets here, it mentions on the first page sprinklers, disc harrows, harvesters of certain brands, truck-lift Volvo, and so on and so forth so a lot of machinery that was contributed by a foreign	611
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18	The question would be how you made sure 11 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs documents, and achieved from an accounting point of view reasonable certainty as regards the existence of those assets based on the accounting records THE PRESIDENT: Reasonable certainty they had been purchased? MR WIECHEN: They have been purchased. THE PRESIDENT: But no expression of you as to what has happened to them subsequently? MR WIECHEN: I have not investigated what	009 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and show it? He is entitled to see it MR KOPECKY: It is coming. (Displayed) I appreciate you won't be able to read all of this, but if we scroll through it and if we go to the list of assets here, it mentions on the first page sprinklers, disc harrows, harvesters of certain brands, truck-lift Volvo, and so on and so forth, so a lot of machinery that was contributed by a foreign invested enterprise, Laguardia Ltd, to Laguardia	611
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 18 19	The question would be how you made sure 113 you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs documents, and achieved from an accounting point of view reasonable certainty as regards the existence of those assets based on the accounting records THE PRESIDENT: Reasonable certainty they had been purchased? MR WIECHEN: They have been purchased. THE PRESIDENT: But no expression of you as to what has happened to them subsequently? MR WIECHEN: I have not investigated what has happened with these assets, so this is not my	2009 107 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and show it? He is entitled to see it MR KOPECKY: It is coming. (Displayed) I appreciate you won't be able to read all of this, but if we scroll through it and if we go to the list of assets here, it mentions on the first page sprinklers, disc harrows, harvesters of certain brands, truck-lift Volvo, and so on and so forth, so a lot of machinery that was contributed by a foreign invested enterprise, Laguardia Ltd, to Laguardia Agrobusiness. I appreciate you cannot evaluate the	611
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The question would be how you made sure 11: you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs documents, and achieved from an accounting point of view reasonable certainty as regards the existence of those assets based on the accounting records THE PRESIDENT: Reasonable certainty they had been purchased? MR WIECHEN: They have been purchased. THE PRESIDENT: But no expression of you as to what has happened to them subsequently? MR WIECHEN: I have not investigated what has happened with these assets, so this is not my expertise. I look in the accounts and I have found	209 107 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and show it? He is entitled to see it MR KOPECKY: It is coming. (Displayed) I appreciate you won't be able to read all of this, but if we scroll through it and if we go to the list of assets here, it mentions on the first page sprinklers, disc harrows, harvesters of certain brands, truck-lift Volvo, and so on and so forth, so a lot of machinery that was contributed by a foreign invested enterprise, Laguardia Ltd, to Laguardia Agrobusiness. I appreciate you cannot evaluate the legal quality of this document. I wanted to ask	611
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 18 19 0 21	The question would be how you made sure 11: you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WIECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs documents, and achieved from an accounting point of view reasonable certainty as regards the existence of those assets based on the accounting records THE PRESIDENT: Reasonable certainty they had been purchased? MR WIECHEN: They have been purchased. THE PRESIDENT: But no expression of you as to what has happened to them subsequently? MR WIECHEN: I have not investigated what has happened with these assets, so this is not my expertise. I look in the accounting books.	009 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and show it? He is entitled to see it MR KOPECKY: It is coming. (Displayed) I appreciate you won't be able to read all of this, but if we scroll through it and if we go to the list of assets here, it mentions on the first page sprinklers, disc harrows, harvesters of certain brands, truck-lift Volvo, and so on and so forth, so a lot of machinery that was contributed by a foreign invested enterprise, Laguardia Ltd, to Laguardia Agrobusiness. I appreciate you cannot evaluate the legal quality of this document. I wanted to ask whether you were aware that this contribution took	611
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 20 11 12 13 4 15 6 17 8 9 20 12 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22	The question would be how you made sure 11: you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs documents, and achieved from an accounting point of view reasonable certainty as regards the existence of those assets based on the accounting records THE PRESIDENT: Reasonable certainty they had been purchased? MR WIECHEN: They have been purchased. THE PRESIDENT: But no expression of you as to what has happened to them subsequently? MR WIECHEN: I have not investigated what has happened with these assets, so this is not my expertise. I look in the accounting books. THE PRESIDENT: It is not a critique.	009 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and show it? He is entitled to see it MR KOPECKY: It is coming. (Displayed) I appreciate you won't be able to read all of this, but if we scroll through it and if we go to the list of assets here, it mentions on the first page sprinklers, disc harrows, harvesters of certain brands, truck-lift Volvo, and so on and so forth, so a lot of machinery that was contributed by a foreign invested enterprise, Laguardia Ltd, to Laguardia Agrobusiness. I appreciate you cannot evaluate the legal quality of this document. I wanted to ask whether you were aware that this contribution took place on 28 November 2012? Were you told that this	611
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 20 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	The question would be how you made sure 11: you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs documents, and achieved from an accounting point of view reasonable certainty as regards the existence of those assets based on the accounting records THE PRESIDENT: Reasonable certainty they had been purchased? MR WIECHEN: They have been purchased. THE PRESIDENT: But no expression of you as to what has happened to them subsequently? MR WIECHEN: I have not investigated what has happened with these assets, so this is not my expertise. I look in the accounting books. THE PRESIDENT: It is not a critique. I want to be very clear that you are testifying your	2009 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and show it? He is entitled to see it MR KOPECKY: It is coming. (Displayed) I appreciate you won't be able to read all of this, but if we scroll through it and if we go to the list of assets here, it mentions on the first page sprinklers, disc harrows, harvesters of certain brands, truck-lift Volvo, and so on and so forth, so a lot of machinery that was contributed by a foreign invested enterprise, Laguardia Ltd, to Laguardia Agrobusiness. I appreciate you cannot evaluate the legal quality of this document. I wanted to ask whether you were aware that this contribution took place on 28 November 2012? Were you told that this happened?	611
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 20 11 12 13 4 15 6 17 8 9 20 12 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22	The question would be how you made sure 11: you covered all assets that were purchased for the Capex claimed by Claimants? MR WECHEN: What we first did, as I explained also in the course of my presentation, is that we analysed the accounting records of Laguardia, especially the fixed asset register. We crosschecked those entries in the fixed asset register with other documents like customs documents, and achieved from an accounting point of view reasonable certainty as regards the existence of those assets based on the accounting records THE PRESIDENT: Reasonable certainty they had been purchased? MR WIECHEN: They have been purchased. THE PRESIDENT: But no expression of you as to what has happened to them subsequently? MR WIECHEN: I have not investigated what has happened with these assets, so this is not my expertise. I look in the accounting books. THE PRESIDENT: It is not a critique.	009 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR KOPECKY: Do you know whether a portion a of the machinery owned by Laguardia was contributed to Laguardia Agrobusiness Ltd's share capital? MR WIECHEN: At the present moment I do not recall this alleged transaction MR GLEASON: Can I ask what document? Is it an exhibit in this case? MR KOPECKY: Exhibit R-9. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we put it up and show it? He is entitled to see it MR KOPECKY: It is coming. (Displayed) I appreciate you won't be able to read all of this, but if we scroll through it and if we go to the list of assets here, it mentions on the first page sprinklers, disc harrows, harvesters of certain brands, truck-lift Volvo, and so on and so forth, so a lot of machinery that was contributed by a foreign invested enterprise, Laguardia Ltd, to Laguardia Agrobusiness. I appreciate you cannot evaluate the legal quality of this document. I wanted to ask whether you were aware that this contribution took place on 28 November 2012? Were you told that this	611

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			nber 201 a, Austri
		Revis 612 11:12	sed 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		a, Aust r 614
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 31 4 15 16 17 18 19 20	in 2013 when preparing your report in what I presume was 2016 and 2017? They were no longer, according to this, with Claimants, so how did you inspect them, as you say in paragraph 18 of your report? MR WIECHEN: In my report I have not filed a statement of completeness for machinery and equipment. Even in the financial world of auditing, financial statements, you do not do a physical count of all the assets a company owns. You do it basically on a sample basis. I considered it for the analysis I have performed sufficient evidence to physically confirm the existence of certain machinery and equipment which should have been used within the operations of Mr Grot. THE PRESIDENT: Could you just clarify on paragraph 18, you don't say "you" visited the Republic of Moldova, and "you" inspected the equipment. You say "Deloitte team members". Is it persons other than yourself? MR WIECHEN: This is correct. We usually	613 11:13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR KOPECKY: When you sell assets, do you have to take the sale into account when you discuss the loss of investment pertaining to those assets? You have assets listed here and they may have been sold. I am not saying you need to opine on whether they have been, but had they been sold and had this information been made available to you you would have taken it into account no doubt Would it have any impact on the valuation of the lost investment concerning those assets? MR WIECHEN: I think we are running again into a legal issue here. If I just assume that I am the owner of assets, if I have control over the assets, I am still the owner and I sell the assets at a certain point in time I would probably sell them most evidently at a loss because they have depreciated, they are used, but I don't know what THE PRESIDENT: I think we understand you very clearly. Your report expresses your opinion as to the value of the asset at the point the business was going to start operating in 2010, what had been	615 11:16
21 22 23 24 25	work in teams. We had a project team of people. There was a director of my team and manager of my team physically in Moldova who identified the assets. THE PRESIDENT: But you have no first-hand		21 22 23 24	acquired. You are not expressing any view as to who owns what now or what was lost? MR WIECHEN: I was never asked. THE PRESIDENT: And you have been very clear about that.	

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Revise		
		Confiden Revise 616 11:18 1 3 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 12 13 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 12 13 14 15 16 17 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 17 18 19 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	d Vienna experts as per paragraph 59 of your First Report. That is the first sentence. Indirect costs. We heard you were quite familiar with the agricultural expert report. Do you have it in front of you MR ASTUNO: I am happy to provide him a copy. MR KOPECKY: Thank you. (Same handed) Can you show us where in the report the agricultural experts mention indirect costs? Take all the time you need, literally. Maybe as a small point of order, can he also be given a clean copy of his report, because his copy includes handwritten notes and we don't like that. MR ASTUNO: With all due respect, you are now questioning. I was prepared for my examination of the witness. MR KOPECKY: I mean his report. The	618 618 11:20
20 21	MR KOPECKY: Did you do the review? MR WIECHEN: I did the review together	20 2 ²	established yesterday that that is not acceptable in	
22 23 24 25	with my team. MR KOPECKY: My second of seven issues is your reliance on the agricultural expert figures. We already have that. You state in paragraph 51 of	22 23 24 25	 copy, so if the secretary could hand that up and replace it, that would be very good. (Handed) 	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	your original report that "within the information gathering process for the purpose of the valuation analysis using the income approach, I have relied upon operating assumptions provided by management and by the agricultural experts". I would like you to point me and take all the time you need to assumptions that were	617 11:19 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	the First Report as well, because I see notes there as well. I know it is a hassle. MR ASTUNO: Again, that was my version of the report I was making notes on. MR GLEASON: Do you happen to have a copy?	619 11:22
8				
9 10	taken from management and not from the agricultural expert report in your original report? Because I only see the agricultural report cited and not	8 9 10	MR WIECHEN: So this is my report? MR KOPECKY: Yes.	
9 10 11 12 13 14	expert report in your original report? Because I only see the agricultural report cited and not management and, if management is cited, it is not clear which information had been provided by it? MR WIECHEN: Basically, as you can see, if you take the agricultural report by itself, you	9 10 11 12 13 14	MR WECHEN: So this is my report? MR KOPECKY: Yes. MR WECHEN: But you are now referring to the agricultural report which is still missing here on my desk. MR KOPECKY: You need that too?	
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	expert report in your original report? Because I only see the agricultural report cited and not management and, if management is cited, it is not clear which information had been provided by it? MR WIECHEN: Basically, as you can see, if you take the agricultural report by itself, you could have easily remodeled what we have done in the Deloitte report. Basically we relied to the most significant extent on the agricultural reports. We also discussed with the local accountant and	9 10 1 ⁻ 12 13 14 14 16 17 17	MR WIECHEN: So this is my report? MR KOPECKY: Yes. MR WIECHEN: But you are now referring to the agricultural report which is still missing here on my desk. MR KOPECKY: You need that too? I have that too. Just a second. (Same handed to witness) The question was whether you could show us where in the report the agricultural experts mention indirect costs?	
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	expert report in your original report? Because I only see the agricultural report cited and not management and, if management is cited, it is not clear which information had been provided by it? MR WIECHEN: Basically, as you can see, if you take the agricultural report by itself, you could have easily remodeled what we have done in the Deloitte report. Basically we relied to the most significant extent on the agricultural reports. We	9 10 1 ⁻ 12 13 14 15 16 16	MR WIECHEN: So this is my report? MR KOPECKY: Yes. MR WIECHEN: But you are now referring to the agricultural report which is still missing here on my desk. MR KOPECKY: You need that too? I have that too. Just a second. (Same handed to witness) The question was whether you could show us where in the report the agricultural experts mention indirect costs? MR WIECHEN: Without staying here for the next 20 minutes, I believe that you have not found the reference to the indirect costs in the agricultural report.	

-	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia ised	al 13 Decem Vienna	
1	which have been used. The information used by the	620 11:26	1	anything else, and you yourself have not done any \cdot	622 11:29
2	agricultural experts and by us have another source,		2	comparison.	
3	basically the Moldovan National Statistics.		3	MR WIECHEN: Yes. At the end of the day,	
4	MR KOPECKY: I am completely aware of		4	if you do two valuations, using averages	
5	transient sources, but can we agree it does not		5	benchmarking to peer companies is many, many times	
6	mention indirect costs? Because you referenced the		6	the method of last resort if you don't have anything	
7	report. You didn't reference the sources. You		7	else or something which brings more evidential	
8	referenced the report. You didn't say that you		8	method to you, you sometimes need to rely on data	
9	reviewed those sources yourself, you say you		9	from guideline companies which are not really	
10	reviewed the report and used the indirect costs.		10	comparable. This is what we also have done for the	
11	You didn't say or write in your report that you		11	cost of capital.	
12	looked at those other sources which they used?		12	I would like to underscore the fact that,	
13	MR WECHEN: I acknowledged a formal		13	due to the late filing of Mr Peer's report, we did	
14	inconsistency, but as we said and also discussed, we		14	not have time to look for other alternative methods	
15	worked actually together with the agricultural		15	for calculating the cost of capital. This is why	
16	experts, so when it came up that is an omission in		16	we, for simplicity reasons, used the working capital	
17	the report, right. Yes.		17	data from Mr Peer's report.	
18	MR KOPECKY: Thank you. To the third of		18	MR KOPECKY: But you would agree that it	
19	my seven issues on the performance margins. We just		19	is inconsistent to use these companies for one	
20	established that you relied on the agricultural		20	aspect and not for another?	
21	expert report, and used it as an input for a		21	MR WIECHEN: No, I don't agree with this	
22	substantial part of the income statement, including		22	statement.	
23	the revenues, direct costs and, as we have now		23	MR FORTIER: What is your answer to the	
23 24	established, indirect costs. Did you perform any		23	question, though? You criticised Mr Peer's	
			24 25	benchmarking selection, correct, as we saw earlier?	
25	benchmarking of the performance to real existing		20	-	
	benchmarking of the performance to real existing		20		
		621 11:27	1	MR WIECHEN: Yes.	623 11:30
25					
25	businesses?		1	MR WIECHEN: Yes.	
25 1 2	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are		1 2	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any	
25 1 2 3	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to		1 2 3	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of	
25 1 2 3 4	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia.		1 2 3 4	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking	
1 2 3 4 5	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable.		1 2 3 4 5	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise?	
25 1 2 3 4 5 6	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be		1 2 3 4 5 6	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WIECHEN: What we did, for example,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WIECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any?		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WIECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WIECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you refer to the guideline companies as mentioned in our		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WIECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look for other publicly-listed entities operating in the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you refer to the guideline companies as mentioned in our report merely to the cost of capital and the		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR WECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look for other publicly-listed entities operating in the agricultural sector, and this was the best we found.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you refer to the guideline companies as mentioned in our report merely to the cost of capital and the entities which Mr Peer used for his very extensive		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WIECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look for other publicly-listed entities operating in the agricultural sector, and this was the best we found. We also looked, when doing our valuation analysis,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you refer to the guideline companies as mentioned in our report merely to the cost of capital and the entities which Mr Peer used for his very extensive benchmarking analysis, I conclude again that I do		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WIECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look for other publicly-listed entities operating in the agricultural sector, and this was the best we found. We also looked, when doing our valuation analysis, at certain financial key parameters of those companies but, as they are not comparable, they do	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you refer to the guideline companies as mentioned in our report merely to the cost of capital and the entities which Mr Peer used for his very extensive benchmarking analysis, I conclude again that I do not consider these companies comparable to Laguardia.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WIECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look for other publicly-listed entities operating in the agricultural sector, and this was the best we found. We also looked, when doing our valuation analysis, at certain financial key parameters of those companies but, as they are not comparable, they do not help us.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you refer to the guideline companies as mentioned in our report merely to the cost of capital and the entities which Mr Peer used for his very extensive benchmarking analysis, I conclude again that I do not consider these companies comparable to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: I don't disagree with that,		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WIECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look for other publicly-listed entities operating in the agricultural sector, and this was the best we found. We also looked, when doing our valuation analysis, at certain financial key parameters of those companies but, as they are not comparable, they do not help us. This peer or benchmarking analysis does	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 17 14 15 16 17 16 16 17 16 17 16 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you refer to the guideline companies as mentioned in our report merely to the cost of capital and the entities which Mr Peer used for his very extensive benchmarking analysis, I conclude again that I do not consider these companies comparable to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: I don't disagree with that, but you said that. I disagree with the statement		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WIECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look for other publicly-listed entities operating in the agricultural sector, and this was the best we found. We also looked, when doing our valuation analysis, at certain financial key parameters of those companies but, as they are not comparable, they do not help us. This peer or benchmarking analysis does not somehow influence any of Mr Peer's calculations.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you refer to the guideline companies as mentioned in our report merely to the cost of capital and the entities which Mr Peer used for his very extensive benchmarking analysis, I conclude again that I do not consider these companies comparable to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: I don't disagree with that, but you said that. I disagree with the statement but I do not disagree that you said that and it is		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WIECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look for other publicly-listed entities operating in the agricultural sector, and this was the best we found. We also looked, when doing our valuation analysis, at certain financial key parameters of those companies but, as they are not comparable, they do not help us. This peer or benchmarking analysis does not somehow influence any of Mr Peer's calculations. It is definitely a useful tool you would use in case	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you refer to the guideline companies as mentioned in our report merely to the cost of capital and the entities which Mr Peer used for his very extensive benchmarking analysis, I conclude again that I do not consider these companies comparable to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: I don't disagree with that, but you said that. I disagree with the statement but I do not disagree that you said that and it is on record, but you did not compare any companies		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WIECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look for other publicly-listed entities operating in the agricultural sector, and this was the best we found. We also looked, when doing our valuation analysis, at certain financial key parameters of those companies but, as they are not comparable, they do not help us. This peer or benchmarking analysis does not somehow influence any of Mr Peer's calculations. It is definitely a useful tool you would use in case of having really established businesses and	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you refer to the guideline companies as mentioned in our report merely to the cost of capital and the entities which Mr Peer used for his very extensive benchmarking analysis, I conclude again that I do not consider these companies comparable to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: I don't disagree with that, but you said that. I disagree with the statement but I do not disagree that you said that and it is on record, but you did not compare any companies yourself? None? Because you stated earlier that		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR WECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look for other publicly-listed entities operating in the agricultural sector, and this was the best we found. We also looked, when doing our valuation analysis, at certain financial key parameters of those companies but, as they are not comparable, they do not help us. This peer or benchmarking analysis does not somehow influence any of Mr Peer's calculations. It is definitely a useful tool you would use in case of having really established businesses and established industries on a more developed market –	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you refer to the guideline companies as mentioned in our report merely to the cost of capital and the entities which Mr Peer used for his very extensive benchmarking analysis, I conclude again that I do not consider these companies comparable to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: I don't disagree with that, but you said that. I disagree with the statement but I do not disagree that you said that and it is on record, but you did not compare any companies yourself? None? Because you stated earlier that you were using them for deriving working capital		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR WECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look for other publicly-listed entities operating in the agricultural sector, and this was the best we found. We also looked, when doing our valuation analysis, at certain financial key parameters of those companies but, as they are not comparable, they do not help us. This peer or benchmarking analysis does not somehow influence any of Mr Peer's calculations. It is definitely a useful tool you would use in case of having really established businesses and established industries on a more developed market – I am a big proponent of the market approach of	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 2 1 22 22 22 22 22 22 23	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you refer to the guideline companies as mentioned in our report merely to the cost of capital and the entities which Mr Peer used for his very extensive benchmarking analysis, I conclude again that I do not consider these companies comparable to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: I don't disagree with that, but you said that. I disagree with the statement but I do not disagree that you said that and it is on record, but you did not compare any companies yourself? None? Because you stated earlier that you were using them for deriving working capital just during direct, and you consider those companies		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR WECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look for other publicly-listed entities operating in the agricultural sector, and this was the best we found. We also looked, when doing our valuation analysis, at certain financial key parameters of those companies but, as they are not comparable, they do not help us. This peer or benchmarking analysis does not somehow influence any of Mr Peer's calculations. It is definitely a useful tool you would use in case of having really established businesses and established industries on a more developed market I am a big proponent of the market approach of benchmarking when those data are available, but	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 2 12 22 23	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you refer to the guideline companies as mentioned in our report merely to the cost of capital and the entities which Mr Peer used for his very extensive benchmarking analysis, I conclude again that I do not consider these companies comparable to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: I don't disagree with that, but you said that. I disagree with the statement but I do not disagree that you said that and it is on record, but you did not compare any companies yourself? None? Because you stated earlier that you were using them for deriving working capital just during direct, and you consider those companies usable for this aspect, but not for profit margins.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WIECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look for other publicly-listed entities operating in the agricultural sector, and this was the best we found. We also looked, when doing our valuation analysis, at certain financial key parameters of those companies but, as they are not comparable, they do not help us. This peer or benchmarking analysis does not somehow influence any of Mr Peer's calculations. It is definitely a useful tool you would use in case of having really established businesses and established industries on a more developed market – I am a big proponent of the market approach of benchmarking when those data are available, but in Moldova you cannot even extract financial	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 2 1 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 23	businesses? MR WIECHEN: I rather doubt that they are real existing, perfectly comparable entities to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Not perfectly comparable. Any. I understand that Mr Peer's may not be perfectly comparable, but they are still any, and I am asking whether you provided any? MR WIECHEN: I still believe that if you refer to the guideline companies as mentioned in our report merely to the cost of capital and the entities which Mr Peer used for his very extensive benchmarking analysis, I conclude again that I do not consider these companies comparable to Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: I don't disagree with that, but you said that. I disagree with the statement but I do not disagree that you said that and it is on record, but you did not compare any companies yourself? None? Because you stated earlier that you were using them for deriving working capital just during direct, and you consider those companies		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR WECHEN: Yes. MR FORTIER: But did you do yourself any benchmarking? Did you assess the performance of real existing businesses? Do the benchmarking exercise? MR WECHEN: What we did, for example, these are the companies we identified in our report for the cost of capital calculation. We are looking for, and we had no other choice rather than to look for other publicly-listed entities operating in the agricultural sector, and this was the best we found. We also looked, when doing our valuation analysis, at certain financial key parameters of those companies but, as they are not comparable, they do not help us. This peer or benchmarking analysis does not somehow influence any of Mr Peer's calculations. It is definitely a useful tool you would use in case of having really established businesses and established industries on a more developed market I am a big proponent of the market approach of benchmarking when those data are available, but	

www.dianaburden.com

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confident Revised		ber 2017 I, Austria
$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\\25\end{array}$	I could have relied on these sources, but the basis 1: of information was not perfect. MR FORTIER: I understand. In fact, because of reasons you have given, you did not do this benchmarking analysis? MR WECHEN: We did not put it in the report, but it was part of our working analysis, but it does not help. MR FORTIER: I understand that. Thank you for your answer. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can I ask one question, perhaps? I do not know whether it is a consistent question even, but you said at the beginning that you used the DCF method because you compared Laguardia's exercise with Mr Grot's businesses that he had in Poland. Isn't that also not a kind of benchmarking? Because the Polish environment is completely different. MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Is it benchmarking to a certain extent, even if the capital owner is perhaps identical? MR WIECHEN: No. The analysis of Mr Grot's operations in Poland was basically for me sufficient evidence to verify Mr Grot's capability	624 1:32 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	depreciation estimate table 7(a), (b), (c), and here if you look at depreciation it is quite a low number. If you add them up, it is never more than and please forgive my math 22,000 per year. If we look at what we had earlier, namely fixed assets of 887,000, this would mean depreciation over 40 years. 40 years' depreciation time. My question is, is this a useful time to expect for those assets? MR WIECHEN: No. There's probably one misunderstanding here. If you look in our DCF calculation you will not see a direct Capex and a significant amount at the beginning of the projection period. What we assumed is that the existing equipment was already in place. On this basis we calculated the depreciation based on agricultural guidance for depreciation, and what we assumed in our model and this makes sense to me is to assume only maintenance depreciation. So just to keep the assets ongoing like they are, because we had a limited lifetime, or assumed a limited lifetime of the business for only four years.	626 11:35
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	of running farming businesses. If you have an owner and or an investor or a project owner who is really knowledgeable in an industry, you can derive a conclusion that this person would most probably also run good businesses in other locations rather than in the location where he has already achieved the results. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you didn't use the data of the Polish MR WIECHEN: No. It was purely for me to obtain assurance as regards the quality of Mr Grot's management capabilities. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. MR KOPECKY: To the fourth of my seven issues, which concerns Capex and depreciation. You told us earlier that you had a list of assets, and that would allow you to correctly calculate depreciation expenses for the fixed assets of Laguardia, but you have not calculated depreciation for fixed assets. MR WIECHEN: No. We calculated depreciation of fixed assets. MR WIECHEN: No. We calculated depreciation for fixed assets. MR WIECHEN: No. We calculated depreciation for fixed assets. MR WIECHEN: No. We calculated depreciation for fixed assets. MR KOPECKY: Fixed assets as well? MR WIECHEN: Fixed assets, yes. MR KOPECKY: So if we look at table 7 in	625 1:33 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MR WECHEN: No renewal. Maintenance. MR KOPECKY: The fifth of my seven questions concerns working capital. I would like you to confirm what you said in paragraph 61 of your report, namely that the allegedly expropriated business was purely equity financed. If you look at paragraph 61, page 18, it says, "I assumed that Mr Grot would have run his business relying solely upon equity". You confirm that? That is the assumption? Equity only? MR WIECHEN: This was the situation as of the date of the alleged breaches. So it was just	627 11:37

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia rised		nber 20 a, Aust
		Rev 628			
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	contradiction. So the new report is correct? MR WECHEN: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And there the capital calculations take into account that Laguardia would operate similarly to the comparable companies? MR WECHEN: I can confirm that for simplicity reasons we took the KPMG data, Mr Peer's data, on working capital to calculate our working capital. MR KOPECKY: How did you reflect those new assumptions in your working capital calculations? MR WIECHEN: Basically we were applying textbook formulas for deriving the balances of trade receivables, inventories and trade payables, and we had the days outstanding from Mr Peer's report, and did accordingly a correct calculation of working		10 11 12 13 14 15	was fully equity financed, yet you calculate WACC based on a debt to equity ratio of 25.9. How does that match? Maybe it is just my ignorance but I do not understand how can you use both assumptions in one report? MR WIECHEN: They are two assumptions which do not pertain together. The first assumption about the equity financing of Mr Grot was that everything which was brought into this company through one of Mr Grot's subsidiaries and by himself was completely entirely equity financed. If you would run this business reasonably, I would pretty much assume that you would also take into account debt financing. It is just logical, if my cost of capital decrease, my company value increases. A	
$1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \ 7 \ 8 \ 9 \ 101 \ 121 \ 131 \ 151 \ 161 \ 171 \ 192 \ 222 \ 232 \ 242 \ 251 $	capital, which is at the very beginning a cash outflow and then the cash impacted only the changes in working capital for the rest of the projection period. MR KOPECKY: If I may take you to table 12 of your report, page 31 and 32(a) and (b), WACC estimation, and there, Mr Wiechen, you used a debt:equity ratio of comparable companies at 25.9 per cent. I am relying on total debt/market equity selected, so that is a comparator. There the ratio assumed is 25.9. I understand that some of that has been superseded by the presentation that we got ten and a half hours ago now, but I wonder, when you wrote your First Report, you assumed fully equity financed undertaking, so your observations here on page 31 do not match your assumptions, do they, because that would be zero? MR WECHEN: No, no, it is a different story. The assumption I made in the text is that the current business of Mr Grot was equity financed, right? So what is going to be in the future I don't know. A reasonable investor for sure would have not pertained this sole equity financing because bank financing is readily available even in Moldova. The costs of debt financing are much lower than equity	629 11:41	 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	reasonable investor would do this step. I want to emphasise this, because what we have done here is a business valuation and we are omitting in many, many documents I have seen certain principles at the very beginning and this is a standard market value and fair market value is indisputably the right standard of value. It is not an investment value from the perspective of Mr Grot MR KOPECKY: That is my point. You assumed something else. Because Mr Grot did something else, then you assumed already then, because if he equity-financed, and your forward look is debt to equity 25.9 financed, it doesn't go together, does it? We have the facts from 2010 and 2011 as of the valuation date and there was no debt. MR WIECHEN: Until then there was no debt, yes, but to run the business in the future it would be reasonable to change the capital structure according to an optimum MR KOPECKY: You were told that this would happen? MR WIECHEN: No. I think this is reasonable to believe. Just one comment I would like to make to the Tribunal: I believe these discussion as regards	631 11:44

-	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia ised		a, Austr
1	the cost of capital, equity, or WACC is somehow a	632 11:45	1	By the CFO, Mr Tcaci, who was the previous	634 11:52
2	discussion which is a very subjective. I would like		2	administrator.	
3	to underscore that I am doing business valuations		3	MR ASTUNO: Were you in contact with their	
4	for 16 years and there is no right or wrong.		4	accountants?	
5	Valuation is and still will be all the time somehow		5	MR WECHEN: Yes.	
6	a disputable excise. There is no right or wrong.		6	MR ASTUNO: This voluminous amount of	
7	THE PRESIDENT: An art, not a science.		7	material was the source of your calculations for the	
8	MR WECHEN: Exactly, yes.		8	initial costs, including vehicles and equipment?	
9	MR FORTIER: Not like the law!		9	MR WECHEN: Yes.	
9 10	MR KOPECKY: Indeed. That is where		10	MR ASTUNO: Just two follow up points.	
11	-				
12	I stop. Thank you Mr Wiechen		11	One, I want to emphasise again, or allow you to	
	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr Kopecky.		12	emphasise again, why was it so difficult to do a	
13	I think we will give you a chance to come back and		13	benchmarking analysis in the country of Moldova?	
14	then the Tribunal will have a few questions.		14	MR WECHEN: Because it is a very specific	
15	Mr Astuno?		15	country. Agriculture is in general a very, very	
16	Re-examination by Claimants		16	specific business.	
17	MR ASTUNO: Thank you. Mr Wiechen, hello		17	MR ASTUNO: Would that explain, then, why	
18	again. I would like to start by making a note for		18	a pure DCF calculation is again the most appropriate	
19	the record actually. There were several conclusory		19	methodology to apply here?	
20	remarks made by Mr Kopecky during the previous		20	MR WIECHEN: Yes, I confirm that.	
21	witness examination that indicated conclusions as to		21	MR ASTUNO: Would that also again	
22			22	highlight why Mr Peer's comparison to other	
23	THE PRESIDENT: We have got that point.		23	countries and companies operating in other countries	
24	You really don't need to waste your time on that.		24	would be an unreliable comparison?	
05	We have really understood as a Tribunal what		25	MR WECHEN: I think this benchmarking	
25					
25		633			635
1	, ,	633 11:50	1	analysis is useless because we are not talking about	635 11:53
1 2	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President.		2	comparable companies, otherwise I would have	635 11:53
1	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about		2 3	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also	635 11:53
1 2 3 4	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial		2 3 4	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data.	635 11:53
1 2 3	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open		2 3	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question	635 11:53
1 2 3 4	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits		2 3 4 5 6	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your	635 11:53
1 2 3 4 5	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify –		2 3 4 5	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your	635 11:53
1 2 3 4 5 6	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page?		2 3 4 5 6	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of those records did not in any way	635 11:53
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify –		2 3 4 5 6 7	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your	635 11:53
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of those records did not in any way	635 11:53
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of those records did not in any way impact your calculation of the DCF inputs. Is that right? MR WIECHEN: No.	635 11:53
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of those records did not in any way impact your calculation of the DCF inputs. Is that right?	635 11:53
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these exhibits mean, particularly exhibit 1 and 2, and		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of those records did not in any way impact your calculation of the DCF inputs. Is that right? MR WIECHEN: No.	635 11:53
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these exhibits mean, particularly exhibit 1 and 2, and whether this was the source of the calculations you		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of those records did not in any way impact your calculation of the DCF inputs. Is that right? MR WIECHEN: No. MR ASTUNO: It just was evidence of why,	635 11:53
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these exhibits mean, particularly exhibit 1 and 2, and whether this was the source of the calculations you made as to initial costs?		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of those records did not in any way impact your calculation of the DCF inputs. Is that right? MR WIECHEN: No. MR ASTUNO: It just was evidence of why, again, a forward-looking damages analysis would be	635 11:53
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these exhibits mean, particularly exhibit 1 and 2, and whether this was the source of the calculations you made as to initial costs? MR WECHEN: I confirm that these have		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of these records did not in any way impact your calculation of the DCF inputs. Is that right? MR WIECHEN: No. MR ASTUNO: It just was evidence of why, again, a forward-looking damages analysis would be appropriate here?	635 11:53
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these exhibits mean, particularly exhibit 1 and 2, and whether this was the source of the calculations you made as to initial costs? MR WIECHEN: I confirm that these have been the sources for the calculation of the initial		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of these records did not in any way impact your calculation of the DCF inputs. Is that right? MR WIECHEN: No. MR ASTUNO: It just was evidence of why, again, a forward-looking damages analysis would be appropriate here? MR WIECHEN: Yes.	635 11:53
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these exhibits mean, particularly exhibit 1 and 2, and whether this was the source of the calculations you made as to initial costs? MR WIECHEN: I confirm that these have been the sources for the calculation of the initial investment costs.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your impact your calculation of the DCF inputs. Is that right? MR WIECHEN: No. MR ASTUNO: It just was evidence of why, again, a forward-looking damages analysis would be appropriate here? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: Did Mr Peer also apply a	635 11:53
$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\end{array}$	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these exhibits mean, particularly exhibit 1 and 2, and whether this was the source of the calculations you made as to initial costs? MR WIECHEN: I confirm that these have been the sources for the calculation of the initial investment costs. MR ASTUNO: For the benefit of the parties		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of these records did not in any way impact your calculation of the DCF inputs. Is that right? MR WIECHEN: No. MR ASTUNO: It just was evidence of why, again, a forward-looking damages analysis would be appropriate here? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: Did Mr Peer also apply a forward-looking lost profits analysis?	635 11:53
$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\end{array}$	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these exhibits mean, particularly exhibit 1 and 2, and whether this was the source of the calculations you made as to initial costs? MR WIECHEN: I confirm that these have been the sources for the calculation of the initial investment costs. MR ASTUNO: For the benefit of the parties and the Tribunal, I want to scroll down very quickly		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of these records did not in any way impact your calculation of the DCF inputs. Is that right? MR WIECHEN: No. MR ASTUNO: It just was evidence of why, again, a forward-looking damages analysis would be appropriate here? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: Did Mr Peer also apply a forward-looking lost profits analysis? MR WIECHEN: Yes.	635 11:53
$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\end{array}$	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these exhibits mean, particularly exhibit 1 and 2, and whether this was the source of the calculations you made as to initial costs? MR VIECHEN: I confirm that these have been the sources for the calculation of the initial investment costs. MR ASTUNO: For the benefit of the parties and the Tribunal, I want to scroll down very quickly here. Can you explain or verify that there is quite		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of those records did not in any way impact your calculation of the DCF inputs. Is that right? MR WIECHEN: No. MR ASTUNO: It just was evidence of why, again, a forward-looking damages analysis would be appropriate here? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: Did Mr Peer also apply a forward-looking lost profits analysis? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. Nothing further.	635 11:53
$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\9\\20\end{array}$	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these exhibits mean, particularly exhibit 1 and 2, and whether this was the source of the calculations you made as to initial costs? MR WIECHEN: I confirm that these have been the sources for the calculation of the initial investment costs. MR ASTUNO: For the benefit of the parties and the Tribunal, I want to scroll down very quickly here. Can you explain or verify that there is quite a large volume of documentation that you were		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting the stat right? MR WIECHEN: No. MR ASTUNO: Did Mr Peer also apply a forward-looking lost profits analysis? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. Nothing further. Questions by the Arbitral Tribunal	635 11:53
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these exhibits mean, particularly exhibit 1 and 2, and whether this was the source of the calculations you made as to initial costs? MR WIECHEN: I confirm that these have been the sources for the calculation of the initial investment costs. MR ASTUNO: For the benefit of the parties and the Tribunal, I want to scroll down very quickly here. Can you explain or verify that there is quite a large volume of documentation that you were provided?		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of these records did not in any way impact your calculation of the DCF inputs. Is that right? MR WIECHEN: No. MR ASTUNO: It just was evidence of why, again, a forward-looking damages analysis would be appropriate here? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: Did Mr Peer also apply a forward-looking lost profits analysis? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. Nothing further. Questions by the Arbitral Tribunal PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I have a very short	635 11:53
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify – THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these exhibits mean, particularly exhibit 1 and 2, and whether this was the source of the calculations you made as to initial costs? MR WIECHEN: I confirm that these have been the sources for the calculation of the initial investment costs. MR ASTUNO: For the benefit of the parties and the Tribunal, I want to scroll down very quickly here. Can you explain or verify that there is quite a large volume of documentation that you were provided? MR WIECHEN: Indeed. In print.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of these records did not in any way impact your calculation of the DCF inputs. Is that right? MR WIECHEN: No. MR ASTUNO: It just was evidence of why, again, a forward-looking damages analysis would be appropriate here? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: Did Mr Peer also apply a forward-looking lost profits analysis? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. Nothing further. Questions by the Arbitral Tribunal PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I have a very short question. Simply to know, you calculate the damages	635
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. There were discussions, Mr Wiechen, about how you validated your calculations for the initial costs, namely equipment and vehicles, and I now open up appendix 4 to your report. Do these exhibits clarify THE PRESIDENT: Which page? MR ASTUNO: Page 34 of his January 2017 report. Can you describe briefly what these exhibits mean, particularly exhibit 1 and 2, and whether this was the source of the calculations you made as to initial costs? MR WIECHEN: I confirm that these have been the sources for the calculation of the initial investment costs. MR ASTUNO: For the benefit of the parties and the Tribunal, I want to scroll down very quickly here. Can you explain or verify that there is quite a large volume of documentation that you were provided? MR WIECHEN: Indeed. In print MR ASTUNO: And these were provided to you		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	comparable companies, otherwise I would have included it in my report as well, because we also had the data. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. One final question regarding Professor Knieper's point regarding your valuation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of the Polish accounting records. Your evaluation of these records did not in any way impact your calculation of the DCF inputs. Is that right? MR WIECHEN: No. MR ASTUNO: It just was evidence of why, again, a forward-looking damages analysis would be appropriate here? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: Did Mr Peer also apply a forward-looking lost profits analysis? MR WIECHEN: Yes. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. Nothing further. Questions by the Arbitral Tribunal PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I have a very short question. Simply to know, you calculate the damages going until August 2014. Were you told by your	635

www.dianaburden.com

bigi) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi		al 13 Decen Vienna	
1		636 11:54	1	MR GLEASON: I think both sides would	638
2	MR WECHEN: Let's say a reasonability	11.34	2	appreciate some time to prepare for closings.	11.57
3	assessment as regards the projection period is also		3	THE PRESIDENT: It is in your hands. The	
4	part of our work, but, again, it is a legal issue to		4	longer you use with Mr Peer, the less you will have	
5	decide upon the duration of the lease agreements		5	for preparation; it is as simple as that.	
6	We have seen the agreements, we knew it was a three		6	We know from life that the longer a direct	
7	plus one. You could speculate as regards the		7	is, the longer the cross is going to be, so it is	
8	probability of even renewing the lease agreements		8	really in your hands. It may be in the end, having	
9	after the four years, so what we have done was to		9	regard to the needs of our court reporters, there is	
10	stay conservative with the four years and not		10	no time for preparation of the closing. You are	
11	somehow inflating a potential business value The		11	here, you stand up, you make your arguments and that	
12	more you go into the future, the more uncertainty		12	is how it goes. I am not saying we are going to	
13	appears. One of the main purposes of our DCF		13	impose that on you, but it is in your hands.	
14	analysis was to obtain reasonable certainty as		14	I have from Mr Fortier a suggestion.	
15	regards the loss of business value		15	Would you prefer to start now and get the	
16	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: That is clear, but you		16	exam-in-chief done and you can then break for lunch	
17	made your own judgment on the issueof whether these		17	and we will then proceed?	
18	lease contracts were valid for four years or three		18	MR KOPECKY: No. An hour lunch with their	
19	years? It was your own evaluation? You were not		19	expert between direct and cross?	
20	asked to simply accept the four years, but you said		20	THE PRESIDENT: That has been happening	
21	we look into the lease agreements and then we see it		21	over the last couple of days.	
22	was four years.		22	MR KOPECKY: With sequestration?	
23	MR WIECHEN: No, for me it was reasonable		23	THE PRESIDENT: Yes. We will now start	
24	to believe that these leases would have been		24	with Mr Peer. And in the meantime, Mr Wiechen, you	
25	extended for one year, three plus one, but at the		25	are to have no communication with anybody. You may	
		637			639
1	end of the day this is an assumption which basically	11:56	1	walk around, but no communication.	12:00
2	we reconfirmed also with counsel, because these are		2		
3	legal as aspects, I cannot really comment on that,		3	THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer, welcome.	
4	but to me as a professional, not being a lawyer,		4	I welcome you. I am Philippe Sands, chair of this	
5	I am not a specialist, it sounded reasonable to		5	Tribunal. To my right is Mr Fortier and to my left	
6	assume four years because it is very, very		6	Professor Knieper. Do you have an expert	
7 8	conservative, taking into consideration potential		7 8	declaration in front of you?	
8	renewal after four years. THE PRESIDENT: We now will move to		8 9	MR PEER: 1 do. THE PRESIDENT: Could you read it please?	
				THE PRESIDENT: Could you read it, please?	
9 10	Mr. Peer, but probably the consideration is to have			(Declaration read)	
10	Mr Peer, but probably the sensible thing is to have a short lunch break. How long do you expect on		10	(Declaration read)	
10 11	a short lunch break. How long do you expect on		10 11	Mr Kopecky?	
10 11 12	a short lunch break. How long do you expect on direct?		10 11 12	Mr Kopecky? Examination by Respondent	
10 11 12 13	a short lunch break. How long do you expect on direct? MR KOPECKY: 30 minutes.		10 11 12 13	Mr Kopecky? Examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr Peer, please go ahead.	
10 11 12 13 14	a short lunch break. How long do you expect on direct? MR KOPECKY: 30 minutes. THE PRESIDENT: We are going to get into		10 11 12 13 14	Mr Kopecky? Examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr Peer, please go ahead. MR PEER: Thank you. Let me start by	
10 11 12 13 14 15	a short lunch break. How long do you expect on direct? MR KOPECKY: 30 minutes. THE PRESIDENT: We are going to get into time difficulties. With that you can expect that		10 11 12 13 14 15	Mr Kopecky? Examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr Peer, please go ahead. MR PEER: Thank you. Let me start by apologising for having to issue an erratum. It is	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a short lunch break. How long do you expect on direct? MR KOPECKY: 30 minutes. THE PRESIDENT: We are going to get into time difficulties. With that you can expect that the cross will grow exponentially. We have read		10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr Kopecky? Examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr Peer, please go ahead. MR PEER: Thank you. Let me start by apologising for having to issue an erratum. It is not my normal process. I have done it about three	
10 11 12 13 14 15	a short lunch break. How long do you expect on direct? MR KOPECKY: 30 minutes. THE PRESIDENT: We are going to get into time difficulties. With that you can expect that the cross will grow exponentially. We have read everything, we have had his report, and I would		10 11 12 13 14 15	Mr Kopecky? Examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr Peer, please go ahead. MR PEER: Thank you. Let me start by apologising for having to issue an erratum. It is not my normal process. I have done it about three times in the last ten years of doing this work and	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a short lunch break. How long do you expect on direct? MR KOPECKY: 30 minutes. THE PRESIDENT: We are going to get into time difficulties. With that you can expect that the cross will grow exponentially. We have read everything, we have had his report, and I would invite both parties to be really efficient in their		10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr Kopecky? Examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr Peer, please go ahead. MR PEER: Thank you. Let me start by apologising for having to issue an erratum. It is not my normal process. I have done it about three times in the last ten years of doing this work and I do apologise for all the difficulties and extra	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a short lunch break. How long do you expect on direct? MR KOPECKY: 30 minutes. THE PRESIDENT: We are going to get into time difficulties. With that you can expect that the cross will grow exponentially. We have read everything, we have had his report, and I would invite both parties to be really efficient in their questioning if we want to finish in a reasonable		10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Mr Kopecky? Examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr Peer, please go ahead. MR PEER: Thank you. Let me start by apologising for having to issue an erratum. It is not my normal process. I have done it about three times in the last ten years of doing this work and I do apologise for all the difficulties and extra work that costs and causes.	
 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 	a short lunch break. How long do you expect on direct? MR KOPECKY: 30 minutes. THE PRESIDENT: We are going to get into time difficulties. With that you can expect that the cross will grow exponentially. We have read everything, we have had his report, and I would invite both parties to be really efficient in their questioning if we want to finish in a reasonable time. We have all the time in the world for tonight		10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr Kopecky? Examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr Peer, please go ahead. MR PEER: Thank you. Let me start by apologising for having to issue an erratum. It is not my normal process. I have done it about three times in the last ten years of doing this work and I do apologise for all the difficulties and extra work that costs and causes. I have received an updated report from	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a short lunch break. How long do you expect on direct? MR KOPECKY: 30 minutes. THE PRESIDENT: We are going to get into time difficulties. With that you can expect that the cross will grow exponentially. We have read everything, we have had his report, and I would invite both parties to be really efficient in their questioning if we want to finish in a reasonable time. We have all the time in the world for tonight but we do have court reporters who have limits and I		10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Mr Kopecky? Examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr Peer, please go ahead. MR PEER: Thank you. Let me start by apologising for having to issue an erratum. It is not my normal process. I have done it about three times in the last ten years of doing this work and I do apologise for all the difficulties and extra work that costs and causes. I have received an updated report from Deloitte late yesterday afternoon, and a third	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a short lunch break. How long do you expect on direct? MR KOPECKY: 30 minutes. THE PRESIDENT: We are going to get into time difficulties. With that you can expect that the cross will grow exponentially. We have read everything, we have had his report, and I would invite both parties to be really efficient in their questioning if we want to finish in a reasonable time. We have all the time in the world for tonight but we do have court reporters who have limits and I think we will stretch their patience, so I think the		10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mr Kopecky? Examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr Peer, please go ahead. MR PEER: Thank you. Let me start by apologising for having to issue an erratum. It is not my normal process. I have done it about three times in the last ten years of doing this work and I do apologise for all the difficulties and extra work that costs and causes. I have received an updated report from Deloitte late yesterday afternoon, and a third version at some time a little after midnight, so the	
 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	a short lunch break. How long do you expect on direct? MR KOPECKY: 30 minutes. THE PRESIDENT: We are going to get into time difficulties. With that you can expect that the cross will grow exponentially. We have read everything, we have had his report, and I would invite both parties to be really efficient in their questioning if we want to finish in a reasonable time. We have all the time in the world for tonight but we do have court reporters who have limits and I		10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr Kopecky? Examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr Peer, please go ahead. MR PEER: Thank you. Let me start by apologising for having to issue an erratum. It is not my normal process. I have done it about three times in the last ten years of doing this work and I do apologise for all the difficulties and extra work that costs and causes. I have received an updated report from Deloitte late yesterday afternoon, and a third	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a short lunch break. How long do you expect on direct? MR KOPECKY: 30 minutes. THE PRESIDENT: We are going to get into time difficulties. With that you can expect that the cross will grow exponentially. We have read everything, we have had his report, and I would invite both parties to be really efficient in their questioning if we want to finish in a reasonable time. We have all the time in the world for tonight but we do have court reporters who have limits and I think we will stretch their patience, so I think the Tribunal simply invites you to be as efficient as		 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	Mr Kopecky? Examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr Peer, please go ahead. MR PEER: Thank you. Let me start by apologising for having to issue an erratum. It is not my normal process. I have done it about three times in the last ten years of doing this work and I do apologise for all the difficulties and extra work that costs and causes. I have received an updated report from Deloitte late yesterday afternoon, and a third version at some time a little after midnight, so the sands are shifting under my feet as I tried to	

g	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confider Revise		
		640		642
1	be as quick and succinct as I can, but I am going to		5 5 1	2:07
2	try and adapt as much as I can to accommodate some	2		
3 4	of the changes. Deloitte's has pointed out one error in my	3		
4 5	report that was not dealt with by my errata, and	4		
6	I will deal with that, and they have also noted one	6		
7	error that came into my errata, and again I do	7	,	
8	apologise for that. We have been under significant	8		
9	pressure to try and produce some of these documents,	g		
0	and it is an excuse, not a reason.	10		
11	THE PRESIDENT: If I had only made three	1		
2	errors in ten years, I would be thrilled!	1:	-	
3	MR PEER: Three errors that I was asked to	1:	3 experts' input.	
4	correct!	14	4 We have had some discussion already today	
5	Let me start with a high level view of	1	5 about the lack of benchmarking by Deloitte and the	
6	what this claim is.	16	6 reasonability of the benchmarking that I performed.	
7	This claim is actually primarily interest	1	7 The difficulty that I have here is that Deloitte	
8	on what are relatively small actual alleged damages.	18	8 identified what it considered to be comparable	
9	The reasons for that I will get into a little bit	19	9 companies. It relied upon those companies in	
20	later, but let me look at the two categories of	20	5	
21	alleged damages here. The first is that there is an	2	, , ,	
2	alleged loss of an initial investment of some	22		
23	currently 800,000 USD now that some of the	23		
24	investments that were made post the alleged breach	24	5 5	
25	have been dropped off the claim.	2	5 comparable companies and we can consider them in all	
1	I have two concerns with this claim. The :	641 12:06 1	aspects of their operations to be comparable, or 12	643 2:09
	first is that these assets appear still to be owned		aspects of their operations to be comparable, or 12 they are not comparable and we can't use them and we	
2	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have	12:06 1	aspects of their operations to be comparable, or 12 they are not comparable and we can't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and	
2 3 4	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these	12:06 1 2 3 4	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or 12 they are not comparable and we can't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. 	
2 3 4	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some	12:06 1 2 3 4 5	aspects of their operations to be comparable, or 12 they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the	
2 3 4 5 6	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or 12 they are not comparable and we can't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me 	
2 3 4 5 6 7	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or 12 they are not comparable and we can't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not	122:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or 12 they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point.	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point. The second issue I have here is that these	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. (Slide 3) 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point. The second issue I have here is that these assets were required to generate the cashflows that	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. (Slide 3) The other big concern I have about the 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point. The second issue I have here is that these assets were required to generate the cashflows that form the second part of the damages claim, and	122:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 12	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. (Slide 3) The other big concern I have about the reliance on the agricultural experts' report is the 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point. The second issue I have here is that these assets were required to generate the cashflows that form the second part of the damages claim, and therefore while these assets can be claimed for if	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. (Slide 3) The other big concern I have about the reliance on the agricultural experts' report is the granularity of that report. What we appear and what 	
2345678901234	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point. The second issue I have here is that these assets were required to generate the cashflows that form the second part of the damages claim, and therefore while these assets can be claimed for if they have been lost, and what should be claimed for	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12 12	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. (Slide 3) The other big concern I have about the reliance on the agricultural experts' report is the granularity of that report. What we appear and what I understand from the testimony yesterday and this 	
23456789012345	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point. The second issue I have here is that these assets were required to generate the cashflows that form the second part of the damages claim, and therefore while these assets can be claimed for if they have been lost, and what should be claimed for is actually the loss, so if there was a sale and	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. (Slide 3) The other big concern I have about the reliance on the agricultural experts' report is the granularity of that report. What we appear and what I understand from the testimony yesterday and this morning is that what the agricultural experts have 	
234567890123456	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point. The second issue I have here is that these assets were required to generate the cashflows that form the second part of the damages claim, and therefore while these assets can be claimed for if they have been lost, and what should be claimed for	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 ¹ 11 11 11 14 11	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. (Slide 3) The other big concern I have about the reliance on the agricultural experts' report is the granularity of that report. What we appear and what I understand from the testimony yesterday and this morning is that what the agricultural experts have actually produced is an estimate of the average 	
2345678901234567	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point. The second issue I have here is that these assets were required to generate the cashflows that form the second part of the damages claim, and therefore while these assets can be claimed for if they have been lost, and what should be claimed for is actually the loss, so if there was a sale and there were some proceeds, then only the difference	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. (Slide 3) The other big concern I have about the reliance on the agricultural experts' report is the granularity of that report. What we appear and what I understand from the testimony yesterday and this morning is that what the agricultural experts have actually produced is an estimate of the average yield that Mr Grot's operations would obtain over a 	
23456789012345678	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point. The second issue I have here is that these assets were required to generate the cashflows that form the second part of the damages claim, and therefore while these assets can be claimed for if they have been lost, and what should be claimed for is actually the loss, so if there was a sale and there were some proceeds, then only the difference between the original investment value and the	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. (Slide 3) The other big concern I have about the reliance on the agricultural experts' report is the granularity of that report. What we appear and what I understand from the testimony yesterday and this morning is that what the agricultural experts have actually produced is an estimate of the average yield that Mr Grot's operations would obtain over a 5-year period. That is not saying what it would be 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point. The second issue I have here is that these assets were required to generate the cashflows that form the second part of the damages claim, and therefore while these assets can be claimed for if they have been lost, and what should be claimed for is actually the loss, so if there was a sale and there were some proceeds, then only the difference between the original investment value and the proceeds that were obtained should be claimed for	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 1 11 12 14 14 14 15 14 14 14 15 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. (Slide 3) The other big concern I have about the reliance on the agricultural experts' report is the granularity of that report. What we appear and what I understand from the testimony yesterday and this morning is that what the agricultural experts have actually produced is an estimate of the average yield that Mr Grot's operations would obtain over a 5-year period. That is not saying what it would be in year 1, and in fact we have heard this morning 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 8 9 0 1 2 8 9 1 8 1 8	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point. The second issue I have here is that these assets were required to generate the cashflows that form the second part of the damages claim, and therefore while these assets can be claimed for if they have been lost, and what should be claimed for is actually the loss, so if there was a sale and there were some proceeds, then only the difference between the original investment value and the proceeds that were obtained should be claimed for with some adjustment for time, value of money and	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 1 12 10 11 12 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. (Slide 3) The other big concern I have about the reliance on the agricultural experts' report is the granularity of that report. What we appear and what I understand from the testimony yesterday and this morning is that what the agricultural experts have actually produced is an estimate of the average yield that Mr Grot's operations would obtain over a 5-year period. That is not saying what it would be in year 1, and in fact we have heard this morning 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point. The second issue I have here is that these assets were required to generate the cashflows that form the second part of the damages claim, and therefore while these assets can be claimed for if they have been lost, and what should be claimed for is actually the loss, so if there was a sale and there were some proceeds, then only the difference between the original investment value and the proceeds that were obtained should be claimed for with some adjustment for time, value of money and things like that, but these should not be claimed in	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 1 12 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. (Slide 3) The other big concern I have about the reliance on the agricultural experts' report is the granularity of that report. What we appear and what I understand from the testimony yesterday and this morning is that what the agricultural experts have actually produced is an estimate of the average yield that Mr Grot's operations would obtain over a 5-year period. That is not saying what it would be in year 1, and in fact we have heard this morning that it would take two to three years to 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 1 3 1	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point. The second issue I have here is that these assets were required to generate the cashflows that form the second part of the damages claim, and therefore while these assets can be claimed for if they have been lost, and what should be claimed for is actually the loss, so if there was a sale and there were some proceeds, then only the difference between the original investment value and the proceeds that were obtained should be claimed for with some adjustment for time, value of money and things like that, but these should not be claimed in conjunction with the lost cashflows, because these	122:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. (Slide 3) The other big concern I have about the reliance on the agricultural experts' report is the granularity of that report. What we appear and what I understand from the testimony yesterday and this morning is that what the agricultural experts have actually produced is an estimate of the average yield that Mr Grot's operations would obtain over a 5-year period. That is not saying what it would be in year 1, and in fact we have heard this morning that it would take two to three years to reconstitute the soil, and therefore the yields in years 1, 2 and 3 would be lower than later on in the 	
234567890123456789222	first is that these assets appear still to be owned or under the control of the Claimants. As we have just heard, Deloitte was able to inspect these assets and therefore presumably there was some control to allow access to be able to inspect them so I am aware that this is a disputed issue but in terms of whether these assets are lost, I am not clear on that at this point. The second issue I have here is that these assets were required to generate the cashflows that form the second part of the damages claim, and therefore while these assets can be claimed for if they have been lost, and what should be claimed for is actually the loss, so if there was a sale and there were some proceeds, then only the difference between the original investment value and the proceeds that were obtained should be claimed for with some adjustment for time, value of money and things like that, but these should not be claimed in conjunction with the lost cashflows, because these assets were required to generate those lost	122:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	 aspects of their operations to be comparable, or they are not comparable and wecan't use them and we have to go and find some other approach and methodology. So, when I looked at the results of the calculations prepared by Deloitte, it appeared to me that the profitability of Mr Grot's purported operations seemed to be significantly overstated, and I will come back to that point in a moment. (Slide 3) The other big concern I have about the reliance on the agricultural experts' report is the granularity of that report. What we appear and what I understand from the testimony yesterday and this morning is that what the agricultural experts have actually produced is an estimate of the average yield that Mr Grot's operations would obtain over a 5-year period. That is not saying what it would be in year 1, and in fact we have heard this morning that it would take two to three years to reconstitute the soil, and therefore the yields in years 1, 2 and 3 would be lower than later on in the 	

bign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev		al 13 Decem Vienna	
	•	644			646
1	of the 5-year period, Mr Grot's operations would	12:11	1		12:14
2	exceed the performance of the test centre by		2	factors when the alleged date of breach is different	
3	20 per cent.		3	between February and March 2011, so a difference of	
4	What I believe we are seeing is that, in		4	about one month between the two. That just	
5	fact, the yields in years 1 and 2 would be below		5	highlights for you the sensitivity of the	
6 7	that average that is being used to calculate the		6 7	discounting and the DCF to monthly changes in the	
7	profitability of Mr Grot's operations, and years 4		7	cash flow. What really should be happening here	
8	and 5 would be higher than that average, ie, over the 5 year paried they would average out to the		8	because of the way in which this business operates,	
9 10	the 5-year period they would average out to the figures that have been set out in the agricultural		9 10	is you should be monthly predicting the cash outflows and cash inflows of this business	
11	experts' report.		11	As I understand this business, there is an	
12	If that is the case, what that means is		12	element of cash coming in some time midsummer,	
13	that we don't know what the agricultural experts		13	June/July time from the winter wheat, I believe that	
14	believe the yields would be in the first few years		14	is about 10 per cent of the overall cashflows, and	
15	of the operations, or in fact any of the years of		15	then the rest only comes in according to the	
16	the operation. We only know what they think it will		16	assumption made by Deloittes when the rest of the	
17	average out to over the five years.		17	harvest is sold when it is harvested, which would be	
18	From the DCF perspective, this is a very		18	August or September, possibly October, depending on	
19	difficult situation, because if we don't get the		19	the crops. So this isn't a business where you have	
20	yields in the first few years, we need additional		20	a regular cash flow. I will come back to that in a	
21	cash flow because we still have to pay for all the		21	moment as well.	
22	extra fertilizers and pesticides that are needing to		22	(Slide 4)	
23	be put onto the fields to reconstitute or		23	One point I want to address here is that	
	rehabilitate the land.		24	there has been a number of suggestions that I have	
24			05	also performed a discounted cash flow calculation.	
24 25	They were not generating the yields to		25		
	They were not generating the yields to	645	25		647
25	recover that investment in the initial period, in	645 12:12	1	I have made it very clear in my report that if	647 12:15
25 1 2	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in		1 2	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the	
25 1 2 3	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact		1 2 3	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with	
25 1 2 3 4	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment		1 2 3 4	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte	
1 2 3 4 5	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so		1 2 3 4 5	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my	
1 2 3 4 5 6	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of		1 2 3 4 5 6	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own.	
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed	
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at what Mr Grot said, that Bio-Alianta was able to		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already. There is a suggestion that the operations	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at what Mr Grot said, that Bio-Alianta was able to harvest from the 140 ha that they planted with		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already. There is a suggestion that the operations in the south of Moldova that Mr Grot was operating	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at what Mr Grot said, that Bio-Alianta was able to harvest from the 140 ha that they planted with winter wheat. He says they were able to get		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already. There is a suggestion that the operations in the south of Moldova that Mr Grot was operating had a profitability of about 45 per cent gross	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at what Mr Grot said, that Bio-Alianta was able to harvest from the 140 ha that they planted with winter wheat. He says they were able to get 200 tons of winter wheat from that 140 ha. That is		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already. There is a suggestion that the operations in the south of Moldova that Mr Grot was operating had a profitability of about 45 per cent gross margin. I believe those are based on the 2010	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at what Mr Grot said, that Bio-Alianta was able to harvest from the 140 ha that they planted with winter wheat. He says they were able to get 200 tons of winter wheat from that 140 ha. That is around 1.4 tons per ha versus the over 4 tors that		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already. There is a suggestion that the operations in the south of Moldova that Mr Grot was operating had a profitability of about 45 per cent gross margin. I believe those are based on the 2010 financial statements that are presented in my	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at what Mr Grot said, that Bio-Alianta was able to harvest from the 140 ha that they planted with winter wheat. He says they were able to get 200 tons of winter wheat from that 140 ha. That is		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already. There is a suggestion that the operations in the south of Moldova that Mr Grot was operating had a profitability of about 45 per cent gross margin. I believe those are based on the 2010 financial statements that are presented in my report; certainly at least that shows a gross margin	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at what Mr Grot said, that Bio-Alianta was able to harvest from the 140 ha that they planted with winter wheat. He says they were able to get 200 tons of winter wheat from that 140 ha. That is around 1.4 tons per ha versus the over 4 tors that the agricultural experts estimate should have been		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already. There is a suggestion that the operations in the south of Moldova that Mr Grot was operating had a profitability of about 45 per cent gross margin. I believe those are based on the 2010 financial statements that are presented in my	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 1	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at what Mr Grot said, that Bio-Alianta was able to harvest from the 140 ha that they planted with winter wheat. He says they were able to get 200 tons of winter wheat from that 140 ha. That is around 1.4 tons per ha versus the over 4 tors that the agricultural experts estimate should have been achievable.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already. There is a suggestion that the operations in the south of Moldova that Mr Grot was operating had a profitability of about 45 per cent gross margin. I believe those are based on the 2010 financial statements that are presented in my report; certainly at least that shows a gross margin of about 45 per cent. I would point out that that	
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at what Mr Grot said, that Bio-Alianta was able to harvest from the 140 ha that they planted with winter wheat. He says they were able to get 200 tons of winter wheat from that 140 ha. That is around 1.4 tons per ha versus the over 4 tors that the agricultural experts estimate should have been achievable.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already. There is a suggestion that the operations in the south of Moldova that Mr Grot was operating had a profitability of about 45 per cent gross margin. I believe those are based on the 2010 financial statements that are presented in my report; certainly at least that shows a gross margin of about 45 per cent. I would point out that that is on the combined business, but there is an element	
1234567891011231415161789	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at what Mr Grot said, that Bio-Alianta was able to harvest from the 140 ha that they planted with winter wheat. He says they were able to get 200 tons of winter wheat from that 140 ha. That is around 1.4 tons per ha versus the over 4 tors that the agricultural experts estimate should have been achievable. The other issue here of course is that these yields are expected to be averaging over a		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already. There is a suggestion that the operations in the south of Moldova that Mr Grot was operating had a profitability of about 45 per cent gross margin. I believe those are based on the 2010 financial statements that are presented in my report; certainly at least that shows a gross margin of about 45 per cent. I would point out that that is on the combined business, but there is an element of a consulting or services business in there, so	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at what Mr Grot said, that Bio-Alianta was able to harvest from the 140 ha that they planted with winter wheat. He says they were able to get 200 tons of winter wheat from that 140 ha. That is around 1.4 tons per ha versus the over 4 tors that the agricultural experts estimate should have been achievable. The other issue here of course is that these yields are expected to be averaging over a 5-year period. Now, the lease contracts were for		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 16 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already. There is a suggestion that the operations in the south of Moldova that Mr Grot was operating had a profitability of about 45 per cent gross margin. I believe those are based on the 2010 financial statements that are presented in my report; certainly at least that shows a gross margin of about 45 per cent. I would point out that that is on the combined business, but there is an element of a consulting or services business in there, so there are two divisions.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at what Mr Grot said, that Bio-Alianta was able to harvest from the 140 ha that they planted with winter wheat. He says they were able to get 200 tons of winter wheat from that 140 ha. That is around 1.4 tons per ha versus the over 4 tors that the agricultural experts estimate should have been achievable. The other issue here of course is that these yields are expected to be averaging over a 5-year period. Now, the lease contracts were for three plus one. The Deloitte calculations are over		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already. There is a suggestion that the operations in the south of Moldova that Mr Grot was operating had a profitability of about 45 per cent gross margin. I believe those are based on the 2010 financial statements that are presented in my report; certainly at least that shows a gross margin of about 45 per cent. I would point out that that is on the combined business, but there is an element of a consulting or services business in there, so there are two divisions. If you look solely at the growing	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at what Mr Grot said, that Bio-Alianta was able to harvest from the 140 ha that they planted with winter wheat. He says they were able to get 200 tons of winter wheat from that 140 ha. That is around 1.4 tons per ha versus the over 4 tors that the agricultural experts estimate should have been achievable. The other issue here of course is that these yields are expected to be averaging over a 5-year period. Now, the lease contracts were for three plus one. The Deloitte calculations are over a 4-year period, so it is not even certain that the		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already. There is a suggestion that the operations in the south of Moldova that Mr Grot was operating had a profitability of about 45 per cent gross margin. I believe those are based on the 2010 financial statements that are presented in my report; certainly at least that shows a gross margin of about 45 per cent. I would point out that that is on the combined business, but there is an element of a consulting or services business in there, so there are two divisions. If you look solely at the growing business, it has a gross margin of 23 per cent only,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22	recover that investment in the initial period, in the first year or two, so this has an increase in the working capital requirements, this has an impact on the DCF calculation, and therefore at the moment we need, I believe, based on what I have heard so far, significantly greater granularity in terms of the projections prepared by the agricultural experts. I think this is backed up when we look at what Mr Grot said, that Bio-Alianta was able to harvest from the 140 ha that they planted with winter wheat. He says they were able to get 200 tons of winter wheat from that 140 ha. That is around 1.4 tons per ha versus the over 4 tors that the agricultural experts estimate should have been achievable. The other issue here of course is that these yields are expected to be averaging over a 5-year period. Now, the lease contracts were for three plus one. The Deloitte calculations are over a 4-year period, so it is not even certain that the investment into the pesticides and fertilizes would		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I have made it very clear in my report that if I don't specifically comment upon an element of the Deloitte report it does not mean that I agree with it. The fact is I have amended the Deloitte methodology and calculation: I have not prepared my own. The other thing we have already discussed is that Deloitte does not do any validation of its model. We have talked about that already. There is a suggestion that the operations in the south of Moldova that Mr Grot was operating had a profitability of about 45 per cent gross margin. I believe those are based on the 2010 financial statements that are presented in my report; certainly at least that shows a gross margin of about 45 per cent. I would point out that that is on the combined business, but there is an element of a consulting or services business in there, so there are two divisions. If you look solely at the growing business, it has a gross margin of 23 per cent only, and if you then provide for the indirect costs, that	

) ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi		al 13 Decem Vienna	
1	(Slide 5)	648 12:17	1	expectations as at the date of the alleged breach,	650 12:20
2	Coming back to the cashflows, as I said		2	but prepared by people who were not holding those	
3	there is no regular pattern here. What I believe		3	expectations at the time. This is not a business	
4	would have happened is there would have been cash		4	plan that has been prepared by Mr Grot; this is a	
5	going out throughout the year and that cash would		5	business plan effectively prepared by the	
6	only have been recouped on sale of the product, or		6	agricultural experts who were not involved in the	
7	the harvest. While I presented in my report a		7	business at that point in time.	
8	standard calculation of the working capital as noted		8	(Slide 6)	
9	by Deloitte, I did not use that calculation because		9	Moving on, I am not sure, now, who has	
10	I didn't think it was appropriate. I didn't think		10	prepared the projections of the prices and of the	
11	that that actually modelled the cashflows that this		11	costs that this business would incur. I know that	
12	business was going to incur.		12	the agricultural experts provide the values that are	
13	This business was going to have to put out		13	in USD, but I also note that the Deloitte	
14	money throughout the year, and it was only going to		14	presentation, certainly the one that I received	
15	recoup that at year end, and that is why I also		15	yesterday, very clearly said that they had received	
16	don't believe it is appropriate to use midyear		16	the values from the agricultural experts in Moldovan	
17	discounting, as Deloitte has done, because there was		17	lei, and that Deloitte had then applied an inflation	
18	no possibility that this company would be able to		18	rate to it and then applied a foreign exchange rate	
19	pay out cash or dividends to the shareholders except		19	to those inflated values.	
20	at year end. So what we are trying to value here is		20	What they applied in the way of the	
21	not a company, as referred to many times by Lars in		21	foreign exchange rate is an historical rate as at	
22	his testimony, but we are actually trying to		22	the date of the alleged breach. I believe that is a	
23	quantify damages, and there is a significant		23	fundamental methodology error. The foreign exchange	
24	difference there. This is the amount of money that		24 25	rates that ought to have been applied to the prices in years after 2011 should have been the foreign	
25	Mr Grot and his associated entities would have				
		649			651
25	received from this operation, and therefore that is	649 12:19	1	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those	651 12:22
25 1 2	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model.	649 12:19	1 2	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and	651 12:22
25 1 2 3	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model . I have taken on board some of Deloitte's	649 12:19	1 2 3	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used.	651 12:22
25 1 2 3 4	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation.	649 12:19	1 2 3 4	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is	651 12:22
1 23 4 5	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in	651 12:22
1 2 3 4 5 6	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been	651 12:22
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the	651 12:22
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model . I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million.	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they	651 12:22
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to	651 12:22
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that	651 12:22
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante approach. I can assure you that I fully grasp the	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that USD figure, again using an appropriate interest rate	651 12:22
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante approach. I can assure you that I fully grasp the ex ante approach. My difficulty is that there is no	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that USD figure, again using an appropriate interest rate that would be linked to the USD that it denominated	651 12:22
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante approach. I can assure you that I fully grasp the ex ante approach. My difficulty is that there is no contemporaneous business plan prepared by Mr Grot or	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that USD figure, again using an appropriate interest rate that would be linked to the USD that it denominated in.	651 12:22
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante approach. I can assure you that I fully grasp the ex ante approach. My difficulty is that there is no contemporaneous business plan prepared by Mr Grot or management of Laguardia on the record.	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that USD figure, again using an appropriate interest rate that would be linked to the USD that it denominated in. I want to make it clear here that these	651 12:22
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante approach. I can assure you that I fully grasp the ex ante approach. My difficulty is that there is no contemporaneous business plan prepared by Mr Grot or management of Laguardia on the record. What we have is a business projection	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that USD figure, again using an appropriate interest rate that would be linked to the USD that it denominated in. I want to make it clear here that these prices are inflation indexed prices. They are not	651 12:22
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante approach. I can assure you that I fully grasp the ex ante approach. My difficulty is that there is no contemporaneous business plan prepared by Mr Grot or management of Laguardia on the record. What we have is a business projection prepared using information from the date of the	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that USD figure, again using an appropriate interest rate that would be linked to the USD that it denominated in. I want to make it clear here that these prices are inflation indexed prices. They are not based on some market expectation as to future	651 12:22
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 17 16 17 17 17 16 17 17 16 17 17 16 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante approach. I can assure you that I fully grasp the ex ante approach. My difficulty is that there is no contemporaneous business plan prepared by Mr Grot or management of Laguardia on the record. What we have is a business projection prepared using information from the date of the alleged breach, prepared by the agricultural	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that USD figure, again using an appropriate interest rate that would be linked to the USD that it denominated in. I want to make it clear here that these prices are inflation indexed prices. They are not based on some market expectation as to future prices, so they are not derived from future trading	651 12:22
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante approach. I can assure you that I fully grasp the ex ante approach. My difficulty is that there is no contemporaneous business plan prepared by Mr Grot or management of Laguardia on the record. What we have is a business projection prepared using information from the date of the alleged breach, prepared by the agricultural experts, and I find it very difficult to both assume	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that USD figure, again using an appropriate interest rate that would be linked to the USD that it denominated in. I want to make it clear here that these prices are inflation indexed prices. They are not based on some market expectation as to future	651 12:22
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante approach. I can assure you that I fully grasp the ex ante approach. My difficulty is that there is no contemporaneous business plan prepared by Mr Grot or management of Laguardia on the record. What we have is a business projection prepared using information from the date of the alleged breach, prepared by the agricultural	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that USD figure, again using an appropriate interest rate that would be linked to the USD that it denominated in. I want to make it clear here that these prices are inflation indexed prices. They are not based on some market expectation as to future prices, so they are not derived from future trading commodities and things like that in the various	651 12:22
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante approach. I can assure you that I fully grasp the ex ante approach. My difficulty is that there is no contemporaneous business plan prepared by Mr Grot or management of Laguardia on the record. What we have is a business projection prepared using information from the date of the alleged breach, prepared by the agricultural experts, and I find it very difficult to both assume that Mr Grot would commit to investing probably in	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that USD figure, again using an appropriate interest rate that would be linked to the USD that it denominated in. I want to make it clear here that these prices are inflation indexed prices. They are not based on some market expectation as to future prices, so they are not derived from future trading commodities and things like that in the various products.	651 12:22
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante approach. I can assure you that I fully grasp the ex ante approach. My difficulty is that there is no contemporaneous business plan prepared by Mr Grot or management of Laguardia on the record. What we have is a business projection prepared using information from the date of the alleged breach, prepared by the agricultural experts, and I find it very difficult to both assume that Mr Grot would commit to investing probably in excess of 2 million USD into a farming operation in	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that USD figure, again using an appropriate interest rate that would be linked to the USD that it denominated in. I want to make it clear here that these prices are inflation indexed prices. They are not based on some market expectation as to future prices, so they are not derived from future trading commodities and things like that in the various products. Obviously I was also provided the	651 12:22
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 2 1 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <td< td=""><td>received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante approach. I can assure you that I fully grasp the ex ante approach. My difficulty is that there is no contemporaneous business plan prepared by Mr Grot or management of Laguardia on the record. What we have is a business projection prepared using information from the date of the alleged breach, prepared by the agricultural experts, and I find it very difficult to both assume that Mr Grot would commit to investing probably in excess of 2 million USD into a farming operation in Moldova with no business plan, or that he would get financing for that from a financial institution</td><td>649 12:19</td><td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21</td><td>exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that USD figure, again using an appropriate interest rate that would be linked to the USD that it denominated in. I want to make it clear here that these prices are inflation indexed prices. They are not based on some market expectation as to future prices, so they are not derived from future trading commodities and things like that in the various products. Obviously I was also provided the additional estimates by the agricultural experts as to what the costs would have been had the yields</td><td>651 12:22</td></td<>	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante approach. I can assure you that I fully grasp the ex ante approach. My difficulty is that there is no contemporaneous business plan prepared by Mr Grot or management of Laguardia on the record. What we have is a business projection prepared using information from the date of the alleged breach, prepared by the agricultural experts, and I find it very difficult to both assume that Mr Grot would commit to investing probably in excess of 2 million USD into a farming operation in Moldova with no business plan, or that he would get financing for that from a financial institution	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that USD figure, again using an appropriate interest rate that would be linked to the USD that it denominated in. I want to make it clear here that these prices are inflation indexed prices. They are not based on some market expectation as to future prices, so they are not derived from future trading commodities and things like that in the various products. Obviously I was also provided the additional estimates by the agricultural experts as to what the costs would have been had the yields	651 12:22
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	received from this operation, and therefore that is what we need to try and discount and actually model. I have taken on board some of Deloitte's comments about my working capital calculation. I had previously had about 1.9 million as the working capital requirement. I have revised my calculations. I believe that would now be closer to 1.4 million. But I go back to the point that I have been accused of not fully understanding the ex ante approach. I can assure you that I fully grasp the ex ante approach. My difficulty is that there is no contemporaneous business plan prepared by Mr Grot or management of Laguardia on the record. What we have is a business projection prepared using information from the date of the alleged breach, prepared by the agricultural experts, and I find it very difficult to both assume that Mr Grot would commit to investing probably in excess of 2 million USD into a farming operation in Moldova with no business plan, or that he would get	649 12:19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	exchange rate in those years. Unfortunately those are not available in an ex ante approach and therefore the entire approach cannot be used. What I believe should have been done is that the calculations should have been prepared in Moldovan lei; that those results should have been discounted using an appropriate discount rate to the date of the alleged breach, at which point they could be converted using a known exchange rate to USD, and pre-award interest could be applied to that USD figure, again using an appropriate interest rate that would be linked to the USD that it denominated in. I want to make it clear here that these prices are inflation indexed prices. They are not based on some market expectation as to future prices, so they are not derived from future trading commodities and things like that in the various products. Obviously I was also provided the additional estimates by the agricultural experts as	651 12:22

1me.I wasn't able to go into that and modify12:241Given that this is the primary basis of the higher12:232things.What I have now been provided is what theDeloitte did point out an error in my4been to generate the yields that I selected and usedDeloitte did point out an error in my5in my calculations.Deloitte did point out an error in my6I note that the original calculationserratum in respect of my Capex. They are quite7in my calculations.increases the negativity of the cashflows so it8fertilizers used generated an EBIT margin of some9One last point is obviously the935 per cent. The figures that I have now been0One last point is obviously the10proceeded any further with those calculations9One last point is obviously the1150 per cent. I do not know and I cannot understand1separately in the agricultural experts' report. As12is ay, it is a bit of a black box. There is a13mechanicalised cost that includes wear and tear,14which I understand to be depreciation, but it is not15set out anywhere separately. Again, I struggle, as15They don't agree with the approach that10it we turn to the pre-award interest, we16bolott digrees.16I think it is fair17to say that I don't agree with the approach that20If we turn to the pre-award interest, we18bolott capex versus maintenance of theasset sis ufficient. There should be a provision <t< th=""><th></th><th>ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova</th><th>Confic Rev</th><th>dentia rised</th><th></th><th>nber 201 a, Austr</th></t<>		ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia rised		nber 201 a, Austr
3 agricultural experts believe the costs would have 3 Definite did point out an error may are quite 5 in my calculations. arratum in respect of my Capex. They are quite 6 I note that the original calculations 6 7 where there was going to be pesticides and 6 8 5 per calculations. 1 9 30 per calculations and EBIT margin of some 3 10 provided generate an EBIT margin closer to 1 ecomplete and EBIT margin of some 11 provided generate an EBIT margin closer to 1 ecomplete any further calculations using those 11 provided generate an EBIT margin closer to 1 ecomplete any further calculations using those 10 completed any further calculations using those 1 mechanicalised cost that includes wear and tear, 11 updated figures. 1 it think the three ory provide for Capex in this calculations, and I don't 12 based to that pre-yaward interest, we 1 it think the three was ong in those 12 based to that pre-yaward interest, we 1 it think the approxision 12	1	me. I wasn't able to go into that and modify		1	Given that this is the primary basis of the higher	654 12:27
 been to generate the yields that I selected and used in my calculations. Inde that the original calculations where there was going to be pesticides and fertilizers used generated an EBT margin dosme 8 35 per cent. The figures that I have now been 10 provided generate an EBT margin dosme 8 35 per cent. The figures that I have now been 10 provided generate an EBT margin dosme 8 35 per cent. I do not know and I cannot understand 11 proceeded any further with these calculations 12 proveded any further with these calculations 13 proceeded any further with these calculations 14 because I don't understand how they fit together. 15 They don't seem reasonable to me so I have not 16 completed any further calculations using those 17 updated figures. 18 mether asset and the approach that 20 provide for Capacin this calculations that 21 bosk that I advit asset and the approach that 22 provide for Capacin this calculation, such as 24 assets is artificant. There should be a provision 25 for Capacin and the approach that 24 with the methodology. What I with the approach that 25 for Capacin and the approach that 26 for Capacin and the approach that 27 mark assets is artificant. There is that, and 31 understand the secret source of the Copy that 32 understand the secret source of the Copy that 33 understand the secret source of the Copy that 34 why he is going to be more successful than any of 35 the other providing tormaint amore of 36 deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, rules 37 more assets and the tormology comes form 36 deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, rules 36 when I compare that the tormology comes form 36 deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, rules 36 when I compare that the tormology comes form 36 deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, rules 36 and the torms, is that he is going to be as that and that comes a consequence 36 and that comes an obset we key tore 37 mat causes apoblem because there is no 38 apployment of fertilizers and pesticides, rules 39 and be the term agai	2	things. What I have now been provided is what the		2	yields, I struggle with that.	
5 In my calculations. 5 right, there was a and the original calculations 6 Indee that the original calculations 7 increases the negativity of the cashflows so it 8 fertilizers used generated an EBIT margin of some 8 6 outcome of that is insignificant. It simply 10 provided generate an EBIT margin of some 10 escarse I. I do na know wall canou understand 11 escarse I. I do na know and I canou understand 11 Sper cent. I do na know and I canou understand 14 which I can be the case, and therefore I have not 15 proyoeded any further with those calculations using those 13 mechanical ecor thread any further calculations using those 16 completed any further calculations using those 1 think the fibrus has in citocated through one of 17 updated figures. There has been a lot of discussion here 1 is questions, to understand to be depreciaton, but it is not 16 completed any further eaclulations using those 1 think the fibrus has includeated through one of 12 updated figures. There has been a lot of discussion here 1 it superstant to be depreciaton, but it is not 12 brouk Geney versus maintenance. 1 thi	3	agricultural experts believe the costs would have		3	Deloitte did point out an error in my	
6 Indet that the original calculations 7 where there was going to be pesticides and 8 fertilizers used generated an EBIT margin of some 9 35 per cert. The figures that I have now been 10 provided generate an EBIT margin of some 11 50 per cert. I do not know and I cannot understand 12 how that can be the case, and therefore I have not 13 proceeded any further with these calculations 14 because I don't understand how they fit together. 15 They don't argree with the approach that 16 completed any further calculations using those 17 packet figures. 18 There has been a i tot of discussion here 19 assets is solficient. Three should be approach that 10 beloate has set out. I beleve that you do needs 11 there should be approach that 12 beloate has set fort Capex in this calculation, and idon't 13 there should be approach there is approach that 14 which I understand the socret source of Mr Grot here, and 14 which I sources approach that technology-orees from 14 which I sourparesta that technology-orees from	4	been to generate the yields that I selected and used		4	erratum in respect of my Capex. They are quite	
7 where there was going to be pesticides and strikers used generated an EBIT margin of some 35 per cent. The figures that I have now been 10 7 increases the negativity of the cashflows so it depreciation that Deloite uses is not disclosed 11 10 provided generate an EBIT margin doser to 15 0 0 One last point is obviously the 10 11 bor and three case, and therefore I have not 15 1 1 separately, 14 and 10 and 10 and 15 separately, 14 and 11 and 12 an	5	in my calculations.		5	right, there was a mathematical error there. The	
 8 faltizers used generate an EBT margin of some 9 Spor cert. The figures that I have now been 10 provided generate an EBT margin closures 11 So par cert. I do not know and I cannot understand 12 how that can be the case, and therefore I have not 13 proceeded any further with those calculations 14 because I don't understand how the fit together. 15 They don't seem reasonable to me so I have not 16 completed any further calculations using those 17 updated figures. 18 There has been a lot of discussion here 19 about Capex versus maintenance. I think it is fair 10 to say that loch agree with the approach that 10 seget at I don't agree Mathematical I don't agree Mathematical 21 provide for Capex in this calculation, and I don't 22 provide for Capex in this calculation, and I don't 23 believe that merely providing for maintenance of the 24 assets is sufficient. There should be a provision 25 for Capex and capital replacement in this process 21 understand the socret source of Mr Grot here, and 31 understand the socret source of Mr Grot here, and 31 understand the socret source of Mr Grot here, and 31 understand the attechnology, comes from 32 deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, or plant 33 respenditors would be for this business, given that 34 when I lock at what the capital 35 when I lock at what the capital 36 when I lock at what the capital 37 expenditures would be for this business, given that 38 when I lock at what the capital 39 what those are. 30 what these work caps they are 30 what those are. 30 what these work be optimized to the 30 deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, or plant 30 devices byond pesticides, but I am not sure exactly 30 what those are. 31 understand the own much Capex they are 31 when I lock at what the capital 31 what hose are. 32 hunders the work work to capex they are 33 when I compare them again Lamong are there again the own whend Capex they are 34 when I lock at what the comparable 35 when I lock at what the capital 36 when	6	I note that the original calculations		6	outcome of that is insignificant. It simply	
 9 Soper cent. The figures that I have now been provided generate an EBIT margin closer to provided generate an EBIT margin closer to sophic transport of some and the case, and therefore I have not the sophic transport of some and the case, and therefore I have not the case, and therefore I have not the complete any further with those calculations using those in the complete any further with those calculations using those in the complete any further with those calculations using those in the complete any further valuations using those in the complete mark y contained and specific issues in the source of the capex versus maintenance. I think it is fair to complete that y understand that is fair to be obtained through one of the table set out. I below that real-providing for maintenance of the capex and capital replacement in this process. 1 (Slide 7)	7	where there was going to be pesticides and		7		
9 Sper cent. The figures that I have now been provided generate an EBIT margin closer to provided generate an EBIT margin closer to the special close to	8	fertilizers used generated an EBIT margin of some		8	doesn't have an impact.	
11 So per cert. I do not know and I cannot understand 11 separately in the agricultural experts' report. As 12 how that can be the case, and therefore I have not 13 mechanicalised costs that includes wear and tear, 14 because I don't understand how they fit together. 13 mechanicalised costs that includes wear and tear, 15 They don't seem reasonable to me so I have not 14 separately in the agricultural experts' report. As 16 They don't seem reasonable to me so I have not 15 set out anywhere separately. Again, I struggle, as 17 updated figures. 16 I think the Tribunal has indicated through one of 17 updated figures. 16 I think the Tribunal has indicated through one of 18 Declotte has set out. I believe that you do need to 17 its questions, to understand the secret source of M Grot here, and 20 the other fammers, is that he is going to be more successful than any of 14 The first is obviously the assumption that as 21 (Side 7) 12 The first is obviously the assumption that as 22 The other concern I have here is that, as 15 23 Inderstand the secret source of M Grot here, and 1 4	9			9	One last point is obviously the	
12 how that can be the case, and therefore I have not 13 proceeded any further with those calculations 13 proceeded flyures. 14 which I understand to be depreciation, but it is not 15 They don't seem reasonable to me so I have not 15 set out anywhere separately. Again, I struggle, as 16 completed flyures. 14 which I understand to be depreciation, but it is not 17 updatef flyures. 15 the pack versus maintenance. I think it is fain 17 to say that I don't agree with the approach that 16 11 the understand what is in those 18 believe that merely providing for maintenance of the asset is sufficient. There should be a provision 16 14 white he mithodology. What I do have are some 16 (Silde 7) 1232 1232 1 The first is obviously the assumption that 1232 17 (Silde 7) 1233 1 The first is obviously the assumption that 1232 18 (Silde 7) 1233 1 The first is obviously the assumption that 11232 19 rotechnology. I understand thes exert source of M Grot here, and 1 there was to be equily financing only. We have now	10	provided generate an EBIT margin closer to		10		
12 how that can be the case, and therefore I have not 13 proceeded any further with those calculations 13 proceeded any further with those calculations 14 michanicalised cost that includes wear and tear, 15 They don't seem reasonable to me so I have not 15 set out anywhere separately. Again, I struggle, as 16 completed any further calculations using those 14 which I understand those they fit together. 16 below that I don't agree with the approach that 15 they asset is sufficient. There is and I don't agree with the approach that 20 provide for Capex in this calculation, and I don't agree with the approach that 16 I think the Tribunal has indicated through one of 21 provide for Capex in this calculation, and I don't agree with the approach that 20 If we turn to the pre-award interest, we 22 provide for Capex in this calculation, and I don't agree with the approach that 21 14 The other concern I have here is that, as 23 the other concern I have here is that, as 11 The other concern I have here is that, as 1 1 The first is obviously the assumption that 111 24 the other farmers, is that he is going to deploy 1 The there was to be equily finanonig only. We have now	11			11	separately in the agricultural experts' report. As	
13 proceeded any further with those calculations 13 mechanicalised cost that includes wear and tear, 14 because I don't understand how they fit together. 14 which I understand to be depreciation, but it is not 15 They don't seem reasonable to me so I have not 15 set out anywhere separately. Again, I struggle, as 16 completed any further calculations using those 16 I think the Thibunal has indicated through one of 17 to say that I don't agree with the approach that 16 If we turn to the pre-award interest, we 12 believe that merely providing for maintenance of the 20 If we turn to the pre-award interest, we 24 assets is sufficient. There should be a provision 20 If we turn to the pre-award interest, we 25 for Capex and capital replacement in this process 1 The first is obviously the assumption that 1232 2 there was to be equily financing only. We have now 2 1 3 I understand the secret source of M Grot here, and 4 that quity financing only. We have now 3 I understand that lechnology comes from 7 The first is obviously the assumption that 1232 4 whyhe is going to be more successful than any of	12			12		
14 because I don't understand how they fit together. 14 which I understand to be depreciation, but it is not 15 They don't seem reasonable to me so I have not 15 est out anywhere separately. Again, 1 struggle, as 16 There has been a lot of discussion here 14 which I understand to be depreciation, but it is not 17 updated figures. 16 I hink the Tithough one of 18 There has been a lot of discussion here 16 I hink the Tithough as indicated through one of 19 below that loon't agree with the approach that 16 I hink the Tithough as indicated through one of 20 provide for Capex in this calculation, and I don't 22 rate was arrived at. I have no particular issues 20 for Capex and capital replacement in this process 23 with the methodology. What I do have are some 2 The other concern I have here is that, as 122 1 The first is obviously the assumption that 1222 2 The other farmers, is that he is going to be provision 16 14 4 3 I understand the secret source of M' Grot here, and 4 4 4 4 4 where look at that techorology comes from 14 14 </td <td>13</td> <td>proceeded any further with those calculations</td> <td></td> <td>13</td> <td>-</td> <td></td>	13	proceeded any further with those calculations		13	-	
 15 They don't seem reasonable to me so I have not completed any further calculations using those completed any further calculations using those in updated any further calculations using those in this calculations using those in this dust diverses. 18 There has been a lot of discussion here about Capex versus maintenance. I think it is fair to say that I don't agree with the approach that is believe that merely providing for maintenance of the assets is sufficient. There should be a provision for Capex and capital replacement in this process 19 (Slide 7) 10 (Slide 7				14		
16 completed any further calculations using those 16 I think the Tribunal has indicated through one of 17 updated figures. 16 I think the Tribunal has indicated through one of 18 There has been a lot of discussion here 18 indicated through one of 19 about Capex versus maintenance. I think its fair 18 indicated the size of how to consider those. 10 Deditite has set out. I believe that you do need to 17 its questions, to understand what is in those 11 Deditite has set out. I believe that you do need to 17 its questions, to understand the size of how the discound 12 Deditite has set out. I believe that you do need to 16 I think the Tribunal has indicated through one of 12 Deditite has set out. I believe that you do need to 17 its questions, to understand what is in those 12 Deditite has set out. I believe that you do need to 17 its questions, to understand maintenance of the 13 Linderstand there seconce of Mr Grot here, and 17 1 The first is obviously the assumption that 14 that technology. Linderstand the technology comes from 7 The three was an undisclosed assumption that 14 Whert look at what the ca					•	
17 updated figures. 17 its questions, to understand what is in those 18 There has been a lot of discussion here about Capex versus maintenance. I think it is fair 19 about Capex versus maintenance. I think it is fair 10 to say that I don't agree with the approach that 11 Deloite has set out. I believe that you do need to 12 provide for Capex in this calculation, and I don't 13 believe that merely providing for maintenance of the 14 essets is sufficient. There should be a provision 15 for Capex in this calculation, and I don't 16 (Slide 7) 11 (Slide 7) 12 the other concern I have here is that, as 13 I understand the scoret source of M Grot here, and 14 Why he is going to be more successful than any of 15 the other farmers, is that he is going to deploy 16 theoremain of fertilizers and pesticides". Like 10 understand that technology comes from 11 understand there are some other plant protection 12 obviousy maximises the captilows that are alleged to be 14 when I look at what the capitial		-				
18 There has been a lot of discussion here 18 mechanical costs and how to consider those. 19 about Capex versus maintenance. I think it is fair 15 (Slide 8) 21 Deloitte has set out. I believe that you do need to 16 If we turn to the pre-award interest, we 21 Deloitte has set out. I believe that you do need to 21 If we turn to the pre-award interest, we 22 provide for Capex in this calculation, and I don't 23 with the methodology. What I do have are some 23 believe that merely providing for maintrannce of the 24 concerns about individual and specific issues in 24 assets is sufficient. There should be a provision 25 rate was a roived at. Thave no particular issues 25 The other concern I have here is that, as 1 The first is obviously the assumption that 12:25 2 The other concern I have here is that, as 12 there was to be equity financing only. We have now 3 3 I understand the secret source of Mr Grot here, and 4 that equity financing would be foregone and that 4 4 why he is going to be more successful than any of 5 there was to be equity financing only. We have now 3 6 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td>					-	
19 about Capex versus maintenance. I think it is fair 19 (Side 8) 20 to say that I don't agree with the approach that 20 If we turn to the pre-award interest, we 21 Deloit has set out. I believe that you do need to provide for Capex in this calculation, and I don't 22 23 believe that merely providing for maintenance of the 23 with the methodology. What I do have are some 24 assets is sufficient. Three should be a provision 25 for Capex and capital replacement in this process 25 for Capex and capital replacement in this process 1 The first is obviously the assumption that 12:2:3:6 1 (Side 7) 12:3:6 1 The first is obviously the assumption that 12:2:3:6 2 The other concern I have here is that, as 2 there was to be equity financing only. We have now 3 I understand the secret source of Mr Grot here, and 4 that there was an undiscosed assumption that 12:2:3:6 4 twy he is going to be more successful than any of 5 there would be a standard industry norm of 6 technology. I understand the attechnology comes from 7 That causes a problem because there is no 7 toresourese: one is equipment and the other is		· -				
20 to say that I don't agree with the approach that 20 If we turn to the pre-award interest, we 21 Deloitte has set out. I believe that you do need to 20 If we turn to the pre-award interest, we 22 provide for Capex in this calculation, and I don't 22 have discussed already the issue of how the discount 23 believe that merely providing for maintenance of the assets is sufficient. There should be a provision for Capex and capital replacement in this process 24 asset is sufficient. There should be a provision for Capex and capital replacement in this process 25 of Capex and capital replacement in this process 23 with the methodology. What I do have are some 26 The other concern I have here is that, as 1 The first is obviously the assumption that 11 27 The other concern I have here is that, as 1 The other concern I have here is that, as 2 there was to be equity financing only. We have now 3 I understand the secret source of MF Grot here, and 3 have discusse a nundisclosed assumption that 4 that exploying financing would be foregone and that 5 that exploying financing would be foregone and that 5 the other farmers, is that he is going to beploy 5				_		
 21 Deloite has set out. I believe that you do need to 22 provide for Capex in this calculation, and I don't 23 believe that merely providing for maintenance of the 24 assets is sufficient. There should be a provision 25 for Capex and capital replacement in this process 21 (Slide 7) 22 The other concern I have here is that, as 31 I understand the secret source of M Grot here, and 4 why he is going to be more successful than any of 5 the other farmers, is that he is going to deploy 6 technology. I understand that technology comes from 7 two sources: one is equipment and the other is 8 deployment of fetilizers and pesticides, or plant 9 protection. I used the term "pesticides". Like 10 most af the people in the room, 1 am not sure exactly 11 understand there are some other plant protection 12 devices beyond pesticides, but I am not sure exactly 14 When I look at what the capital 15 expenditures would be for this business, given that 16 it was supposed to be a technology-based business, 17 I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures 18 when L comparies. I have looked at their comparable 19 criticism of Deloitte – their chosen comparable 10 companies. I have looked at their comparable 21 companies. I have looked at their comparable 22 companies. I have looked at their comparable 23 should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as 24 I understand it now, and I see that this is 		•				
22 provide for Capex in this calculation, and I don't 22 rate was arrived at. I have no particular issues 23 believe that merely providing for maintenance of the 23 with the methodology. What I do have are some 24 assets is sufficient. There should be a provision 25 respect of this case. 25 for Capex and capital replacement in this process 26 3 is understand the secret source of W Grot here, and 1 4 why he is going to be more successful than any of 5 5 the other farmers, is that he is going to be more successful than any of 5 6 the other farmers, is that he is going to deploy 6 7 That causes a problem because there is no 7 That causes a problem because there is no 7 That causes a problem because there is no 8 protection. I used the term "pesticides". Like 7 9 protection. I used the term aposition by protection. 7 11 understand there are some other plant protection 7 12 devices beyond pesticides, but am not a farmer. 1 14 When I look at what the capital 1 15 expe		, o 11			•	
 23 believe that merely providing for maintenance of the assets is sufficient. There should be a provision for Capex and capital replacement in this process 24 concerns about individual and specific issues in respect of this case. 25 respect of this case. 26 (Slide 7) 27 The other concern I have here is that, as 28 Understand the secret source of Mr Grot here, and 29 there was to be equity financing only. We have now 20 there was an undisclosed assumption that 21 that equity financing would be foregone and that 23 there was an undisclosed assumption that 24 that equity financing would be foregone and that 25 the other farmers, is that he is going to deploy 26 technology. I understand that technology comes from 27 two sources: one is equipment and the other is 28 deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, or plant 29 protection. I used the term "pesticides," Like 20 most of the people in the room, I am not a farmer. 21 understand there are some other plant protection 22 devices beyond pesticides, but I am not sure exactly 23 with the mestical exponentitures would be for this business, given that 24 obviously maximises the cashflows to Mr Got and his 25 respenditures would be for this business, given that 26 exponditures would be a technology-based business, 27 I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures 28 when I compare them again to – and subject to the 29 roticitics in O Deloitte – their chosen comparable 20 companies. I have looked at their comparable 21 companies, I have looked at their comparable 22 should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as 23 hub the be Capex, or rather the maintenance as 24 understand it now, and I see that this is 		5				
24 assets is sufficient. There should be a provision 24 concerns about individual and specific issues in 25 for Capex and capital replacement in this process 24 concerns about individual and specific issues in 26 (Slide 7) 12:26 1 2 The other concern I have here is that, as 1 1 3 I understand the secret source of Mr Grot here, and 4 4 why he is going to be more successful than any of 5 5 the other farmers, is that he is going to deploy 5 6 technology. I understand the technology comes from 6 7 That causes a problem because there is no 8 8 deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, or plant 9 9 protection. I used the term "pesticides". Like 9 10 most of the people in the room, I am not a farmer. 10 11 understand there are some other plant protection 13 14 When I look at what the capital 13 15 expenditures would be for this business, given that 14 16 it was supposed to be a technology-based business, 14 related companies, but with that com					•	
25 for Capex and capital replacement in this process 25 respect of this case. 26 (Slide 7) 653 1 (Slide 7) 12:26 2 The other concern I have here is that, as 1 3 I understand the secret source of Mr Grot here, and 2 4 why he is going to be more successful than any of 5 5 the other farmers, is that he is going to deploy 6 6 technology. I understand that technology comes from 6 7 two sources: one is equipment and the other is 7 7 two sources: one is equipment and the other is 7 8 protection. I used the term "pesticides, plant 9 9 protection. I used the term "pesticides, plant 9 11 understand thare are some other plant protection 11 12 expenditures would be for this business, given that 12 14 When I look at what the capital 12 15 expenditures would be for this business, given that 15 16 it was supposed to be a technology-based business, 14 14 when I compare them again to – and subject to						
1 (Slide 7) 1 The first is obviously the assumption that 12:24 1 2 The other concern I have here is that, as 1 The first is obviously the assumption that 12:24 2 The other concern I have here is that, as 1 The first is obviously the assumption that 12:24 3 I understand the secret source of Mr Grot here, and 4 that there was to be equity financing only. We have now 4 why he is going to be more successful than any of 5 there there tars an undisclosed assumption that 5 the other farmers, is that he is going to deploy 5 there would be a standard industry norm of 6 debloquity ratios. 7 That causes a problem because there is no 9 protection. I used the term "pesticides, or plant 9 provision within Deloitte's discounted cash flow 9 protection. I used the term speaticides, but I am not sure exactly 9 calculation to repay those debilities. If they were 1 understand there are some other plant protection 1 assumption that there is equity only and that 14 When I look at what the capital related comparies, but with that comes a consequence 14 when I compare them again to – and subject to the 1 ano						
1(Slide 7)12:261The first is obviously the assumption that 12:22The other concern I have here is that, as1The first is obviously the assumption that 12:23I understand the secret source of Mr Grot here, and3heard that there was an undisclosed assumption that4why he is going to be more successful than any of4that equity financing would be foregone and that5the other farmers, is that he is going to deploy6thete was to be equity financing would be foregone and that6technology. I understand that technology comes from6debt:equity ratios.7two sources: one is equipment and the other is7That causes a problem because there is no8protection. I used the term "pesticides, or plant8provision within Deloitte's discounted cash flow9protection. I used there are some other plant protection11for those are.11I understand there are some other plant protection12assumption that there is equity only and that13what those are.12assumption that there is equity only and that14When I look at what the capital14related companies, but with that comes a consequence15expenditures would be for this business, given that15and that consequence is that we do not here evaluate16it was supposed to be a technology-based business,16business, we value cashflows that are alleged to be17I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures17into account Mr Grot's decision to wholly finance			653			655
 I understand the secret source of Mr Grot here, and why he is going to be more successful than any of the other farmers, is that he is going to deploy technology. I understand that technology comes from two sources: one is equipment and the other is deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, or plant protection. I used the term "pesticides". Like most of the people in the room, I am not a farmer. I understand there are some other plant protection devices beyond pesticides, but I am not sure exactly what those are. When I look at what the capital expenditures would be for this business, given that it was supposed to be a technology-based business, I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures when I compare them again to - and subject to the oriticism of Deloitte - their chosen comparable companies. I have looked at what Deloitte believes should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as I understand it now, and I see that this is and that time discount rate that I used, but yes, that is 	1			1	The first is obviously the assumption that	
 4 why he is going to be more successful than any of 5 the other farmers, is that he is going to deploy 6 technology. I understand that technology comes from 7 two sources: one is equipment and the other is 8 deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, or plant 9 protection. I used the term "pesticides". Like 10 most of the people in the room, I am not a farmer. 11 I understand there are some other plant protection 12 devices beyond pesticides, but I am not sure exactly what those are. 14 When I look at what the capital 15 expenditures would be for this business, given that 16 it was supposed to be a technology-based business, 17 I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures 18 when I compare them again to – and subject to the 19 criticism of Deloitte – their comparable 20 companies. I have looked at their comparable 21 companies. I have looked at their comparable 22 expending. I have looked at what Deloitte believes 23 should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as 24 I understand it now, and I see that this is 4 that equity financing would be for egone and that 5 the extendive formation to the provide 10 debt:equity ratios. 7 That causes a problem because there is no 8 provision within Deloitte as they meed to provide 10 going to say there were debts they need to provide 11 for those. Alternatively, we stick with the 12 assumption that there is equity only and that 13 obviously maximises the cashflows to Mr Grot and his 14 related companies, but with that comes a consequence 15 and that consequence is that we do not here evaluate 16 business, we value cashflows that are alleged to be 17 the source of damages, and therefore we need to take 18 into account Mr Grot's decision to wholly finance 19 his business through equity. 20 Again, Deloitte has correctly pointed out 21 that the change in debt to equity to full equity 22 financing would change the beta within the WACCC. 23 That has a less than 1 per cent impact on the 24 ultimate discount rate that I used,	2	The other concern I have here is that, as		2	there was to be equity financing only. We have now	
 5 the other farmers, is that he is going to deploy 6 technology. I understand that technology comes from 7 two sources: one is equipment and the other is 8 deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, or plant 9 protection. I used the term "pesticides". Like 1 understand there are some other plant protection 1 understand there are some other plant protection 1 devices beyond pesticides, but I am not sure exactly what those are. 1 understand there capital expenditures would be for this business, given that it was supposed to be a technology-based business, it was supposed to be a technology based business, ith the change in debt to equity to full equity<td>3</td><td>I understand the secret source of Mr Grot here, and</td><td></td><td>3</td><td></td><td></td>	3	I understand the secret source of Mr Grot here, and		3		
 6 technology. I understand that technology comes from 7 two sources: one is equipment and the other is 8 deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, or plant 9 protection. I used the term "pesticides". Like 1 understand there are some other plant protection 1 devices beyond pesticides, but I am not a farmer. 11 understand there are some other plant protection 12 devices beyond pesticides, but I am not sure exactly 13 what those are. 14 When I look at what the capital 15 expenditures would be for this business, given that 16 it was supposed to be a technology-based business, 17 I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures 18 when I compare them again to - and subject to the 19 criticism of Deloitte - their chosen comparable 20 companies, I have looked at their comparable 20 Again, Deloitte has correctly pointed out 21 that the change in debt to equity to full equity 22 financing would change the beta within the WACC. 23 should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as 24 l understand it now, and I see that this is 	4	why he is going to be more successful than any of		4	that equity financing would be foregone and that	
7two sources: one is equipment and the other is deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, or plant protection. I used the term "pesticides". Like7That causes a problem because there is no 8 provision within Deloitte's discounted cash flow9protection. I used the term "pesticides". Like9calculation to repay those debilities. If they were10most of the people in the room, I am not a farmer.10going to say there were debts they need to provide11I understand there are some other plant protection12assumption that there is equity only and that13what those are.13obviously maximises the cashflows to Mr Grot and his14When I look at what the capital14related companies, but with that comes a consequence15expenditures would be for this business, given that15and that consequence is that we do not here evaluate16it was supposed to be a technology-based business,16business, we value cashflows that are alleged to be17I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures17the source of damages, and therefore we need to take18when I compare them again to and subject to the18into account Mr Grot's decision to wholly finance19criticism of Deloitte their chosen comparable20Again, Deloitte has correctly pointed out20companies, I have looked at their comparable20Again, Deloitte has correctly pointed out21that the change in debt to equity to full equity22should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as2424 <td>5</td> <td>the other farmers, is that he is going to deploy</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>there would be a standard industry norm of</td> <td></td>	5	the other farmers, is that he is going to deploy		5	there would be a standard industry norm of	
 deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, or plant protection. I used the term "pesticides". Like most of the people in the room, I am not a farmer. I understand there are some other plant protection devices beyond pesticides, but I am not sure exactly what those are. When I look at what the capital expenditures would be for this business, given that it was supposed to be a technology-based business, I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures when I compare them again to and subject to the companies. I have looked at their comparable companies, I have looked at what Deloitte believes should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as I understand it now, and I see that this is 	6	technology. I understand that technology comes from		6	debt:equity ratios.	
 9 protection. I used the term "pesticides". Like 9 calculation to repay those debilities. If they were 10 going to say there were debts they need to provide 11 understand there are some other plant protection 12 devices beyond pesticides, but I am not sure exactly 13 what those are. 14 When I look at what the capital 15 expenditures would be for this business, given that 16 it was supposed to be a technology-based business, 17 I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures 18 when I compare them again to and subject to the 19 criticism of Deloitte their chosen comparable 10 going to say there were debts they need to provide 11 for those. Alternatively, we stick with the 12 assumption that there is equity only and that 13 obviously maximises the cashflows to Mr Grot and his 14 related companies, but with that comes a consequence 15 and that consequence is that we do not here evaluate 16 business, we value cashflows that are alleged to be 17 the source of damages, and therefore we need to take 18 into account Mr Grot's decision to wholly finance 19 his business through equity. 20 Again, Deloitte has correctly pointed out 21 that the change in debt to equity to full equity 22 financing would change the beta within the WACC. 23 should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as 24 l understand it now, and I see that this is 	7	two sources: one is equipment and the other is		7	That causes a problem because there is no	
 10 most of the people in the room, I am not a farmer. 11 I understand there are some other plant protection 12 devices beyond pesticides, but I am not sure exactly 13 what those are. 14 When I look at what the capital 15 expenditures would be for this business, given that 16 it was supposed to be a technology-based business, 17 I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures 18 when I compare them again to and subject to the 19 criticism of Deloitte their chosen comparable 10 going to say there were debts they need to provide 11 for those. Alternatively, we stick with the 12 assumption that there is equity only and that 13 obviously maximises the cashflows to Mr Grot and his 14 related companies, but with that comes a consequence 15 and that consequence is that we do not here evaluate 16 business, we value cashflows that are alleged to be 17 the source of damages, and therefore we need to take 18 into account Mr Grot's decision to wholly finance 19 his business through equity. 20 Again, Deloitte has correctly pointed out 21 that the change in debt to equity to full equity 22 financing would change the beta within the WACC. 23 should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as 24 I understand it now, and I see that this is 	8	deployment of fertilizers and pesticides, or plant		8	provision within Deloitte's discounted cash flow	
 11 I understand there are some other plant protection 12 devices beyond pesticides, but I am not sure exactly 13 what those are. 14 When I look at what the capital 15 expenditures would be for this business, given that 16 it was supposed to be a technology-based business, 17 I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures 18 when I compare them again to and subject to the 19 criticism of Deloitte their chosen comparable 10 companies. I have looked at their comparable 21 companies, I have looked at what Deloitte believes 23 should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as 24 I understand it now, and I see that this is 	9	protection. I used the term "pesticides". Like		9	calculation to repay those debilities. If they were	
 devices beyond pesticides, but I am not sure exactly what those are. When I look at what the capital expenditures would be for this business, given that it was supposed to be a technology-based business, I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures when I compare them again to and subject to the criticism of Deloitte their chosen comparable companies. I have looked at their comparable companies, I have looked at what Deloitte believes should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as I understand it now, and I see that this is 	10	most of the people in the room, ${\rm I}$ am not a farmer.		10	going to say there were debts they need to provide	
 13 what those are. 14 When I look at what the capital 13 obviously maximises the cashflows to Mr Grot and his 14 related companies, but with that comes a consequence 15 and that consequence is that we do not here evaluate 16 it was supposed to be a technology-based business, 17 I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures 18 when I compare them again to and subject to the 19 criticism of Deloitte their chosen comparable 10 companies. I have looked at their comparable 11 companies, I have looked at what Deloitte believes 12 should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as 14 related companies the cashflows to Mr Grot and his 14 related companies, but with that comes a consequence 15 and that consequence is that we do not here evaluate 16 business, we value cashflows that are alleged to be 17 the source of damages, and therefore we need to take 18 into account Mr Grot's decision to wholly finance 19 his business through equity. 20 Again, Deloitte has correctly pointed out 21 that the change in debt to equity to full equity 22 financing would change the beta within the WACC. 23 should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as 24 I understand it now, and I see that this is 	11	I understand there are some other plant protection		11	-	
14When I look at what the capital14related companies, but with that comes a consequence15expenditures would be for this business, given that14related companies, but with that comes a consequence16it was supposed to be a technology-based business,15and that consequence is that we do not here evaluate16business, we value cashflows that are alleged to be17I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures1618when I compare them again to and subject to the1819criticism of Deloitte their chosen comparable1920companies, I have looked at their comparable2021companies, I have looked at what Deloitte believes2022expending, I have looked at what Deloitte believes2123should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as2424I understand it now, and I see that this is24	12	devices beyond pesticides, but I am not sure exactly		12	assumption that there is equity only and that	
 15 expenditures would be for this business, given that 16 it was supposed to be a technology-based business, 17 I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures 18 when I compare them again to and subject to the 19 criticism of Deloitte their chosen comparable 19 criticism of Deloitte their chosen comparable 19 companies. I have looked at their comparable 20 companies, I have looked at what Deloitte believes 23 should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as 24 I understand it now, and I see that this is 				13	-	
 16 it was supposed to be a technology-based business, 17 I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures 18 when I compare them again to and subject to the 19 criticism of Deloitte their chosen comparable 19 companies. I have looked at their comparable 20 companies, I have looked at their comparable 20 companies, I have seen how much Capex they are 21 expending, I have looked at what Deloitte believes 23 should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as 24 I understand it now, and I see that this is 	14	When I look at what the capital		14	related companies, but with that comes a consequence	
 17 I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures 18 when I compare them again to and subject to the 19 criticism of Deloitte their chosen comparable 19 companies. I have looked at their comparable 10 companies, I have seen how much Capex they are 11 expending, I have looked at what Deloitte believes 12 should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as 14 understand it now, and I see that this is 17 the source of damages, and therefore we need to take 18 into account Mr Grot's decision to wholly finance 19 his business through equity. 20 Again, Deloitte has correctly pointed out 21 that the change in debt to equity to full equity 22 financing would change the beta within the WACC. 23 That has a less than 1 per cent impact on the 24 ultimate discount rate that I used, but yes, that is 	15	expenditures would be for this business, given that		15	and that consequence is that we do not here evaluate $% \left({{{\left({{{{{\bf{n}}}} \right)}}}} \right)$	
 18 when I compare them again to and subject to the 19 criticism of Deloitte their chosen comparable 19 companies. I have looked at their comparable 10 companies, I have looked at their comparable 10 companies, I have seen how much Capex they are 11 expending, I have looked at what Deloitte believes 12 should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as 14 understand it now, and I see that this is 18 into account Mr Grot's decision to wholly finance 19 his business through equity. 20 Again, Deloitte has correctly pointed out 21 that the change in debt to equity to full equity 22 financing would change the beta within the WACC. 23 That has a less than 1 per cent impact on the 24 ultimate discount rate that I used, but yes, that is 	16	it was supposed to be a technology-based business,		16	business, we value cashflows that are alleged to be	
19criticism of Deloitte their chosen comparable19his business through equity.20companies. I have looked at their comparable20Again, Deloitte has correctly pointed out21companies, I have looked at their comparable20Again, Deloitte has correctly pointed out22expending, I have looked at what Deloitte believes21that the change in debt to equity to full equity23should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as23That has a less than 1 per cent impact on the24I understand it now, and I see that this is24ultimate discount rate that I used, but yes, that is	17	I am somewhat surprised to see the very low figures		17	-	
20companies. I have looked at their comparable20Again, Deloitte has correctly pointed out21companies, I have seen how much Capex they are21that the change in debt to equity to full equity22expending, I have looked at what Deloitte believes21that the change in debt to equity to full equity23should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as23That has a less than 1 per cent impact on the24I understand it now, and I see that this is24ultimate discount rate that I used, but yes, that is	18	when I compare them again to and subject to the		18	into account Mr Grot's decision to wholly finance	
21companies, I have seen how much Capex they are21that the change in debt to equity to full equity22expending, I have looked at what Deloitte believes22financing would change the beta within the WACC.23should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as23That has a less than 1 per cent impact on the24I understand it now, and I see that this is24ultimate discount rate that I used, but yes, that is	19	criticism of Deloitte their chosen comparable			his business through equity.	
22expending, I have looked at what Deloitte believes22financing would change the beta within the WACC.23should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as23That has a less than 1 per cent impact on the24I understand it now, and I see that this is24ultimate discount rate that I used, but yes, that is	20	companies. I have looked at their comparable		20	Again, Deloitte has correctly pointed out	
23 should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as23 That has a less than 1 per cent impact on the24 I understand it now, and I see that this is24 ultimate discount rate that I used, but yes, that is	21	companies, I have seen how much Capex they are		21	that the change in debt to equity to full equity	
24I understand it now, and I see that this is24ultimate discount rate that I used, but yes, that is	22	expending, I have looked at what Deloitte believes		22	financing would change the beta within the WACC.	
	23	should be the Capex, or rather the maintenance as		23	That has a less than 1 per cent impact on the	
25 exceptionally low compared to the other companies. 25 correct, it would need to be taken into account.	24	I understand it now, and I see that this is		24	ultimate discount rate that I used, but yes, that is	
	25	exceptionally low compared to the other companies.		25	correct, it would need to be taken into account.	

CSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Mc		nfidentia levised		nber 20 [.] a, Austr
1 I note that (slide 8) Deloit 2 that it does not feel there is a need 3 additional risk in relation to the cass 4 has projected. I note that deep in it 5 in its original report Deloitte did stat 6 considered whether an additional rist 7 to be taken into account, and becaus 8 the agricultural experts' projections 9 conservative, it felt there was no no 10 additional risk. 11 This is where we get into 12 of the pre-award interest. Deloitte 13 WACC to being the appropriate int 14 I believe that is an inappropriate and 15 it tries to say that the cost of finance 16 business, and obviously debt finan 17 business, and obviously debt finan 18 significantly less costly than equity 19 heard that already. 20 My perspective is that you 21 are going to set an award at a point 22 not is no risk to the Claimants as to the 23 award at that po	656 12:30 to assume any hflows that it ts appendices te that it k factor needed se it considered a to be eed for that the application equates the erest rate. pproach in that cing this investing in the cing is , and we have a sa Tribunal, t in time. There a value of that ore, they have at point, so they		underreporting of yields by the farmers in Moldova. There has been a lot of discussion about a supposed tax that I have imposed upon loss-making operations that I have predicted or projected. Nothing could be further from the truth. What I have done is I have calculated a tax shield and I have added it back to the cashflows from the loss-making operation. I have done so on the assumption that the other business divisions within Laguardia would be profitable and would be able to benefit from the losses generated by the agricultural business or the produce growing business. The last point is I understand that the Claimants have asked for the award to be paid directly to Mr Grot or the Laguardia US-based entity, so both of these are US-based entities. I don't believe that it would be appropriate, based on the information and calculation before you right now, to do so. The reason is that the damages and the cashflows have been calculated at the Moldovan level. If you were then to pay that sum of money directly to a US entity you would circumvent any of the tax and other legal legislation that would govern the payment between the Moldovan entity and	658
 the chance of it disappearing entire going to be given a sum of money a your award, so they have not borned between those two dates, the date breach and the award date, and the risk that they need to be compensa risk-free rate of return or the time v I believe that since this is USD the appropriate risk-free rate with the USD which is the treasury preference is for a one-year treasury if you go beyond that you get into a interest for illiquidity, which would n case here. (Slide 9) Just to wrap up, there is s submitted evidence that suggests f underreporting of revenues in Molo rather. I shouldn't say "revenue". itself makes it very clear that this is of a survey of some small farms, n large farms, and we have heard thi small patches, small farms, have hig large farms, so I don't believe that any way substantiates a rumour th 	as at the date of e any risk in of the alleged erefore the only ated for is the value of money. calculated in is associated bills, and my ry bill because additional not be the some recently that there was dova, or yields The source s on the basis ot any of the is morning that gher yields than this report in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the US legal entity. That ends my presentation. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer, thank you very much for your efficiency. I think we will now break for 45 minutes for lunch. I am just going to read into the record document RH-3, presentation of the expert, Michael Peer, just given. RH-2 is the errata to the expert report, dated 13 November 2017 also by Mr Peer. It is the errata to the report of 13 November, but this document is dated 10 December. The errata to the original report is of 13 November. Mr Peer, you too are sequestrated for the luncheon. You can talk to Mr Wiechen, if you want, but I hope you will not talk to anyone else. We will see you back here at quarter past two to carry on for cross-examination by Claimants, and there may be some re-direct, and then at that point we would like the two of you to sit together and we may have questions for you both. Thank you. (Luncheon adjournment from 1.37 pm to 2.16 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Mr Astuno, over to you. Cross-examination by Claimant MR ASTUNO: Mr Peer, we would like to ask you a few questions referring to your presentation,	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev			iber 201 I, Austri
	first. I note that you began your presentation	660	1	to be incorrect, that would be yet another reason	662
2	earlier discussing this notion of equipment that		2	why this approximation is unreliable. Is that true?	
3	still purportedly is owned by Claimants, is that		3	MR PEER: If there has been an ownership	
4	correct?		4	transfer, I am not aware of it.	
5	MR PEER: I recall saying that the		5	MR ASTUNO: I understand that point	
6	equipment is in dispute as to its ownership but that		6	generally, but my question was specifically as it	
7	the claim for it could only be for the actual loss		7	pertains to that transfer to Laguardia Agrobusiness,	
8	of that equipment.		8	if we are operate under the assumption or we learned	
9	MR ASTUNO: So you agree it is a question		9	that Mr Grot was not the one hundred percent owner	
10	that does not have a clear answer. Do you agree?		10	of the Laguardia Agrobusiness, that would be another	
11	MR PEER: I have no opinion as to the		11	reason why this number is unreliable. Would you	
12	ownership of it.		12	agree with that assessment?	
13	MR ASTUNO: But nevertheless you state		13	MR PEER: Again, the issue here is what is	
14	here that approximately 83 per cent is still owned?		14	the damage to Mr Grot? If he has sold that company	
15	The second bullet point of your presentation.		15	then he will have been compensated for these assets.	
16	THE PRESIDENT: What page of the		16	MR ASTUNO: I am speaking specifically to	
17	presentation?		17	the transfer to the Laguardia Agrobusiness. Just to	
18	MR ASTUNO: The first page.		18	confirm, you assumed when you made this	
19	MR PEER: Slide 2 of my presentation.		19	approximation that Mr Grot the one hundred per cent	
20	Those are the calculations that I have seen in the		20	owner of Laguardia Agrobusiness?	
21	financial statements. Now I appreciate that there		21	MR PEER: That was my premise of the	
22	has been some movement and some transfers. I don't		22	calculation.	
23	know who owns the equipment.		23	MR ASTUNO: That is fine. There was	
	MR ASTUNO: Movement and transfers. Could		24	mention of multiple business divisions in your report and one of the primary reasons for that	
24 25	movement and transfers likely impact that		25	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	movement and transfers likely impact that				
		661 13:17	1	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing	663 13:20
25					663 13:20
25	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other		1	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing	663 13:20
25 1 2	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers		1 2	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this	663 13:20
25 1 2 3	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not		1 2 3	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the		1 2 3 4 5 6	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business.	663 13:20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no longer in the control of my client?		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements that you refer to – that is table 2 of your report,	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no longer in the control of my client? MR PEER: Again, if they have been lost		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements that you refer to – that is table 2 of your report, is that correct?	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no longer in the control of my client? MR PEER: Again, if they have been lost then they can be claimed for, except to the extent		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements that you refer to – that is table 2 of your report, is that correct? MR PEER: That is correct.	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no longer in the control of my client? MR PEER: Again, if they have been lost then they can be claimed for, except to the extent that they cannot be claimed in conjunction with the		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements that you refer to – that is table 2 of your report, is that correct? MR PEER: That is correct. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements you	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no longer in the control of my client? MR PEER: Again, if they have been lost then they can be claimed for, except to the extent that they cannot be claimed in conjunction with the DCF calculation.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements that you refer to – that is table 2 of your report, is that correct? MR PEER: That is correct. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements you are referring to years 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no longer in the control of my client? MR PEER: Again, if they have been lost then they can be claimed for, except to the extent that they cannot be claimed in conjunction with the DCF calculation. MR ASTUNO: This approximation, this		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements that you refer to – that is table 2 of your report, is that correct? MR PEER: That is correct. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements you are referring to years 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 Is that correct?	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no longer in the control of my client? MR PEER: Again, if they have been lost then they can be claimed for, except to the extent that they cannot be claimed in conjunction with the DCF calculation. MR ASTUNO: This approximation, this calculation, too, was largely dependent on a		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements that you refer to – that is table 2 of your report, is that correct? MR PEER: That is correct. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements you are referring to years 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 Is that correct? MR PEER: 2010 as well.	663 13:20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 16 17 17	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no longer in the control of my client? MR PEER: Again, if they have been lost then they can be claimed for, except to the extent that they cannot be claimed in conjunction with the DCF calculation. MR ASTUNO: This approximation, this calculation, too, was largely dependent on a corporation document that Mr Kopecky put up with the		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements that you refer to that is table 2 of your report, is that correct? MR PEER: That is correct. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements you are referring to years 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 Is that correct? MR PEER: 2010 as well. MR ASTUNO: We start at 2010, but when you	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no longer in the control of my client? MR PEER: Again, if they have been lost then they can be claimed for, except to the extent that they cannot be claimed in conjunction with the DCF calculation. MR ASTUNO: This approximation, this calculation, too, was largely dependent on a corporation document that Mr Kopecky put up with the transfer to regarding Laguardia Agrobusiness. Do		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements that you refer to – that is table 2 of your report, is that correct? MR PEER: That is correct. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements you are referring to years 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 Is that correct? MR PEER: 2010 as well. MR ASTUNO: We start at 2010, but when you are looking at revenue generated from the sale of	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no longer in the control of my client? MR PEER: Again, if they have been lost then they can be claimed for, except to the extent that they cannot be claimed in conjunction with the DCF calculation. MR ASTUNO: This approximation, this calculation, too, was largely dependent on a corporation document that Mr Kopecky put up with the		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements that you refer to that is table 2 of your report, is that correct? MR PEER: That is correct. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements you are referring to years 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 Is that correct? MR PEER: 2010 as well. MR ASTUNO: We start at 2010, but when you	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no longer in the control of my client? MR PEER: Again, if they have been lost then they can be claimed for, except to the extent that they cannot be claimed in conjunction with the DCF calculation. MR ASTUNO: This approximation, this calculation, too, was largely dependent on a corporation document that Mr Kopecky put up with the transfer to regarding Laguardia Agrobusiness. Do you recall that document that was shown? MR PEER: I do.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements that you refer to – that is table 2 of your report, is that correct? MR PEER: That is correct. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements you are referring to years 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 Is that correct? MR PEER: 2010 as well. MR ASTUNO: We start at 2010, but when you are looking at revenue generated from the sale of merchandise, that begins in 2011. Is that right?	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no longer in the control of my client? MR PEER: Again, if they have been lost then they can be claimed for, except to the extent that they cannot be claimed in conjunction with the DCF calculation. MR ASTUNO: This approximation, this calculation, too, was largely dependent on a corporation document that Mr Kopecky put up with the transfer to regarding Laguardia Agrobusiness. Do you recall that document that was shown? MR PEER: I do. MR ASTUNO: When you made this		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements that you refer to – that is table 2 of your report, is that correct? MR PEER: That is correct. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements you are referring to years 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 Is that correct? MR PEER: 2010 as well. MR ASTUNO: We start at 2010, but when you are looking at revenue generated from the sale of merchandise, that begins in 2011. Is that right? MR PEER: Merchandise is 2011. Sales is 2010.	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no longer in the control of my client? MR PEER: Again, if they have been lost then they can be claimed for, except to the extent that they cannot be claimed in conjunction with the DCF calculation. MR ASTUNO: This approximation, this calculation, too, was largely dependent on a corporation document that Mr Kopecky put up with the transfer to regarding Laguardia Agrobusiness. Do you recall that document that was shown? MR PEER: I do.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements that you refer to – that is table 2 of your report, is that correct? MR PEER: That is correct. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements you are referring to years 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 Is that correct? MR PEER: 2010 as well. MR ASTUNO: We start at 2010, but when you are looking at revenue generated from the sale of merchandise, that begins in 2011. Is that right? MR PEER: Merchandise is 2011. Sales is	663 13:20
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 21 22	calculation of 887,000? Is that possible, in other words? Is it possible that movements and transfers would mean that this number is not a reliable number? MR PEER: It may well be that that is not a reliable number. I revert to my point that the issue here is more that the claim can't be for those assets until they have been lost MR ASTUNO: Unless, of course, they are no longer in the control of my client? MR PEER: Again, if they have been lost then they can be claimed for, except to the extent that they cannot be claimed in conjunction with the DCF calculation. MR ASTUNO: This approximation, this calculation, too, was largely dependent on a corporation document that Mr Kopecky put up with the transfer to regarding Laguardia Agrobusiness. Do you recall that document that was shown? MR PEER: I do. MR ASTUNO: When you made this approximation, did you assume that Mr Grot was the		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	assessment of yours pertained to a 2010 servicing agreement. Do you recall reference to this agreement? MR PEER: I do not. The premise of that is actually the detail in the financial statements that were provided to me as an attachment to the Deloitte report, where it actually shows segmentation of the revenue earned by the business. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements that you refer to – that is table 2 of your report, is that correct? MR PEER: That is correct. MR ASTUNO: Those financial statements you are referring to years 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 Is that correct? MR PEER: 2010 as well. MR ASTUNO: We start at 2010, but when you are looking at revenue generated from the sale of merchandise, that begins in 2011. Is that right? MR PEER: Merchandise is 2011. Sales is 2010. MR ASTUNO: Let me go back to that	663 13:20

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	lentia ised	al 13 Decem Vienna	
1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	664 13:21	1	MR ASTUNO: That correction, to be clear,	666
2	breach date assumed by Deloitte, yes.	13.21	2	would be one of terminology. It would not be one of	13.25
3	MR ASTUNO: Also the valuation date of		3	actual revenue number.	
4	your revised DCF calculation. Is that correct?		4	MR PEER: Well, the financial statements	
5	MR PEER: Again, all I have is the annual		5	very clearly have a segmentation, so if that	
6	financials so		6	segmentation is incorrect, the financial statements	
7	MR ASTUNO: Mr Peer, you prepared a		7	themselves would have to be corrected.	
8	revised		8	MR ASTUNO: We are only talking about the	
9	MR PEER: Let me finish my answer. The		9	correction of the term "servicing", we are not	
10	assumed valuation date, or the alleged breach date,		10	talking about the correction of the actual number.	
11	is the beginning of 2011, February or March. I have		11	Is that right?	
12	financials that show results for all of 2011.		12	MR PEER: Again, no, because the figure is	
3	I will take your point, if you wish to put		13	beside the term, so if the term is incorrect, then	
4	it to me, that that business did not start operating		14	the figure would be it is a chicken and egg	
15	until after the alleged breach in 2011, but I have		15	you put the number beside what you think it is in	
16	no knowledge of that.		16	terms of revenue. If you are saying that has now	
17	MR ASTUNO: So you would agree that all of		17	been incorrectly classified, then the financial	
8	that information from after the date of taking, as		18	statements ought to be updated	
9	you phrased it, would be information on an expost		19	MR ASTUNO: Moving on, there was reference	
20	basis? Information that we now know to be true at		20	in your presentation to the alleged 200 tons of	
21	this point in time?		20 21	winter wheat that were sold in 2010. Do you recall	
22	MR PEER: Again, I don't use the term of		22	that?	
23	the taking. You are putting words in my mouth		23	MR PEER: I do. It is on slide 3 of my	
24	there and I will revert that I don't know whether		23 24	presentation.	
-4			24 25	MR ASTUNO: You use that as a point of	
25	that business started before or after.		20		
25	that business started before or after.	665			667
1	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no	665 13:22	1	comparative data to Laguardia's projected	667 13:24
1 2	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that	665 13:22	1 2	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right?	667 13:24
1 2 3	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct?	665 13:22	1 2 3	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have	
1 2 3 4	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the	665 13:22	1 2 3 4	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard	
1 2 3 4 5	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct.	665 13:22	1 2 3 4 5	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the	
1 2 3 4 5 6	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of	665 13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed	665 13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010,	665 13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from the sale of agricultural products?	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by the agricultural experts	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from the sale of agricultural products? MR PEER: Well, it is certainly separates	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by the agricultural experts MR ASTUNO: You have assumed, then, that	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from the sale of agricultural products? MR PEER: Well, it is certainly separates in the financial statements from the activity that	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by the agricultural experts MR ASTUNO: You have assumed, then, that what was produced was only 200 tons. To make that	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from the sale of agricultural products? MR PEER: Well, it is certainly separates in the financial statements from the activity that it declares for the sale of agricultural production	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by the agricultural experts MR ASTUNO: You have assumed, then, that what was produced was only 200 tons. To make that calculation and that assessment, you have assumed	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from the sale of agricultural products? MR PEER: Well, it is certainly separates in the financial statements from the activity that it declares for the sale of agricultural production MR ASTUNO: If you were to learn or if you	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by the agricultural experts MR ASTUNO: You have assumed, then, that what was produced was only 200 tons. To make that calculation and that assessment, you have assumed that only 200 tons of winter wheat were produced on	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from the sale of agricultural products? MR PEER: Well, it is certainly separates in the financial statements from the activity that it declares for the sale of agricultural production MR ASTUNO: If you were to learn or if you were to be told that there might have been some	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by the agricultural experts MR ASTUNO: You have assumed, then, that what was produced was only 200 tons. To make that calculation and that assessment, you have assumed that only 200 tons of winter wheat were produced on 140 ha that year?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from the sale of agricultural products? MR PEER: Well, it is certainly separates in the financial statements from the activity that it declares for the sale of agricultural production MR ASTUNO: If you were to learn or if you were to be told that there might have been some confusion as to what that term exactly meant, and	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by the agricultural experts MR ASTUNO: You have assumed, then, that what was produced was only 200 tons. To make that calculation and that assessment, you have assumed that only 200 tons of winter wheat were produced on 140 ha that year? MR PEER: That is the estimate provided by	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 6 17 18	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from the sale of agricultural products? MR PEER: Well, it is certainly separates in the financial statements from the activity that it declares for the sale of agricultural production MR ASTUNO: If you were to learn or if you were to be told that there might have been some confusion as to what that term exactly meant, and again that term would be "servicing", if you were to	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by the agricultural experts MR ASTUNO: You have assumed, then, that what was produced was only 200 tons. To make that calculation and that assessment, you have assumed that only 200 tons of winter wheat were produced on 140 ha that year? MR PEER: That is the estimate provided by Mr Grot. I have no basis on which to consider that	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 6 17 18 19	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from the sale of agricultural products? MR PEER: Well, it is certainly separates in the financial statements from the activity that it declares for the sale of agricultural production MR ASTUNO: If you were to learn or if you were to be told that there might have been some confusion as to what that term exactly meant, and again that term would be "servicing", if you were to be told that there "servicing" did actually	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by the agricultural experts MR ASTUNO: You have assumed, then, that what was produced was only 200 tons. To make that calculation and that assessment, you have assumed that only 200 tons of winter wheat were produced on 140 ha that year? MR PEER: That is the estimate provided by Mr Grot. I have no basis on which to consider that to be inaccurate.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 18 19 20	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from the sale of agricultural products? MR PEER: Well, it is certainly separates in the financial statements from the activity that it declares for the sale of agricultural production MR ASTUNO: If you were to learn or if you were to be told that there might have been some confusion as to what that term exactly meant, and again that term would be "servicing", if you were to be told that thet term "servicing" did actually equal the sale of agricultural products, would that	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by the agricultural experts MR ASTUNO: You have assumed, then, that what was produced was only 200 tons. To make that calculation and that assessment, you have assumed that only 200 tons of winter wheat were produced on 140 ha that year? MR PEER: That is the estimate provided by Mr Grot. I have no basis on which to consider that to be inaccurate. MR ASTUNO: That was an estimate that you	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 8 19 20 1	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from the sale of agricultural products? MR PEER: Well, it is certainly separates in the financial statements from the activity that it declares for the sale of agricultural production MR ASTUNO: If you were to learn or if you were to be told that there might have been some confusion as to what that term exactly meant, and again that term would be "servicing", if you were to be told that that term "servicing" did actually equal the sale of agricultural products, would that change your assessment?	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by the agricultural experts MR ASTUNO: You have assumed, then, that what was produced was only 200 tons. To make that calculation and that assessment, you have assumed that only 200 tons of winter wheat were produced on 140 ha that year? MR PEER: That is the estimate provided by Mr Grot. I have no basis on which to consider that to be inaccurate. MR ASTUNO: That was an estimate that you found in Mr Grot's witness statement. Is that	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 8 9 20 1 22 2	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from the sale of agricultural products? MR PEER: Well, it is certainly separates in the financial statements from the activity that it declares for the sale of agricultural production MR ASTUNO: If you were to learn or if you were to be told that there might have been some confusion as to what that term exactly meant, and again that term would be "servicing", if you were to be told that that term "servicing" did actually equal the sale of agricultural products, would that change your assessment? MR PEER: Well, if the financial	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by the agricultural experts MR ASTUNO: You have assumed, then, that what was produced was only 200 tons. To make that calculation and that assessment, you have assumed that only 200 tons of winter wheat were produced on 140 ha that year? MR PEER: That is the estimate provided by Mr Grot. I have no basis on which to consider that to be inaccurate. MR ASTUNO: That was an estimate that you found in Mr Grot's witness statement. Is that correct?	
123456789101121314151617819221223	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from the sale of agricultural products? MR PEER: Well, it is certainly separates in the financial statements from the activity that it declares for the sale of agricultural production MR ASTUNO: If you were to learn or if you were to be told that there might have been some confusion as to what that term exactly meant, and again that term would be "servicing", if you were to be told that there "servicing" did actually equal the sale of agricultural products, would that change your assessment? MR PEER: Well, if the financial statements that have been produced are incorrect,	13:22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by the agricultural experts MR ASTUNO: You have assumed, then, that what was produced was only 200 tons. To make that calculation and that assessment, you have assumed that only 200 tons of winter wheat were produced on 140 ha that year? MR PEER: That is the estimate provided by Mr Grot. I have no basis on which to consider that to be inaccurate. MR ASTUNO: That was an estimate that you found in Mr Grot's witness statement. Is that correct? MR PEER: That is correct.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 8 9 20 1 22 2	MR ASTUNO: But, as of 2010, there was no revenue input for the sale of merchandise. Is that correct? MR PEER: There was none declared in the financial statements, correct. MR ASTUNO: Going back to the idea of Laguardia acting as a servicer, you have assumed when you look at the revenue statement from 2010, haven't you assumed that the servicing arrangements meant that Laguardia was not attaining revenue from the sale of agricultural products? MR PEER: Well, it is certainly separates in the financial statements from the activity that it declares for the sale of agricultural production MR ASTUNO: If you were to learn or if you were to be told that there might have been some confusion as to what that term exactly meant, and again that term would be "servicing", if you were to be told that that term "servicing" did actually equal the sale of agricultural products, would that change your assessment? MR PEER: Well, if the financial	13:22	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	comparative data to Laguardia's projected profitability. Is that right? MR PEER: Not particularly. What I have put it in here for is that obviously we have heard and, as I understand it, there is a growth in the yield over a 5-year period, and the premise is that the starting point would be lower than the average, and that seems to be supported by the fact that the winter wheat was only 1.4, which is significantly lower than the 5-year average that is predicted by the agricultural experts MR ASTUNO: You have assumed, then, that what was produced was only 200 tons. To make that calculation and that assessment, you have assumed that only 200 tons of winter wheat were produced on 140 ha that year? MR PEER: That is the estimate provided by Mr Grot. I have no basis on which to consider that to be inaccurate. MR ASTUNO: That was an estimate that you found in Mr Grot's witness statement. Is that correct?	

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			a, Austri
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 112 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \\ 25 \end{array}$	MR PEER: My understanding is that it would have occurred some time in the middle of the summer. June. MR ASTUNO: Of what year? MR PEER: If it had sown in 2010, it would have been 2011. MR ASTUNO: You are aware that in 2011 there was a serious dispute on these lands You are aware of that fact? MR PEER: I am aware of that. MR ASTUNO: Would you also agree that that dispute, and the nature of the affairs that were occurring on that land at that time between Bio-Alianta, the government and Mr Grot's company, might have impaired the productivity of those lands? MR PEER: I have no ability to comment on		4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR ASTUNO: But in all fairness you don't exactly know what Deloitte requested of my client, just like you don't know what Respondent requested from Claimant regarding this business plan. Is that right? MR PEER: No, I do not. MR ASTUNO: So you would concede that there likely is a business plan, but it is just not on the record? THE PRESIDENT: I think he has been pretty clear in what he says. MR ASTUNO: I now want to move on to what in Claimants' mind is the most fundamental issue that we have with your report, and that is your source of information as to the cost structure of Laguardia, and your source of information as to the projected yields of Laguardia. You earlier mentioned that you felt as though you were in a black box. Is that not the case that you were in a black box as to your ability to project Laguardia's cost structure? Is that right? MR PEER: That is correct. I did not know how the agricultural experts had arrived at their cost structure, so I could not modify it based on	670 13:28
$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\8\\9\\21\\22\\23\\24\\25\end{array}$	 also contains information that would indicate that the productivity of those lands could be seriously impaired? MR PEER: Again, I don't know whether the productivity was impaired or not. I know that that is what was stated to be harvested MR ASTUNO: You did read in that statement that there was a serious dispute at the time on these lands. Is that right? MR PEER: I understand there was dispute regarding the lands, yes. MR ASTUNO: There were repeated assertions by you that Laguardia lacked a business plan for its operations as of 2010. You recall making these assertions. Is that right? MR PEER: My assertion is that there is no business plan on the record. MR ASTUNO: On the record? Your assertion is that there is no business plan on the record? MR PEER: The starting point of the damages calculation that Deloitte prepared ought to have been a contemporaneous business plan. Because one was not provided to Deloitte, I assume there is none available. I also am not aware of any business plan having been submitted and been made available. 		$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	the modifications I made to the projected yields MR ASTUNO: But at the same time you were in a black box as to projecting yields. Is that right? MR PEER: The yield projections were fairly straightforward and transparent in terms of how the agricultural experts had prepared it. They had said that they had considered the production capacity at the test centre. It was only during the testimony yesterday that I understood more about what that projection actually was, ie, it was a 5-year average, not an expectation for each year. But yes, I believe that I had more transparency as to what they had actually projected in terms of the yields. MR ASTUNO: Do you feel now on the basis of what you learned throughout these proceedings so far that you have more transparency on the direct correlation that costs and yields have to one another in the agricultural industry? MR PEER: I don't. I have a revised set of figures, but I do not know how those figures were derived. MR ASTUNO: Do you know generally how revenue figures correlate to costs in the	671 13:29

www.dianaburden.com
) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia ised	Il 13 Decem Vienna	
1		672	1		674
1	5	13:31		6	13:33
2	MR PEER: Again, I am somewhat bemused at		2	MR ASTUNO: But you created a revised	
3	the moment because the new figures that we received			discounted cash flow valuation for Laguardia.	
4	yesterday		4	MR PEER: No. I prepared a revised	
5	MR ASTUNO: I am not asking about that		5	discounted cash flow to firm which is an	
6	MR PEER: The new figures that we received		6	approximation of the damages to Mr Grot. I have not	
7	yesterday from the agricultural experts suggest a		7	valued Laguardia.	
8	greater profit margin if you do not apply pesticides		8	MR ASTUNO: You revised the projected	
9	and fertilizers. I am therefore confused as to how		9	revenues of Laguardia. Would you agree to that	
10	this relationship works.		10	statement?	
11	MR ASTUNO: You were confused about how		11	MR PEER: I did revise the projected	
12	this relationship works, but you still nevertheless		12	revenues, yes.	
13	revised yield projections in this case. Is that		13	MR ASTUNO: Despite not being an expert in	
14	correct?		14	the industry and just agreeing that there could be a	
15	MR PEER: I did revise the yield		15	correlation between costs and revenue?	
16	projections, yes.		16	MR PEER: Without being an agricultural	
17	MR ASTUNO: You are by no means, neither		17	expert, yes.	
18	am I, of course, but you are not an expert in		18	MR ASTUNO: If you don't mind me asking,	
19	agriculture. Is that right?		19	did you ask your client if you could have the	
20	MR PEER: I am not an expert in		20	opportunity to collaborate with a local agricultural	
21	agriculture.		21	expert?	
22	5		22	MR PEER: I produced my report in under	
	MR ASTUNO: Despite none of us in the room				
23	perhaps right now being experts in agriculture			seven days. I did not have time to ask many	
24	MR FORTIER: Mr Grot. MR ASTUNO: How can I forget? My		24 25	questions. MR ASTUNO: I am impressed you were able	
25					
25		673			675
1	forgiveness, Mr Grot! Would you agree that what a	673 13:32		to produce that in under seven days. Do you think	675 13:34
25 1 2	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs	673 13:32	2	the credibility and reliability of your report would	675 13:34
1		673 13:32	2		675 13:34
1 2 3	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs	673 13:32	2	the credibility and reliability of your report would	675 13:34
1 2 3 4	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in	673 ^{13:32}	2 3	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields?	673 ^{13:32}	2 3 4 5	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert?	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is	673 13:32	2 3 4 5	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the	673 13:32	2 3 4 5 6	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it.	673 13:32	2 3 4 5 6 7	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert.	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation	673 ^{13:32}	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision?	673 ^{13:32}	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable?	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision? MR PEER: As I said, I was unable to make	673 ^{13:32}	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable? MR PEER: I don't know whether it would	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision? MR PEER: As I said, I was unable to make that correlation and therefore unable to adjust the	673 ^{13:32}	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable? MR PEER: I don't know whether it would have been more reliable. It depends on what I did	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision? MR PEER: As I said, I was unable to make that correlation and therefore unable to adjust the costs, and I am very straightforward about that.	673 ^{13:32}	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable? MR PEER: I don't know whether it would have been more reliable. It depends on what I did with the information I was given by them, but	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision? MR PEER: As I said, I was unable to make that correlation and therefore unable to adjust the costs, and I am very straightforward about that. MR ASTUNO: Adjust the yields?	673 ^{13:32}	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable? MR PEER: I don't know whether it would have been more reliable. It depends on what I did with the information I was given by them, but I think it would have been useful to corroborate	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision? MR PEER: As I said, I was unable to make that correlation and therefore unable to adjust the costs, and I am very straightforward about that. MR ASTUNO: Adjust the yields? MR PEER: I wasn't able to adjust the costs and I have been very forthright about that in	673 ^{13:32}	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable? MR PEER: I don't know whether it would have been more reliable. It depends on what I did with the information I was given by them, but I think it would have been useful to corroborate with them. MR ASTUNO: It would have been more	675 13:34
1	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision? MR PEER: As I said, I was unable to make that correlation and therefore unable to adjust the costs, and I am very straightforward about that. MR ASTUNO: Adjust the yields? MR PEER: I wasn't able to adjust the costs and I have been very forthright about that in my report.	673 ^{13:32}	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable? MR PEER: I don't know whether it would have been more reliable. It depends on what I did with the information I was given by them, but I think it would have been useful to corroborate with them.	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision? MR PEER: As I said, I was unable to make that correlation and therefore unable to adjust the costs, and I am very straightforward about that. MR ASTUNO: Adjust the yields? MR PEER: I wasn't able to adjust the costs and I have been very forthright about that in my report. MR ASTUNO: Would you agree that an	673 ^{13:32}	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable? MR PEER: I don't know whether it would have been more reliable. It depends on what I did with the information I was given by them, but I think it would have been useful to corroborate with them. MR ASTUNO: It would have been more useful? You can agree to that. MR PEER: I twould have been more useful	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision? MR PEER: As I said, I was unable to make that correlation and therefore unable to adjust the costs, and I am very straightforward about that. MR ASTUNO: Adjust the yields? MR PEER: I wasn't able to adjust the costs and I have been very forthright about that in my report. MR ASTUNO: Would you agree that an agricultural company that spends money on	673 13:32	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable? MR PEER: I don't know whether it would have been more reliable. It depends on what I did with the information I was given by them, but I think it would have been useful to corroborate with them. MR ASTUNO: It would have been more useful? You can agree to that. MR PEER: I twould have been more useful for me, yes.	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 6 17 18 19	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision? MR PEER: As I said, I was unable to make that correlation and therefore unable to adjust the costs, and I am very straightforward about that. MR ASTUNO: Adjust the yields? MR PEER: I wasn't able to adjust the costs and I have been very forthright about that in my report. MR ASTUNO: Would you agree that an agricultural company that spends money on fertilizers, soil protectants and modern equipment	673 13:32	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable? MR PEER: I don't know whether it would have been more reliable. It depends on what I did with the information I was given by them, but I think it would have been useful to corroborate with them. MR ASTUNO: It would have been more useful? You can agree to that. MR PEER: It would have been more useful for me, yes. MR ASTUNO: I want to discuss the	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 6 17 18 19 20	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision? MR PEER: As I said, I was unable to make that correlation and therefore unable to adjust the costs, and I am very straightforward about that. MR ASTUNO: Adjust the yields? MR PEER: I wasn't able to adjust the costs and I have been very forthright about that in my report. MR ASTUNO: Would you agree that an agricultural company that spends money on fertilizers, soil protectants and modern equipment could expect to achieve greater than average yields	673 13:32	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable? MR PEER: I don't know whether it would have been more reliable. It depends on what I did with the information I was given by them, but I think it would have been useful to corroborate with them. MR ASTUNO: It would have been more useful? You can agree to that. MR PEER: It would have been more useful for me, yes. MR ASTUNO: I want to discuss the reference to the guideline companies that Deloitte	675 13:34
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 1	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision? MR PEER: As I said, I was unable to make that correlation and therefore unable to adjust the costs, and I am very straightforward about that. MR ASTUNO: Adjust the yields? MR PEER: I wasn't able to adjust the costs and I have been very forthright about that in my report. MR ASTUNO: Would you agree that an agricultural company that spends money on fertilizers, soil protectants and modern equipment could expect to achieve greater than average yields than a company that does not?	673 13:32	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable? MR PEER: I don't know whether it would have been more reliable. It depends on what I did with the information I was given by them, but I think it would have been useful to corroborate with them. MR ASTUNO: It would have been more useful? You can agree to that. MR PEER: It would have been more useful for me, yes. MR ASTUNO: I want to discuss the reference to the guideline companies that Deloitte and Mr Wiechen prepared. That reference to the	675
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 15 10 11 12 3 14 11 10 11 12 3 14 11 10 11 11 12 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision? MR PEER: As I said, I was unable to make that correlation and therefore unable to adjust the costs, and I am very straightforward about that. MR ASTUNO: Adjust the yields? MR PEER: I wasn't able to adjust the costs and I have been very forthright about that in my report. MR ASTUNO: Would you agree that an agricultural company that spends money on fertilizers, soil protectants and modern equipment could expect to achieve greater than average yields than a company that does not? MR PEER: I don't know.	673 13:32	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable? MR PEER: I don't know whether it would have been more reliable. It depends on what I did with the information I was given by them, but I think it would have been useful to corroborate with them. MR ASTUNO: It would have been more useful? You can agree to that. MR PEER: It would have been more useful for me, yes. MR ASTUNO: I want to discuss the reference to the guideline companies that Deloitte and Mr Wiechen prepared. That reference to the guideline companies did not impact its calculation	675
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 1 22 3	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision? MR PEER: As I said, I was unable to make that correlation and therefore unable to adjust the costs, and I am very straightforward about that. MR ASTUNO: Adjust the yields? MR PEER: I wasn't able to adjust the costs and I have been very forthright about that in my report. MR ASTUNO: Would you agree that an agricultural company that spends money on fertilizers, soil protectants and modern equipment could expect to achieve greater than average yields than a company that does not? MR ASTUNO: But without knowing, and I can	673 13:32	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable? MR PEER: I don't know whether it would have been more reliable. It depends on what I did with the information I was given by them, but I think it would have been useful to corroborate with them. MR ASTUNO: It would have been more useful? You can agree to that. MR PEER: It would have been more useful for me, yes. MR ASTUNO: I want to discuss the reference to the guideline companies that Deloitte and Mr Wiechen prepared. That reference to the guideline companies did not impact its calculation of projected revenue and costs. Is that right?	675
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 15 10 11 12 3 14 11 10 11 12 3 14 11 10 11 11 12 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	farmer decides to spend in terms of his cost inputs directly affects what he can expect to receive in yields? MR PEER: I would expect that there is going to be some sort of correlation. That is the economics of it. MR ASTUNO: But there is no correlation done in your revision? MR PEER: As I said, I was unable to make that correlation and therefore unable to adjust the costs, and I am very straightforward about that. MR ASTUNO: Adjust the yields? MR PEER: I wasn't able to adjust the costs and I have been very forthright about that in my report. MR ASTUNO: Would you agree that an agricultural company that spends money on fertilizers, soil protectants and modern equipment could expect to achieve greater than average yields than a company that does not? MR PEER: I don't know.	673 13:32	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the credibility and reliability of your report would have been enhanced had you had the opportunity to collaborate with a local expert? MR PEER: I think that it would have been useful, yes, to have some discussions with a local agricultural expert. MR ASTUNO: In other words, it would have been more reliable? MR PEER: I don't know whether it would have been more reliable. It depends on what I did with the information I was given by them, but I think it would have been useful to corroborate with them. MR ASTUNO: It would have been more useful? You can agree to that. MR PEER: It would have been more useful for me, yes. MR ASTUNO: I want to discuss the reference to the guideline companies that Deloitte and Mr Wiechen prepared. That reference to the guideline companies did not impact its calculation	675 13:34

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confidenti Revised	al 13 Decemb Vienna,	
	Revised 676 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 24	Vienna,	
 they are comparable for one purpose but not for others. MR ASTUNO: But you have compared the estimated profitability of Laguardia to the profitability of these companies, haven't you? MR PEER: I have done that, yes. MR ASTUNO: And you just said that that would not be useful, or was I misinterpreting your statement? MR PEER: No. Either Deloitte considers these to be comparable companies in all aspects, or they don't consider them to be comparable companies. I do not believe that they can cherrypick and say they are comparable for the purposes of determining what the working capital ought to be, they are comparable for determining what the beta ought to be, they are comparable for determining what the debt to equity ratio ought to be, but they are not comparable for considering what the profitability ought to be. I don't believe that that is cherrypicking that can be allowed. MR ASTUNO: Any comparison that you made of Laguardia to these companies as it pertains to profitability would not be credible, then. Is that right? 	6777 13:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	company, that would be something that you would take 1 into consideration. Is that right? MR PEER: One of the factors you would consider is what impact that being modern and technologically sophisticated had on its cashflows, as that is ultimately what you are looking at. MR ASTUNO: Mr President, there are a number of other accounting issues that I could pretend to be an expert on, I have done some homework, but I believe it might be the best use of our time now for Claimants to end their cross-examination of Mr Peer. I would ask at this point that any other differences in the calculation of accounting inputs, we stand by the record and we stand by our expert report. THE PRESIDENT: That is certainly understood. Thank you very much. We hand back to Mr Kopecky for any re-direct. Re-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Just one question. In Appendix E to your report did you project yields? MR PEER: No. In Appendix E I project the actual revenue from the fields, not the yield itself. MR KOPECKY: So a revenue is different	679 3:38

ign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi		al 13 Decem Vienna	
1	from a yield?	680 13:41	1	dream up everything – of course you don't dream up	682
2	MR PEER: It is different from yields.	13:41	2	everything because you are scientific, you are	13:45
<u>-</u> 3	MR KOPECKY: Thank you.		2	educated, so you have literature, so you have	
, 1	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Excuse me, because you		4	figures and WACCs and all these kind of things, but	
5	are not talking to experts. What is the difference		5	for a simple mind like mine an income-based approach	
5	between yield and revenue? I am sorry to ask these		6	presupposes the existence of income over a certain	
7	stupid questions but I simply don't know.		7	period of time.	
3	MR PEER: The reason I didn't project the		8	If there were no other possibility to come	
9	yields is that the yields and the price work		9	to some kind of estimate of damages, I would say	
0	together to generate the revenue, and I projected		10	okay, we have to live with this uncertainty, but	
1	revenue rather than yields themselves because I was		11	there are other possibilities to come to damage	
2	accepting of the fact that there is an interaction		12	appreciation. My question is why did you both agree	
3	between the two.			on a DCF, which means income-based evaluation of	
4	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you very much.		14	damages when there is also a possibility to assess	
5	THE PRESIDENT: We now ask Mr Lars Wiechen		15	damages based on asset evaluation, or comparable	
6	to come and join Mr Peer.		16	property evaluation? Because we have assets, we	
7	LARS WIECHEN and MICHAEL PEER		17	have financial statements, we have all this. Why	
8	Questions by the Arbitral Tribunal		18	did you choose under these circumstances of extreme	
9	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I will try to form the		19	uncertainty and non-maturity of business, the DCF	
0	question to the best of my intelligence, not being		20	method?	
1	an expert in the field you are in, and at the same		21	I ask both of you, of course, but it is	
2	time confirming that I am full of admiration when		22	better to start with the Claimants' expert.	
3	l listen to people who talk about an ex ante		23	MR WIECHEN: Maybe to clarify from the	
4	approach of the past as if it were the future, and		24	very beginning, what we performed was a business	
5	that is really fantastic. I am not cynical at all,		25	valuation of a business which indeed had a very	
1	l am full of admiration, because I have problems	681	1	short history. But the value of the business is	
	I am full of admiration, because I have problems predicting the future until Sunday, including my	681 13:43	1	short history. But the value of the business is determined on the future earnings generation	683 13:46
2	predicting the future until Sunday, including my		2	determined on the future earnings generation	
2	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain,		2 3	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the	
1 2 3 4 5	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know.		2	determined on the future earnings generation	
2 3 4 5	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain,		2 3 4 5	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the	
2 3 4 5	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark		2 3 4 5	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have	
2 3 4 5 7	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have		2 3 4 5 6	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to	
2 3 4 5 7 8	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my		2 3 4 5 6 7	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the ground to become an established business, or have a		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me I have done in the last five years at least 150 of	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the ground to become an established business, or have a mature activity in farming leased land in Moldova.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me I have done in the last five years at least 150 of those.	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0 1 2	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the ground to become an established business, or have a mature activity in farming leased land in Moldova. Now, there are different methods to come		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me I have done in the last five years at least 150 of those. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I believe you	
23457390123	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the ground to become an established business, or have a mature activity in farming leased land in Moldova. Now, there are different methods to come to damage appreciations, and an incomebased method		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me I have done in the last five years at least 150 of those. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I believe you completely!	
2345573901234	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the ground to become an established business, or have a mature activity in farming leased land in Moldova. Now, there are different methods to come to damage appreciations, and an incomebased method that you seem to agree upon, like a DCF method, presumes in my understanding that there has been income and I haven't seen any, except for if you		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me I have done in the last five years at least 150 of those. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I believe you completely! MR WIECHEN: And due to the fact that the entire investment was lost, so there is actually no business any more, the company is currently under	13:46
23455739012345	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the ground to become an established business, or have a mature activity in farming leased land in Moldova. Now, there are different methods to come to damage appreciations, and an incomebased method that you seem to agree upon, like a DCF method, presumes in my understanding that there has been income and I haven't seen any, except for if you take it as part of this whole parcel some		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me I have done in the last five years at least 150 of those. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I believe you completely! MR WIECHEN: And due to the fact that the entire investment was lost, so there is actually no business any more, the company is currently under insolvency proceedings and special administration,	13:46
2345673901234567	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the ground to become an established business, or have a mature activity in farming leased land in Moldova. Now, there are different methods to come to damage appreciations, and an incomebased method that you seem to agree upon, like a DCF method, presumes in my understanding that there has been income and I haven't seen any, except for if you take it as part of this whole parcel some production in the south of Moldova done by Laguardia		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me I have done in the last five years at least 150 of those. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I believe you completely! MR WIECHEN: And due to the fact that the entire investment was lost, so there is actually no business any more, the company is currently under insolvency proceedings and special administration, so basically Mr Grot entirely lost the business	
23456739012345678	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the ground to become an established business, or have a mature activity in farming leased land in Moldova. Now, there are different methods to come to damage appreciations, and an incomebased method that you seem to agree upon, like a DCF method, presumes in my understanding that there has been income and I haven't seen any, except for if you take it as part of this whole parcel some production in the south of Moldova done by Laguardia before it moved to the north, and then perhaps		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me I have done in the last five years at least 150 of those. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I believe you completely! MR WIECHEN: And due to the fact that the entire investment was lost, so there is actually no business any more, the company is currently under insolvency proceedings and special administration, so basically Mr Grot entirely lost the business factually at the date of revocation of the	13:46
234567390123456789	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the ground to become an established business, or have a mature activity in farming leased land in Moldova. Now, there are different methods to come to damage appreciations, and an incomebased method that you seem to agree upon, like a DCF method, presumes in my understanding that there has been income and I haven't seen any, except for if you take it as part of this whole parcel some production in the south of Moldova done by Laguardia before it moved to the north, and then perhaps which I had not really looked into the other		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me I have done in the last five years at least 150 of those. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I believe you completely! MR WIECHEN: And due to the fact that the entire investment was lost, so there is actually no business any more, the company is currently under insolvency proceedings and special administration, so basically Mr Grot entirely lost the business factually at the date of revocation of the respective lease agreements.	13:46
2345678901234567890	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the ground to become an established business, or have a mature activity in farming leased land in Moldova. Now, there are different methods to come to damage appreciations, and an incomebased method that you seem to agree upon, like a DCF method, presumes in my understanding that there has been income and I haven't seen any, except for if you take it as part of this whole parcel some production in the south of Moldova done by Laguardia before it moved to the north, and then perhaps which I had not really looked into the other activities by Laguardia, which had nothing to do		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me I have done in the last five years at least 150 of those. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I believe you completely! MR WIECHEN: And due to the fact that the entire investment was lost, so there is actually no business any more, the company is currently under insolvency proceedings and special administration, so basically Mr Grot entirely lost the business factually at the date of revocation of the respective lease agreements. To come back to your initial question,	13:46
23456789012345678901	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the ground to become an established business, or have a mature activity in farming leased land in Moldova. Now, there are different methods to come to damage appreciations, and an incomebased method that you seem to agree upon, like a DCF method, presumes in my understanding that there has been income and I haven't seen any, except for if you take it as part of this whole parcel some production in the south of Moldova done by Laguardia before it moved to the north, and then perhaps which I had not really looked into the other activities by Laguardia, which had nothing to do with this farming business, but for the rest no		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me I have done in the last five years at least 150 of those. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I believe you completely! MR WIECHEN: And due to the fact that the entire investment was lost, so there is actually no business any more, the company is currently under insolvency proceedings and special administration, so basically Mr Grot entirely lost the business factually at the date of revocation of the respective lease agreements. To come back to your initial question, yes, I agree, we have a degree of uncertainty, we	13:46
234567390123456789012	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the ground to become an established business, or have a mature activity in farming leased land in Moldova. Now, there are different methods to come to damage appreciations, and an incomebased method that you seem to agree upon, like a DCF method, presumes in my understanding that there has been income and I haven't seen any, except for if you take it as part of this whole parcel some production in the south of Moldova done by Laguardia before it moved to the north, and then perhaps which I had not really looked into the other activities by Laguardia, which had nothing to do with this farming business, but for the rest no activity.		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me I have done in the last five years at least 150 of those. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I believe you completely! MR WIECHEN: And due to the fact that the entire investment was lost, so there is actually no business any more, the company is currently under insolvency proceedings and special administration, so basically Mr Grot entirely lost the business factually at the date of revocation of the respective lease agreements. To come back to your initial question, yes, I agree, we have a degree of uncertainty, we have in all business valuations, and as an evaluator	13:46
2345673901234567890123	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the ground to become an established business, or have a mature activity in farming leased land in Moldova. Now, there are different methods to come to damage appreciations, and an incomebased method that you seem to agree upon, like a DCF method, presumes in my understanding that there has been income and I haven't seen any, except for if you take it as part of this whole parcel some production in the south of Moldova done by Laguardia before it moved to the north, and then perhaps which I had not really looked into the other activities by Laguardia, which had nothing to do with this farming business, but for the rest no activity. Then, of course, an income-based approach		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me I have done in the last five years at least 150 of those. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I believe you completely! MR WIECHEN: And due to the fact that the entire investment was lost, so there is actually no business any more, the company is currently under insolvency proceedings and special administration, so basically Mr Grot entirely lost the business factually at the date of revocation of the respective lease agreements. To come back to your initial question, yes, I agree, we have a degree of uncertainty, we have in all business valuations, and as an evaluator it is one of your basic tasks to reduce the	13:46
2 3 4	predicting the future until Sunday, including my revenues. Well, until Sunday I am quite certain, but beyond that I don't know. There is some seriousness in my remark because I think many of the questions we have discussed here are due to the facts that in my knowledge this Laguardia never really took off the ground to become an established business, or have a mature activity in farming leased land in Moldova. Now, there are different methods to come to damage appreciations, and an incomebased method that you seem to agree upon, like a DCF method, presumes in my understanding that there has been income and I haven't seen any, except for if you take it as part of this whole parcel some production in the south of Moldova done by Laguardia before it moved to the north, and then perhaps which I had not really looked into the other activities by Laguardia, which had nothing to do with this farming business, but for the rest no activity.		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	determined on the future earnings generation capability of the business. If you establish the value of the business you have to look into the future. You have to forecast the future. You have to make certain assumptions about what is going to happen in the future. This is the essence of all business valuations. Professor Knieper, believe me I have done in the last five years at least 150 of those. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I believe you completely! MR WIECHEN: And due to the fact that the entire investment was lost, so there is actually no business any more, the company is currently under insolvency proceedings and special administration, so basically Mr Grot entirely lost the business factually at the date of revocation of the respective lease agreements. To come back to your initial question, yes, I agree, we have a degree of uncertainty, we have in all business valuations, and as an evaluator	13:46

ign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia ised		a, Aust
	· ·	684			686
1	for example, the reason why we worked closely	13:48	1	for the prospective financial information.	13:51
2	together with the agricultural experts, first of		2	However, as I said also previously in	
3	all, because I am not an agricultural expert, and		3	direct and cross-examination, Mr Grot in this case	
4 5	secondly, to work with somebody who knows the		4	already proved his capabilities of running	
5 6	business, who knows the specifics of the Moldovan agricultural environment, and who can assist us in		5 6	agricultural businesses in Poland. This at least gives me credibility as regards the management	
6 7	making reasonable assumptions as regards future		7	capabilities and that Mr Grot is an expert in	
8	yields and future cost structures, future cashflows,		8	agriculture. And, secondly, we have seen that	
9	and help us to come up with a reliable estimate for		9	Laguardia, if you look just at the 2010 figures, had	
10	the value of the business as of the date of the		10	a very profitable business in Stefan Voda. This	
11	alleged breaches of contracts.		11	gave me, let's say, sufficient credibility as	
12	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Before I get your		12	regards the future profitable operations of	
13	answer, to come back a little bit on what you said,		13	Laguardia.	
14	you said "the revocation of the leases". We heard		14	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Mr Peer?	
15	from the legal experts yesterday that these leases		15	MR PEER: First, I will try to correct you	
16	were not revoked by deletion from the registry. We		16	though. It is an assertion by Claimants' counsel	
17	also heard today there were all these assets still		17	that I have agreed to the use of the DCF. I have	
18	there. There was no expropriation of assets of any		18	not.	
19	kind. You say that the investment was completely		19	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: That was in the	
20	lost. Is that a fair assumption of what happened?		20	opening remarks of Claimants that you had agreed to	
21	MR WIECHEN: This was one of my working		21	base your reports on the DCF method.	
22	assumptions, but I cannot opine on any legal		22	MR PEER: Exactly. It is an assertion of	
23	aspects.		23	Claimants' counsel. I have not agreed to the DCF	
24	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: That was information		24	calculation because I share your view that there is	
25	given to you by the client and you worked on this		25	an insufficient basis on which to make that DCF	
		005			
	assumption?	685 13:49	1	calculation. I think there is a big difference	687 13:53
2	MR WIECHEN: Yes.		1 2	between what we are doing here, which is valuing	
2	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all			between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to	
2 3 4	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so?		2 3 4	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business.	
2 3 4	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like		2 3	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have	
2 3 4 5 6	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in		2 3 4 5 6	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can	
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the		2 3 4 5 6 7	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an income-based evaluation where no income had been		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You are going to award a sum of money that must be paid	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an income-based evaluation where no income had been generated, the uncertainty becomes		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You are going to award a sum of money that must be paid between the parties, so there needs to be, in my	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an income-based evaluation where no income had been generated, the uncertainty becomes disproportionately high to an evaluation of an		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You are going to award a sum of money that must be paid between the parties, so there needs to be, in my opinion, a greater level of certainty as to how you	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an income-based evaluation where no income had been generated, the uncertainty becomes disproportionately high to an evaluation of an activity where you had a mature business activity.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You are going to award a sum of money that must be paid between the parties, so there needs to be, in my opinion, a greater level of certainty as to how you base that calculation. I said in my opening I leave	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 12 3 4 5	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an income-based evaluation where no income had been generated, the uncertainty becomes disproportionately high to an evaluation of an activity where you had a mature business activity. Would you agree with that?		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You are going to award a sum of money that must be paid between the parties, so there needs to be, in my opinion, a greater level of certainty as to how you base that calculation. I said in my opening I leave it to you as to whether you feel there is a	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an income-based evaluation where no income had been generated, the uncertainty becomes disproportionately high to an evaluation of an activity where you had a mature business activity. Would you agree with that? MR WIECHEN: Coming back to your example,		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You are going to award a sum of money that must be paid between the parties, so there needs to be, in my opinion, a greater level of certainty as to how you base that calculation. I said in my opening I leave it to you as to whether you feel there is a sufficient basis and sufficient support for the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 15 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 15 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 13 14 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an income-based evaluation where no income had been generated, the uncertainty becomes disproportionately high to an evaluation of an activity where you had a mature business activity. Would you agree with that? MR WIECHEN: Coming back to your example, if you have a history of several years of an		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You are going to award a sum of money that must be paid between the parties, so there needs to be, in my opinion, a greater level of certainty as to how you base that calculation. I said in my opening I leave it to you as to whether you feel there is a sufficient basis and sufficient support for the calculations that are before you. I will leave it	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an income-based evaluation where no income had been generated, the uncertainty becomes disproportionately high to an evaluation of an activity where you had a mature business activity. Would you agree with that? MR WIECHEN: Coming back to your example, if you have a history of several years of an operating business, yes, indeed, this historical		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You are going to award a sum of money that must be paid between the parties, so there needs to be, in my opinion, a greater level of certainty as to how you base that calculation. I said in my opening I leave it to you as to whether you feel there is a sufficient basis and sufficient support for the calculations that are before you. I will leave it at that.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 7 18 19	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an income-based evaluation where no income had been generated, the uncertainty becomes disproportionately high to an evaluation of an activity where you had a mature business activity. Would you agree with that? MR WIECHEN: Coming back to your example, if you have a history of several years of an operating business, yes, indeed, this historical financial analysis of a company is one of the main		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You are going to award a sum of money that must be paid between the parties, so there needs to be, in my opinion, a greater level of certainty as to how you base that calculation. I said in my opening I leave it to you as to whether you feel there is a sufficient basis and sufficient support for the calculations that are before you. I will leave it at that. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an income-based evaluation where no income had been generated, the uncertainty becomes disproportionately high to an evaluation of an activity where you had a mature business activity. Would you agree with that? MR WIECHEN: Coming back to your example, if you have a history of several years of an operating business, yes, indeed, this historical financial analysis of a company is one of the main ingredients in any business evaluation, but it gives		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You are going to award a sum of money that must be paid between the parties, so there needs to be, in my opinion, a greater level of certainty as to how you base that calculation. I said in my opening I leave it to you as to whether you feel there is a sufficient basis and sufficient support for the calculations that are before you. I will leave it at that. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. MR FORTIER: I think everyone is agreed	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 20 21	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an income-based evaluation where no income had been generated, the uncertainty becomes disproportionately high to an evaluation of an activity where you had a mature business activity. Would you agree with that? MR WIECHEN: Coming back to your example, if you have a history of several years of an operating business, yes, indeed, this historical financial analysis of a company is one of the main ingredients in any business evaluation, but it gives you a picture of what has happened in the past.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You are going to award a sum of money that must be paid between the parties, so there needs to be, in my opinion, a greater level of certainty as to how you base that calculation. I said in my opening I leave it to you as to whether you feel there is a sufficient basis and sufficient support for the calculations that are before you. I will leave it at that. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. MR FORTIER: I think everyone is agreed that this is a very unusual situation. Mr Grot	
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 9\\ 21\\ 22\\ 12\\ 1$	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an income-based evaluation where no income had been generated, the uncertainty becomes disproportionately high to an evaluation of an activity where you had a mature business activity. Would you agree with that? MR WIECHEN: Coming back to your example, if you have a history of several years of an operating business, yes, indeed, this historical financial analysis of a company is one of the main ingredients in any business evaluation, but it gives you a picture of what has happened in the past. What has happened in the past, for sure you use this		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You are going to award a sum of money that must be paid between the parties, so there needs to be, in my opinion, a greater level of certainty as to how you base that calculation. I said in my opening I leave it to you as to whether you feel there is a sufficient basis and sufficient support for the calculations that are before you. I will leave it at that. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. MR FORTIER: I think everyone is agreed that this is a very unusual situation. Mr Grot really did not get his business off the ground, and	
$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 12 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 23 \end{array}$	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an income-based evaluation where no income had been generated, the uncertainty becomes disproportionately high to an evaluation of an activity where you had a mature business activity. Would you agree with that? MR WIECHEN: Coming back to your example, if you have a history of several years of an operating business, yes, indeed, this historical financial analysis of a company is one of the main ingredients in any business evaluation, but it gives you a picture of what has happened in the past. What has happened in the past, for sure you use this information also to predict the future and having a		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You are going to award a sum of money that must be paid between the parties, so there needs to be, in my opinion, a greater level of certainty as to how you base that calculation. I said in my opening I leave it to you as to whether you feel there is a sufficient basis and sufficient support for the calculations that are before you. I will leave it at that. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. MR FORTIER: I think everyone is agreed that this is a very unusual situation. Mr Grot really did not get his business off the ground, and yet I accept the fact that he had machinery which	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 3 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 21 22	MR WIECHEN: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then you say in all evaluation you have this uncertainty. Is that so? Let us assume that an agricultural firm like Laguardia had cultivated sunflower for ten years in Moldova, and then you make an evaluation into the future. I would say perfect I would not even ask these questions but this is not there, so there is a different degree of uncertainty. I think in an income-based evaluation where no income had been generated, the uncertainty becomes disproportionately high to an evaluation of an activity where you had a mature business activity. Would you agree with that? MR WIECHEN: Coming back to your example, if you have a history of several years of an operating business, yes, indeed, this historical financial analysis of a company is one of the main ingredients in any business evaluation, but it gives you a picture of what has happened in the past. What has happened in the past, for sure you use this		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	between what we are doing here, which is valuing damages, and you are awarding a sum of money to somebody versus the valuation of a business. In the valuation of a business you have two parties who can negotiate and the parties can walk away from each other if they do not agree on what the future cashflows of that business are and what the value of those further cashflows are in today's terms. That is not a possibility here. You are going to award a sum of money that must be paid between the parties, so there needs to be, in my opinion, a greater level of certainty as to how you base that calculation. I said in my opening I leave it to you as to whether you feel there is a sufficient basis and sufficient support for the calculations that are before you. I will leave it at that. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. MR FORTIER: I think everyone is agreed that this is a very unusual situation. Mr Grot really did not get his business off the ground, and	

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis		al 13 Decem Vienna	
1	Poland. He had done pretty well in Stefan Voda, as	688 13:55	1	Great Britain, we are not in Canada. Moldova is	, 690 14:00
2	was mentioned by one of you a short while ago, and		2	what it is, probably a beautiful country. I was	14.00
3	he had acquired these leases and then, however you		3	trying to convince my colleagues the other night	
4	characterise it, his dream, which by then was more		4	that we should go and visit Moldova in order to	
5	than a dream, he had machinery on the ground, he had		5	satisfy our	
6	paper which was worth in his mind, I think we can		6	THE PRESIDENT: And we were convinced.	
7	recognise that it was worth money, it was certainly		7	MR FORTIER: I was making progress!	
8	part of his investment, and all this came to nought		8	So I know you want to help us. You are	
9	I am not going to venture into the realm		9	vastly experienced. I do not know if you have been	
0	of a Bilateral Investment Treaty and whether any	·	10	here since Monday morning Have you been here since	
1	article in the treaty was breached, because his	· ·	11	Monday morning?	
2	dream evaporated in some very strange ways, as		12	MR WIECHEN: No.	
3	I think we articulated a couple of days ago		13	MR PEER: I was here for Monday morning	
4	I am assuming, and I appreciate Mr Peer		14	and then I have stepped out for the intervening time	
5	saying "I leave it to you". Of course it is up to		15	until this morning.	
16	us, we are the adjudicators, but we need help, and		16	MR FORTIER: So you heard some of the	
17	I am looking at the persons, the experts, whom		17	evidence of Mr Grot?	
8	I think can help I speak for myself obviously but		18	MR PEER: No, I only listened to	
9	I know my colleagues pretty well and I think we are		19 20	Claimants' opening.	
20	all wrestling with the same and again I am not		20	MR FORTIER: It is unfortunate that you	
21 22	talking breaches of the BIT right now, I am talking		21 22	did not have the benefit of Mr Grot and Mr Beril,	
22 23	about Mr Grot made an investment, he had a plan, he		22	the only two factual witnesses. Because, you see,	
23 24	may not have written, as was said this morning, a business plan as such with people versed in numbers		23 24	one of the problems we have and we have many is that the lawyers from Moldova in their wisdom	
24 25	like yourselves who could have prepared a lovely,		24 25	and they are very wise their game plan, their	
1	bogutiful business plan that we would have	689	1	stratogy was "wa dap't produce any witness from	691
1 2	beautiful business plan that we would have understood, but he had something of value which		1 2	strategy was "we don't produce any witness from Moldova. Nobody". In fact, we asked counsel at one	14:02
3	and I don't intend a pun when I say this went up		3	point on Monday a question where he said "my	
4	in smoke. Again, we have to decide what was the		4	understanding was I could not really get an answer	
5	value that his business had.		5	from my clients in Moldova", so that puts us in a	
6	It is not as if he owned a refinery and				
7			6	very difficult situation.	
'	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you		-	-	
-	-		6	very difficult situation.	
8	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you		6 7	very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but	
8 9 10	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey		6 7 8 9 10	very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with	
8 9 0 1	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey and decide how much it is worth because you guys and		6 7 8 9 10 11	very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with cross-examination of course is trying to belittle	
8 9 0 1 2	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey and decide how much it is worth because you guys and girls, the experts, don't always agree.		6 7 9 10 11	very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with cross-examination of course is trying to belittle the evidence of the Claimant.	
8 9 1 2 3	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey and decide how much it is worth because you guys and girls, the experts, don't always agree. Here I have a sense I have listened to		6 7 9 10 11 12 13	very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with cross-examination of course is trying to belittle the evidence of the Claimant. How can you help us put a number, whether	
8 9 1 2 3 4	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey and decide how much it is worth because you guys and girls, the experts, don't always agree. Here I have a sense I have listened to you, I am looking at you that you are very		6 7 9 10 11 12 13 14	very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with cross-examination of course is trying to belittle the evidence of the Claimant. How can you help us put a number, whether it is a lei number or a dollar number, on the dream,	
8 9 1 2 3 4 5	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey and decide how much it is worth because you guys and girls, the experts, don't always agree. Here I have a sense I have listened to you, I am looking at you that you are very reasonable people, that you would like to help us.		6 7 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with cross-examination of course is trying to belittle the evidence of the Claimant. How can you help us put a number, whether it is a lei number or a dollar number, on the dream, which was more than a dream? There were some hard	
8 9 1 2 3 4 5 6	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey and decide how much it is worth because you guys and girls, the experts, don't always agree. Here I have a sense I have listened to you, I am looking at you that you are very reasonable people, that you would like to help us. All this is a lead-up to the question of whether it		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with cross-examination of course is trying to belittle the evidence of the Claimant. How can you help us put a number, whether it is a lei number or a dollar number, on the dream, which was more than a dream? There were some hard papers, some leases, which vanished as quickly as	
8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey and decide how much it is worth because you guys and girls, the experts, don't always agree. Here I have a sense I have listened to you, I am looking at you that you are very reasonable people, that you would like to help us. All this is a lead-up to the question of whether it is a DCF or comparable sales, one after the other,		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with cross-examination of course is trying to belittle the evidence of the Claimant. How can you help us put a number, whether it is a lei number or a dollar number, on the dream, which was more than a dream? There were some hard papers, some leases, which vanished as quickly as they saw the light of day, which is why I wish you	
8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey and decide how much it is worth because you guys and girls, the experts, don't always agree. Here I have a sense I have listened to you, I am looking at you that you are very reasonable people, that you would like to help us. All this is a lead-up to the question of whether it is a DCF or comparable sales, one after the other, can you tell us, first of all, whether Mr Grot's		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with cross-examination of course is trying to belittle the evidence of the Claimant. How can you help us put a number, whether it is a lei number or a dollar number, on the dream, which was more than a dream? There were some hard papers, some leases, which vanished as quickly as they saw the light of day, which is why I wish you had been here when Mr Grot testified.	
8 9 10 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 19	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey and decide how much it is worth because you guys and girls, the experts, don't always agree. Here I have a sense I have listened to you, I am looking at you that you are very reasonable people, that you would like to help us. All this is a lead-up to the question of whether it is a DCF or comparable sales, one after the other, can you tell us, first of all, whether Mr Grot's business had value and how much was that value?		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with cross-examination of course is trying to belittle the evidence of the Claimant. How can you help us put a number, whether it is a lei number or a dollar number, on the dream, which was more than a dream? There were some hard papers, some leases, which vanished as quickly as they saw the light of day, which is why I wish you had been here when Mr Grot testified. How can you help us put a dollar value?	
8 9 10 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 9 20	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey and decide how much it is worth because you guys and girls, the experts, don't always agree. Here I have a sense I have listened to you, I am looking at you that you are very reasonable people, that you would like to help us. All this is a lead-up to the question of whether it is a DCF or comparable sales, one after the other, can you tell us, first of all, whether Mr Grot's business had value and how much was that value? Mr Peer, you go so far as to say it is		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with cross-examination of course is trying to belittle the evidence of the Claimant. How can you help us put a number, whether it is a lei number or a dollar number, on the dream, which was more than a dream? There were some hard papers, some leases, which vanished as quickly as they saw the light of day, which is why I wish you had been here when Mr Grot testified. How can you help us put a dollar value? Whether or not the Respondent is responsible, that	
, 8 9 10 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey and decide how much it is worth because you guys and girls, the experts, don't always agree. Here I have a sense I have listened to you, I am looking at you that you are very reasonable people, that you would like to help us. All this is a lead-up to the question of whether it is a DCF or comparable sales, one after the other, can you tell us, first of all, whether Mr Grot's business had value and how much was that value?		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with cross-examination of course is trying to belittle the evidence of the Claimant. How can you help us put a number, whether it is a lei number or a dollar number, on the dream, which was more than a dream? There were some hard papers, some leases, which vanished as quickly as they saw the light of day, which is why I wish you had been here when Mr Grot testified. How can you help us put a dollar value?	
8 9 10 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey and decide how much it is worth because you guys and girls, the experts, don't always agree. Here I have a sense I have listened to you, I am looking at you that you are very reasonable people, that you would like to help us. All this is a lead-up to the question of whether it is a DCF or comparable sales, one after the other, can you tell us, first of all, whether Mr Grot's business had value and how much was that value? Mr Peer, you go so far as to say it is nil. I read it. I don't accept that, and I don't		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with cross-examination of course is trying to belittle the evidence of the Claimant. How can you help us put a number, whether it is a lei number or a dollar number, on the dream, which was more than a dream? There were some hard papers, some leases, which vanished as quickly as they saw the light of day, which is why I wish you had been here when Mr Grot testified. How can you help us put a dollar value? Whether or not the Respondent is responsible, that is not what I am asking you to do we will do	
8 9 10 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 21 22	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey and decide how much it is worth because you guys and girls, the experts, don't always agree. Here I have a sense I have listened to you, I am looking at you that you are very reasonable people, that you would like to help us. All this is a lead-up to the question of whether it is a DCF or comparable sales, one after the other, can you tell us, first of all, whether Mr Grot's business had value and how much was that value? Mr Peer, you go so far as to say it is nil. I read it. I don't accept that, and I don't think you do either, having been with us for a few		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with cross-examination of course is trying to belittle the evidence of the Claimant. How can you help us put a number, whether it is a lei number or a dollar number, on the dream, which was more than a dream? There were some hard papers, some leases, which vanished as quickly as they saw the light of day, which is why I wish you had been here when Mr Grot testified. How can you help us put a dollar value? Whether or not the Respondent is responsible, that is not what I am asking you to do we will do that but how can you help us put a dollar value	
8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 10 12 3 12 10 12 10 12 10 12 12 10 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	the refinery was expropriated by the state and you have some very expensive economists and experts who come and give a valuation, and very often, as arbitrators, we have to pin the tail on the donkey and decide how much it is worth because you guys and girls, the experts, don't always agree. Here I have a sense I have listened to you, I am looking at you that you are very reasonable people, that you would like to help us. All this is a lead-up to the question of whether it is a DCF or comparable sales, one after the other, can you tell us, first of all, whether Mr Grot's business had value and how much was that value? Mr Peer, you go so far as to say it is nil. I read it. I don't accept that, and I don't think you do either, having been with us for a few hours. I think you acknowledge that Mr Grot was an		6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	very difficult situation. I speak for myself at the moment, but I would love to have seen chairs of witnesses from Moldova rather than empty chairs and theories and cross-examination. What comes with cross-examination of course is trying to belittle the evidence of the Claimant. How can you help us put a number, whether it is a lei number or a dollar number, on the dream, which was more than a dream? There were some hard papers, some leases, which vanished as quickly as they saw the light of day, which is why I wish you had been here when Mr Grot testified. How can you help us put a dollar value? Whether or not the Respondent is responsible, that is not what I am asking you to do we will do that but how can you help us put a dollar value	

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia ised		nber 2011 a, Austria
1	MR PEER: You are correct that I don't	692	1	calculation because he had all the information as	694
2	believe that the cashflows from the business were	14:04	2	regards yields, prices, direct, indirect, operating	14:07
3	going to be negative, because Mr Grot would not have		3	costs. We have a breakdown of kilograms,	
4	continued in that vein. He would have made changes.		4	fertilizers suggested to be used on the fields, so	
5	They are negative in my calculation because I could		5	this is something that could have been done by the	
6	not adjust the costs that were associated with the		6	Respondents' expert.	
7	lower yields.		7	Secondly, honestly I have done my best.	
8	I have been given updated figures that		8	Out of all my experience of 16 years of business	
9	don't make sense to me because they generate results		9	evaluations sorry for repeating that to come	
10	that are nonsensical to me, so I am not in a		10	up with a reliable value of the business Mr Grot	
11	position to give you what I think would be		11	lost with this investment, I did not exaggerate,	
12	sufficiently reliable cash flow projections for you		12	I am an independent expert. I was conservative on	
13	to prepare a damages calculation and to award		13	almost all of my assumptions. I believe that if we	
14	damages.		14	define the damages as loss of business value, I	
15	I think from my perspective the figures		15	believe that Mr Grot has lost approximately	
16	that are generated by the Deloitte calculations are		16	2.7 million USD in 2011.	
17	unrealistically profitable. If I look solely at		17	MR PEER: May I respond to that, very	
18	what was happening in Stefan Voda, this was a		18	briefly? I don't believe there is sufficient detail	
19	marginally profitable business, 1-2 per cent, and		19	within the agricultural experts' reports to prepare	
20	the suggestion that it was going to be a		20	a reliable DCF. I don't believe that I could have	
21	35-45 per cent profitable business does not sit with		21	adjusted and created a DCF based on that	
22	me.		22	information.	
23	We could, if you were to instruct us,		23	MR FORTIER: You looked at it carefully?	
24	continue to work together to try to come up with		24	MR PEER: I looked at it very carefully	
25	some sort of DCF, a calculation that would be		25	and I don't believe I could have adjusted it any	
4					
1	an affinite and the marked by a first state of the first state of	693			695
2	sufficiently reliable for you, but I think that	693 14:06	1	more than I have. I maintain that it isn't	695 14:09
2	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that		2	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average	
3	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been		2 3	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and	
3 4	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is		2 3 4	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that	
3 4 5	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some		2 3 4 5	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best	
3 4 5 6	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs.		2 3 4 5 6	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed	
3 4 5 6 7	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at		2 3 4 5	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural	
3 4 5 6	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed	
3 4 5 6 7 8	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants.	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also understand burden of proof.	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether those	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also	
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether those assets have been disposed of and therefore whether	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also understand burden of proof. MR FORTIER: That is proof that is not	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether those assets have been disposed of and therefore whether there is some compensation that Mr Grot has already	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also understand burden of proof. MR FORTIER: That is proof that is not contradicted. You mean the level of proof, but be	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether those assets have been disposed of and therefore whether there is some compensation that Mr Grot has already received from the disposal of those assets. So	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also understand burden of proof. MR FORTIER: That is proof that is not contradicted. You mean the level of proof, but be that as it may.	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether those assets have been disposed of and therefore whether there is some compensation that Mr Grot has already received from the disposal of those assets. So again, as far as I am aware, there is insufficient	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also understand burden of proof. MR FORTIER: That is proof that is not contradicted. You mean the level of proof, but be that as it may. Mr Wiechen, I heard Mr Peer say well,	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether those assets have been disposed of and therefore whether there is some compensation that Mr Grot has already received from the disposal of those assets. So again, as far as I am aware, there is insufficient evidence before you in order to award damages based	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also understand burden of proof. MR FORTIER: That is proof that is not contradicted. You mean the level of proof, but be that as it may. Mr Wiechen, I heard Mr Peer say well, maybe the two of us could retire and come up with a report and a recommendation that could be of assistance to you. Do you think he is hopeless, or	14:09
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether those assets have been disposed of and therefore whether there is some compensation that Mr Grot has already received from the disposal of those assets. So again, as far as I am aware, there is insufficient evidence before you in order to award damages based on an invested cost. MR FORTIER: Thank you, Mr Peer. And you, sir?	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also understand burden of proof. MR FORTIER: That is proof that is not contradicted. You mean the level of proof, but be that as it may. Mr Wiechen, I heard Mr Peer say well, maybe the two of us could retire and come up with a report and a recommendation that could be of assistance to you. Do you think he is hopeless, or do you think that you could sit down and produce	14:09
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether those assets have been disposed of and therefore whether there is some compensation that Mr Grot has already received from the disposal of those assets. So again, as far as I am aware, there is insufficient evidence before you in order to award damages based on an invested cost MR FORTIER: Thank you, Mr Peer. And you, sir? MR WIECHEN: Thank you. I just want to	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also understand burden of proof. MR FORTIER: That is proof that is not contradicted. You mean the level of proof, but be that as it may. Mr Wiechen, I heard Mr Peer say well, maybe the two of us could retire and come up with a report and a recommendation that could be of assistance to you. Do you think he is hopeless, or do you think that you could sit down and produce some smoke that would come out of the chimney?	14:09
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether those assets have been disposed of and therefore whether there is some compensation that Mr Grot has already received from the disposal of those assets. So again, as far as I am aware, there is insufficient evidence before you in order to award damages based on an invested cost. MR FORTIER: Thank you, Mr Peer. And you, sir? MR WIECHEN: Thank you. I just want to make an errata to what Mr Peer said. If you simply	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also understand burden of proof. MR FORTIER: That is proof that is not contradicted. You mean the level of proof, but be that as it may. Mr Wiechen, I heard Mr Peer say well, maybe the two of us could retire and come up with a report and a recommendation that could be of assistance to you. Do you think he is hopeless, or do you think that you could sit down and produce some smoke that would come out of the chimney? MR WIECHEN: What are you referring to?	14:09
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether Mr Grot there is some compensation that Mr Grot has already received from the disposal of those assets. So again, as far as I am aware, there is insufficient evidence before you in order to award damages based on an invested cost. MR FORTIER: Thank you, Mr Peer. And you, sir? MR WIECHEN: Thank you. I just want to make an errata to what Mr Peer said. If you simply look at the financial statements of Laguardia, the	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also understand burden of proof. MR FORTIER: That is proof that is not contradicted. You mean the level of proof, but be that as it may. Mr Wiechen, I heard Mr Peer say well, maybe the two of us could retire and come up with a report and a recommendation that could be of assistance to you. Do you think he is hopeless, or do you think that you could sit down and produce some smoke that would come out of the chimney? MR WECHEN: What are you referring to?	14:09
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether those assets have been disposed of and therefore whether there is some compensation that Mr Grot has already received from the disposal of those assets. So again, as far as I am aware, there is insufficient evidence before you in order to award damages based on an invested cost. MR FORTIER: Thank you, Mr Peer. And you, sir? MR WIECHEN: Thank you. I just want to make an errata to what Mr Peer said. If you simply look at the financial statements of Laguardia, the 2010 net income margin was 31 per cent and not close	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also understand burden of proof. MR FORTIER: That is proof that is not contradicted. You mean the level of proof, but be that as it may. Mr Wiechen, I heard Mr Peer say well, maybe the two of us could retire and come up with a report and a recommendation that could be of assistance to you. Do you think he is hopeless, or do you think that you could sit down and produce some smoke that would come out of the chimney? MR WIECHEN: What are you referring to? Excuse me, please, to stand with Mr Peer and rediscuss and try and find an objective way?	14:09
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether Mr Grot there is some compensation that Mr Grot has already received from the disposal of those assets. So again, as far as I am aware, there is insufficient evidence before you in order to award damages based on an invested cost. MR FORTIER: Thank you, Mr Peer. And you, sir? MR WIECHEN: Thank you. I just want to make an errata to what Mr Peer said. If you simply look at the financial statements of Laguardia, the 2010 net income margin was 31 per cent and not close to zero. Secondly, Mr Peer would have been able to	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also understand burden of proof. MR FORTIER: That is proof that is not contradicted. You mean the level of proof, but be that as it may. Mr Wiechen, I heard Mr Peer say well, maybe the two of us could retire and come up with a report and a recommendation that could be of assistance to you. Do you think he is hopeless, or do you think that you could sit down and produce some smoke that would come out of the chimney? MR WIECHEN: What are you referring to? Excuse me, please, to stand with Mr Peer and rediscuss and try and find an objective way? MR FORTIER: Yes.	14:09
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether those assets have been disposed of and therefore whether there is some compensation that Mr Grot has already received from the disposal of those assets. So again, as far as I am aware, there is insufficient evidence before you in order to award damages based on an invested cost. MR FORTIER: Thank you, Mr Peer. And you, sir? MR WIECHEN: Thank you. I just want to make an errata to what Mr Peer said. If you simply look at the financial statements of Laguardia, the 2010 net income margin was 31 per cent and not close to zero. Secondly, Mr Peer would have been able to make a DCF calculation based on the report of the	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also understand burden of proof. MR FORTIER: That is proof that is not contradicted. You mean the level of proof, but be that as it may. Mr Wiechen, I heard Mr Peer say well, maybe the two of us could retire and come up with a report and a recommendation that could be of assistance to you. Do you think he is hopeless, or do you think that you could sit down and produce some smoke that would come out of the chimney? MR WIECHEN: What are you referring to? Excuse me, please, to stand with Mr Peer and rediscuss and try and find an objective way? MR FORTIER: Yes. MR WIECHEN: Both of us presented	14:09
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	would be a long and costly exercise. I think that the alternative, if you believe that there has been a breach and you believe that the state is responsible for that breach, would be to award some form of return of the invested costs. Now those currently are on the record at around 800,000, but those would have to be lost costs, and there is a dispute as to whether Mr Grot continues to own those assets and whether Mr Grot there is some compensation that Mr Grot has already received from the disposal of those assets. So again, as far as I am aware, there is insufficient evidence before you in order to award damages based on an invested cost. MR FORTIER: Thank you, Mr Peer. And you, sir? MR WIECHEN: Thank you. I just want to make an errata to what Mr Peer said. If you simply look at the financial statements of Laguardia, the 2010 net income margin was 31 per cent and not close to zero. Secondly, Mr Peer would have been able to	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sufficiently granular because it assumes an average yield over five years rather than yield by year and so forth, and costs associated with that MR FORTIER: But here again it is the best we have. Moldova has not produced an expert versed in agronomy who would have attacked the agricultural experts produced by the Claimants. MR PEER: I understand that, but I also understand burden of proof. MR FORTIER: That is proof that is not contradicted. You mean the level of proof, but be that as it may. Mr Wiechen, I heard Mr Peer say well, maybe the two of us could retire and come up with a report and a recommendation that could be of assistance to you. Do you think he is hopeless, or do you think that you could sit down and produce some smoke that would come out of the chimney? MR WIECHEN: What are you referring to? Excuse me, please, to stand with Mr Peer and rediscuss and try and find an objective way? MR FORTIER: Yes.	14:09

ign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confie Rev	dentia /ised		nber 20 a, Aust
4		696	1		698
1	I can bring to the case.	14:12	1	I suppose what I am saying is would you	
2	MR FORTIER: You do, and you have based		2 3	not have assumed that an investor who prepares a business plan is an investor that may be perceived	
3 4	your report on the expert report of the agricultural witnesses we heard this morning.		4	as having done some due diligence and have worked	
4 5	On the other side we have a learned		4 5	out in a reflective manner what the real prospects	
6	accountant from a very well known firm, KPMG, who		6	were, and an investor who has not does not fall into	
7	says, "on the basis of what I have seen it is nil".		7	that category of investors?	
8	I don't accept that. I think Mr Grot		8	MR WIECHEN: am convinced that Mr Grot	
9	I am using the singular, we have had a lot of those		9	made his own considerations and for sure he had a	
10	"I", "we" Mr Grot and the other two Claimants		10	business plan in place, but not a formally	
11	have lost a business that had value, and it is		11	documented business plan with 80 pages explaining	
12	unfortunate that the two of you, who strike me as		12	all these separate line items.	
13	being very reasonable and knowledgeable accountants		13	THE PRESIDENT: I didn't say anything	
14	which we are not. As you heard from		14	about 80 pages. I just said a piece of paper that	
15	Professor Knieper and the Chairman, lawyers always		15	sets out, back-of-the-envelope stuff like the	
16	have some issues with numbers. In this case it is		16	invasion of Iraq type of thing or not!	
17	not a question of comparing numbers because		17	Just a piece of paper, which could be one	
18	Mr Wiechen's number is contrasted by a nil.		18	page, two or three pages, which just says right,	
10	I will end my unusual line of questioning		19	this is what I'm going to do and this is why I think	
20	by saying what I said at the outset, that it is an		20	it can work. Would that have helped you? I am	
20 21	unusual case, and I wish the two of you together		20	hearing you say that would have helped you? I all	
≤1 22	could help us together more than you have. Thank		22	wouldn't have bound you?	
23	you, Mr Chairman.		22	MR WECHEN: It would have helped me at	
23 24	THE PRESIDENT: Very briefly, I hope, a		23 24	the outset of my deliberations and work to be	
24 25	couple of questions.		24 25	performed, but anyway to really bring up a fair	
		607			600
1	First, to both of you: would you have been	697 14:14	1	value to the business I would have relied	699 14:17
1	materially assisted in your task if there had been	697 14:14	2	predominantly on independent specialised information	
	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan	697 14:14		predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise.	
2 3 4	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment	697 14:14	2 3 4	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer?	
2 3 4 5	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of	697 14:14	2 3 4 5	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality	
2 3 4 5 6	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect?	697 14:14	2 3 4 5 6	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have	
2 3 4 5 6 7	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done	697 14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan,	697 14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan –	697 14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan – THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question.	697 14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question. MR WIECHEN: If there had been a business	697 14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact. THE PRESIDENT: I want to follow on from	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question. MR WIECHEN: If there had been a business plan prepared by Mr Grot or by some consultants to	697 14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact. THE PRESIDENT: I want to follow on from Mr Fortier's question, and I know Mr Kopecky does	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question. MR WIECHEN: If there had been a business plan prepared by Mr Grot or by some consultants to Mr Grot, indeed this would have been an information	697 14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact. THE PRESIDENT: I want to follow on from Mr Fortier's question, and I know Mr Kopecky does not like it, which is entirely proper for him to	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question. MR WIECHEN: If there had been a business plan prepared by Mr Grot or by some consultants to Mr Grot, indeed this would have beenan information that we would have thoroughly analysed.	697 14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact. THE PRESIDENT: I want to follow on from Mr Fortier's question, and I know Mr Kopecky does not like it, which is entirely proper for him to express that view, it is not a critique at all, but	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 12 3 4 5 12 3 4 5 12 3 4 5 12 3 12 5 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan – THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question. MR WIECHEN: If there had been a business plan prepared by Mr Grot or by some consultants to Mr Grot, indeed this would have been an information that we would have thoroughly analysed. However, given the standard of value and	697 14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact. THE PRESIDENT: I want to follow on from Mr Fortier's question, and I know Mr Kopecky does not like it, which is entirely proper for him to express that view, it is not a critique at all, but to invite you to carry on the exercise that Mr	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan – THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question. MR WIECHEN: If there had been a business plan prepared by Mr Grot or by some consultants to Mr Grot, indeed this would have beenan information that we would have thoroughly analysed. However, given the standard of value and the context, I would have preferred to make my own	697 14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact. THE PRESIDENT: I want to follow on from Mr Fortier's question, and I know Mr Kopecky does not like it, which is entirely proper for him to express that view, it is not a critique at all, but to invite you to carry on the exercise that Mr Fortier did, but on the basis of certain	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan – THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question. MR WIECHEN: If there had been a business plan prepared by Mr Grot or by some consultants to Mr Grot, indeed this would have been an information that we would have thoroughly analysed. However, given the standard of value and the context, I would have preferred to make my own estimates together with independent agricultural	697 14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact. THE PRESIDENT: I want to follow on from Mr Fortier's question, and I know Mr Kopecky does not like it, which is entirely proper for him to express that view, it is not a critique at all, but to invite you to carry on the exercise that Mr Fortier did, but on the basis of certain assumptions, and they are nothing more than	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question. MR WIECHEN: If there had been a business plan prepared by Mr Grot or by some consultants to Mr Grot, indeed this would have been an information that we would have thoroughly analysed. However, given the standard of value and the context, I would have preferred to make my own estimates together with independent agricultural experts not to get biased by a business plan which	697 14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact. THE PRESIDENT: I want to follow on from Mr Fortier's question, and I know Mr Kopecky does not like it, which is entirely proper for him to express that view, it is not a critique at all, but to invite you to carry on the exercise that Mr Fortier did, but on the basis of certain assumptions, and they are nothing more than assumptions. They are just for the purpose of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question. MR WIECHEN: If there had been a business plan prepared by Mr Grot or by some consultants to Mr Grot, indeed this would have been an information that we would have thoroughly analysed. However, given the standard of value and the context, I would have preferred to make my own estimates together with independent agricultural experts not to get biased by a business plan which was delivered by the Claimant	697 14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact. THE PRESIDENT: I want to follow on from Mr Fortier's question, and I know Mr Kopecky does not like it, which is entirely proper for him to express that view, it is not a critique at all, but to invite you to carry on the exercise that Mr Fortier did, but on the basis of certain assumptions, and they are nothing more than assumptions. They are just for the purpose of testing out intellectually how one would go about	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question. MR WIECHEN: If there had been a business plan prepared by Mr Grot or by some consultants to Mr Grot, indeed this would have been an information that we would have thoroughly analysed. However, given the standard of value and the context, I would have preferred to make my own estimates together with independent agricultural experts not to get biased by a business plan which was delivered by the Claimant THE PRESIDENT: Would you not assume that	14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact. THE PRESIDENT: I want to follow on from Mr Fortier's question, and I know Mr Kopecky does not like it, which is entirely proper for him to express that view, it is not a critique at all, but to invite you to carry on the exercise that Mr Fortier did, but on the basis of certain assumptions, and they are nothing more than assumptions. They are just for the purpose of testing out intellectually how one would go about that exercise.	
$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 9 \\ 20 \\ 21 \end{array}$	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question. MR WIECHEN: If there had been a business plan prepared by Mr Grot or by some consultants to Mr Grot, indeed this would have been an information that we would have thoroughly analysed. However, given the standard of value and the context, I would have preferred to make my own estimates together with independent agricultural experts not to get biased by a business plan which was delivered by the Claimant THE PRESIDENT: Would you not assume that a Claimant, going through a due diligence exercise	14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact. THE PRESIDENT: I want to follow on from Mr Fortier's question, and I know Mr Kopecky does not like it, which is entirely proper for him to express that view, it is not a critique at all, but to invite you to carry on the exercise that Mr Fortier did, but on the basis of certain assumptions, and they are nothing more than assumptions. They are just for the purpose of testing out intellectually how one would go about that exercise. Assume that amount of hardware was brought	
$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22$	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question. MR WIECHEN: If there had been a business plan prepared by Mr Grot or by some consultants to Mr Grot, indeed this would have been an information that we would have thoroughly analysed. However, given the standard of value and the context, I would have preferred to make my own estimates together with independent agricultural experts not to get biased by a business plan which was delivered by the Claimant THE PRESIDENT: Would you not assume that a Claimant, going through a due diligence exercise before making an investment of this size and of this	14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact. THE PRESIDENT: I want to follow on from Mr Fortier's question, and I know Mr Kopecky does not like it, which is entirely proper for him to express that view, it is not a critique at all, but to invite you to carry on the exercise that Mr Fortier did, but on the basis of certain assumptions, and they are nothing more than assumptions. They are just for the purpose of testing out intellectually how one would go about that exercise. Assume that amount of hardware was brought in, about 900,000 USD. Assume that leases were	699 14:17
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22 23	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan – THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question. MR WIECHEN: If there had been a business plan prepared by Mr Grot or by some consultants to Mr Grot, indeed this would have beenan information that we would have thoroughly analysed. However, given the standard of value and the context, I would have preferred to make my own estimates together with independent agricultural experts not to get biased by a business plan which was delivered by the Claimant THE PRESIDENT: Would you not assume that a Claimant, going through a due diligence exercise before making an investment of this size and of this value that is claimed, would have put some time and	14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact. THE PRESIDENT: I want to follow on from Mr Fortier's question, and I know Mr Kopecky does not like it, which is entirely proper for him to express that view, it is not a critique at all, but to invite you to carry on the exercise that Mr Fortier did, but on the basis of certain assumptions, and they are nothing more than assumptions. They are just for the purpose of testing out intellectually how one would go about that exercise. Assume that amount of hardware was brought in, about 900,000 USD. Assume that leases were obtained which allowed 2830 ha to be farmed for four	
$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22$	materially assisted in your task if there had been in existence, and available to you, a business plan that had been prepared prior to this investment having been made which accorded with the kinds of quality standards you would expect? MR WIECHEN: Basically what we have done in our exercise, we constructed a business plan, based on which business plan THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question. MR WIECHEN: If there had been a business plan prepared by Mr Grot or by some consultants to Mr Grot, indeed this would have been an information that we would have thoroughly analysed. However, given the standard of value and the context, I would have preferred to make my own estimates together with independent agricultural experts not to get biased by a business plan which was delivered by the Claimant THE PRESIDENT: Would you not assume that a Claimant, going through a due diligence exercise before making an investment of this size and of this	14:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	predominantly on independent specialised information like I have done in this exercise THE PRESIDENT: Mr Peer? MR PEER: With your caveats of a quality standard to it, absolutely, I think it would have been very useful to understand what Mr Grot was intending to do at the time in a contemporaneous manner, rather than what an agricultural expert perceives he ought to have done post fact. THE PRESIDENT: I want to follow on from Mr Fortier's question, and I know Mr Kopecky does not like it, which is entirely proper for him to express that view, it is not a critique at all, but to invite you to carry on the exercise that Mr Fortier did, but on the basis of certain assumptions, and they are nothing more than assumptions. They are just for the purpose of testing out intellectually how one would go about that exercise. Assume that amount of hardware was brought in, about 900,000 USD. Assume that leases were	

•	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revise		al 13 Decem Vienna	
1	THE PRESIDENT: Up to four years. We	700 14:19	1	investment while it sits idle until such time as he	702 14:22
2	agree three plus one. Assume that those leases		2	is able to use it again	
3	then, for whatever reason, right or wrong, and like	:	3	THE PRESIDENT: Mr Wiechen, how would you	
4	Mr Fortier and Mr Knieper, I am making no	4	4	go about doing it if you were not allowed to use	
5	assumptions about whether there was a violation of	4	5	DCF?	
6	the BIT, purely for the exercise of accounting	(6	MR WIECHEN: I would not have accepted an	
7	purposes, that those leases were somehow interfered	-	7	engagement of damage calculation.	
8	with, ended, whatever, disappeared, as a consequence	1	8	THE PRESIDENT: Let me help you briefly.	
9	of which he is not able to engage in that farming	9	9	I am not saying this is my view. Every case is	
0	activity, but he maintains full control of all the	1	0	particular or specific, but I am reading on my	
1	capital assets, the equipment, the caterpillars, the	1	1	screen paragraph 604 of a recent award case called	
2	ploughs, and so on and so forth. And, a further	1	2	Bear Creek in which I sat and on which the Tribunal	
3	assumption, there may be alternative farmlands	1	3	was unanimous in its view, although not unanimous in	
4	available around, or not too far away. And a	1	4	all other issues.	
5	further assumption, I am just putting a caveat that	1	5	"The project remained too speculative and	
6	this is not my view that this is or is not what	1	6	uncertain to allow such a method to be utilised.	
7	happened, but there were no other reasons for him to	1	7	Instead, the Tribunal concluded that the measure of	
8	require to leave in an expeditious manner, quit the	1	8	damages should be made by reference to the amounts	
9	country.	1	9	actually invested by Claimant".	
20	In other words, what has essentially been	2	20	Let us assume the Tribunal approaches you	
21	"taken", and I use that not in a legal sense, what	2	21	in this case and the Tribunal says to you it is just	
22	has disappeared is the ability to farm up to 2830 ha	2	22	too speculative. Are you saying to me truly you	
23	for a period of up to four years, possibly three	2	23	can't do it?	
24	plus one.	2	24	MR WECHEN: No, I think this would be a	
25	Against the background of all of the	2	25	method of last resort which I do not consider would	
		701			703
1	uncertainties with regards to yields, benefits or	14:20	1	compensate the Claimant in an appropriate manner if	703 14:23
2	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what	14:20	2	you find liability in this case. It would	703 14:23
2 3	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss?	14:20	2 3	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case	703 14:23
2 3 4	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you	14:20	2 3 4	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it?	703 14:23
2 3 4 5	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value	14:20	2 3 4 5	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative	703 14:23
2 3 4 5 6	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss?	14:20	2 3 4 5 6	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of	703 14:23
2 3 4 5 6 7	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then	14:20	2 3 4 5 6 7	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing	703 14:23
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because	14:20	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to	703 14:23
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he	14:20	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative?	703 14:23
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of	14:20	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a	703 14:23
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of his investment sitting idle for the period of time	14:20	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a general case?	703 14:23
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of his investment sitting idle for the period of time that it takes him to replace those leases.	14:20 2 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a general case? THE PRESIDENT: On the hypothetical facts	703
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of his investment sitting idle for the period of time that it takes him to replace those leases. THE PRESIDENT: What about the time and	14:20 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a general case? THE PRESIDENT: On the hypothetical facts that I have given you. We are telling you this is	703
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of his investment sitting idle for the period of time that it takes him to replace those leases. THE PRESIDENT: What about the time and energy he has expended in preparing the whole	14:20 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a general case? THE PRESIDENT: On the hypothetical facts that I have given you. We are telling you this is what has happened, this is what has gone wrong, this	703
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of his investment sitting idle for the period of time that it takes him to replace those leases. THE PRESIDENT: What about the time and energy he has expended in preparing the whole project and having it delayed by one year, or two	14:20 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a general case? THE PRESIDENT: On the hypothetical facts that I have given you. We are telling you this is what has happened, this is what has gone wrong, this is what is lost, you can't use DCF. Tell us how	703
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of his investment sitting idle for the period of time that it takes him to replace those leases. THE PRESIDENT: What about the time and energy he has expended in preparing the whole project and having it delayed by one year, or two years or three years?	14:20 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a general case? THE PRESIDENT: On the hypothetical facts that I have given you. We are telling you this is what has happened, this is what has gone wrong, this	703
2345678901234567	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of his investment sitting idle for the period of time that it takes him to replace those leases. THE PRESIDENT: What about the time and energy he has expended in preparing the whole project and having it delayed by one year, or two	14:20 2 3 4 4 5 4 5 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a general case? THE PRESIDENT: On the hypothetical facts that I have given you. We are telling you this is what has happened, this is what has gone wrong, this is what is lost, you can't use DCF. Tell us how much we should give Mr Grot?	703
23456789012345678	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of his investment sitting idle for the period of time that it takes him to replace those leases. THE PRESIDENT: What about the time and energy he has expended in preparing the whole project and having it delayed by one year, or two years or three years? MR PEER: As I say, you would allow for the replacement of the work that he has done to get	14:20 2 3 4 4 5 4 4 5 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a general case? THE PRESIDENT: On the hypothetical facts that I have given you. We are telling you this is what has happened, this is what has gone wrong, this is what is lost, you can't use DCF. Tell us how much we should give Mr Grot? MR WIECHEN: I could not determine a fair amount. Basically I agree, if you just look at	703
234567890123456789	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of his investment sitting idle for the period of time that it takes him to replace those leases. THE PRESIDENT: What about the time and energy he has expended in preparing the whole project and having it delayed by one year, or two years or three years? MR PEER: As I say, you would allow for	14:20 2 3 4 4 5 4 5 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a general case? THE PRESIDENT: On the hypothetical facts that I have given you. We are telling you this is what has happened, this is what has gone wrong, this is what is lost, you can't use DCF. Tell us how much we should give Mr Grot? MR WIECHEN: I could not determine a fair amount. Basically I agree, if you just look at valuation theory, and sometimes if you don't have	703
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of his investment sitting idle for the period of time that it takes him to replace those leases. THE PRESIDENT: What about the time and energy he has expended in preparing the whole project and having it delayed by one year, or two years or three years? MR PEER: As I say, you would allow for the replacement of the work that he has done to get to that point, so the cost of getting those leases	14:20 2 3 4 4 5 4 5 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 8 9 0 1 2 8 9 10 1 2 8 9 10 1 2 8 9 10 1 2 8 9 10 1 2 8 9 10 1 2 8 9 10 1 1 2 8 9 10 1 1 2 8 9 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a general case? THE PRESIDENT: On the hypothetical facts that I have given you. We are telling you this is what has happened, this is what has gone wrong, this is what is lost, you can't use DCF. Tell us how much we should give Mr Grot? MR WIECHEN: I could not determine a fair amount. Basically I agree, if you just look at valuation theory, and sometimes if you don't have anything else you go back to costs, but initial	14:23
2 3	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of his investment sitting idle for the period of time that it takes him to replace those leases. THE PRESIDENT: What about the time and energy he has expended in preparing the whole project and having it delayed by one year, or two years or three years? MR PEER: As I say, you would allow for the replacement of the work that he has done to get to that point, so the cost of getting those leases replaced and whether you value his time in that process is something you can discuss, or whether it	14:20 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 8 9 10 12 8 9 10 12 8 9 10 12 10 12 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a general case? THE PRESIDENT: On the hypothetical facts that I have given you. We are telling you this is what has happened, this is what has gone wrong, this is what is lost, you can't use DCF. Tell us how much we should give Mr Grot? MR WIECHEN: I could not determine a fair amount. Basically I agree, if you just look at valuation theory, and sometimes if you don't have	14:23
23456789012345678901	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of his investment sitting idle for the period of time that it takes him to replace those leases. THE PRESIDENT: What about the time and energy he has expended in preparing the whole project and having it delayed by one year, or two years or three years? MR PEER: As I say, you would allow for the replacement of the work that he has done to get to that point, so the cost of getting those leases replaced and whether you value his time in that	14:20 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 8 9 10 12 8 9 10 12 8 9 10 12 10 12 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a general case? THE PRESIDENT: On the hypothetical facts that I have given you. We are telling you this is what has happened, this is what has gone wrong, this is what is lost, you can't use DCF. Tell us how much we should give Mr Grot? MR WIECHEN: I could not determine a fair amount. Basically I agree, if you just look at valuation theory, and sometimes if you don't have anything else you go back to costs, but initial costs or investments do not tell you anything about	14:23
234567890123456789012	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of his investment sitting idle for the period of time that it takes him to replace those leases. THE PRESIDENT: What about the time and energy he has expended in preparing the whole project and having it delayed by one year, or two years or three years? MR PEER: As I say, you would allow for the replacement of the work that he has done to get to that point, so the cost of getting those leases replaced and whether you value his time in that process is something you can discuss, or whether it is simply the cost that he pays lawyers, et cetera,	14:20 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a general case? THE PRESIDENT: On the hypothetical facts that I have given you. We are telling you this is what has happened, this is what has gone wrong, this is what is lost, you can't use DCF. Tell us how much we should give Mr Grot? MR WIECHEN: I could not determine a fair amount. Basically I agree, if you just look at valuation theory, and sometimes if you don't have anything else you go back to costs, but initial costs or investments do not tell you anything about the real value of a business, because the value of a	14:23
2345678901234567890123	not provided by plant protection methodologies, what alternative means to DCF exist to value that loss? Four years of farming those areas? Let's assume you are prohibited from using DCF. How would you value for us that loss? MR PEER: From my perspective I would then look at the cost of replacing those leases, because that is a cost that he has already incurred that he now has to re-incur, and I would look at the cost of his investment sitting idle for the period of time that it takes him to replace those leases. THE PRESIDENT: What about the time and energy he has expended in preparing the whole project and having it delayed by one year, or two years or three years? MR PEER: As I say, you would allow for the replacement of the work that he has done to get to that point, so the cost of getting those leases replaced and whether you value his time in that process is something you can discuss, or whether it is simply the cost that he pays lawyers, et cetera, to replace them, and also the cost of the equipment	14:20 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	you find liability in this case. It would definitely understate the damages in this case THE PRESIDENT: So how would you do it? Assume you can't do DCF, there must be alternative means available, whether it is a variant of Mr Peer's approach, how would you go about valuing it if you had been told the Tribunal considers it to be too speculative? MR WIECHEN: In our specific case or in a general case? THE PRESIDENT: On the hypothetical facts that I have given you. We are telling you this is what has happened, this is what has gone wrong, this is what is lost, you can't use DCF. Tell us how much we should give Mr Grot? MR WIECHEN: I could not determine a fair amount. Basically I agree, if you just look at valuation theory, and sometimes if you don't have anything else you go back to costs, but initial costs or investments do not tell you anything about the real value of a business, because the value of a business is determined by its capability of	14:2:

ign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia ised		nber 20 a, Austi
1	cases for about 30 years, so I have spent a lot of	704 14:25	1	investment costs back. This does not make sense	706 14:28
2	time reflecting on this. One of the things that one		2	economically.	
3	learns is that it is possible to envisage situations		3	THE PRESIDENT: The person who invests in	
4	in which an investor in a particular country stands		4	Moldova knows that it is a more risky business than	
5	to make very significant amounts of return on the		5	investing in potentially some other places, so that	
6	initial investment, precisely because the investor		6	person, Mr Grot, has taken a punt, it might be said,	
7	is willing to take the risk, to not go into the UK,		7	and you can't presumably expect to reimburse him as	
8	not go into the United States, but to actually do		8	one would in a place where the investment was less	
9	what the ICSID system was intended to do, create		9	risky. There has to be some means to take that into	
0	incentives and take risks to go into places which		10	account.	
11	are not traditional places, perhaps to invest, and		11	I suppose the question I am asking you is	
12	that is an honourable and valuable thing to do and		12	is there a way to do it? Is there a way to	
13	I think we all accept that.		13	compensate the initiative a potential investor like	
4	But of course the downside of it is that		14	Mr Grot has taken absent DCF? That is what I am	
5	it is risky, so you have a sort of balancing		15	trying to explore. You are saying no. Mr Peer is	
6	exercise to do. On the one hand, the risk of		16	saying sort of. Please feel free to come back,	
7	success is the profits are tremendous compared to		17	Mr Peer, at any point.	
8	other safer, more usual types of places, but if it		18	I really want to push you on this because	
9	goes belly-up the pain is going to be greater, and		19	I am having trouble assuming that there is no other	
0	it raises a question which one could imagine that		20	way apart from DCF. I understand that as a finance	
1	one way of perceiving the ICSID system is the		21	accounting person there is a security in taking that	
2	question to what extent does it provide which in		22	approach, but I am asking you to think out of the	
3	English cricketing terms would be called "a		23	box and think through the facts of a case like this,	
4	long-stop guarantee"? What is the function of		24	where a reasonable, decent investor takes a punt in	
25	ICSID? What is the function of a BIT? Is it to		25	a risky environment, but it is speculative to the	
		705			707
1	provide an absolute guarantee or is it to act	705 14:26	1	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	707 14:29
2	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with		2	speculative for us to be able to use that	
2 3	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to		2 3	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does	
2 3 4	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost?		2 3 4	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice?	
2 3 4 5	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are		2 3 4 5	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us	
2 3 4 5 6	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You		2 3 4 5 6	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you	
2 3 4 5 6 7	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that		2 3 4 5 6 7	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing	
2 3 4 5 7 8	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations.	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario	
2 3 5 7 3 9 0	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 0	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further. Can you take a variation of Mr Peer's		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are alternative new investments that could be made and	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0 1 2	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further. Can you take a variation of Mr Peer's approach which would lead to a result that you think		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are alternative new investments that could be made and are available. In other words, the totality of the	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0 1 2 3	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further. Can you take a variation of Mr Peer's approach which would lead to a result that you think is right in the circumstances but which does not		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are alternative new investments that could be made and are available. In other words, the totality of the total investment. I am not saying that is what	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0 1 2 3 4	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further. Can you take a variation of Mr Peer's approach which would lead to a result that you think is right in the circumstances but which does not make use of DCF?		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are alternative new investments that could be made and are available. In other words, the totality of the total investment. I am not saying that is what happened. We have evidentiary matters on Mr Grot's	
2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0 1 2 3 4 5	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further. Can you take a variation of Mr Peer's approach which would lead to a result that you think is right in the circumstances but which does not make use of DCF? MR WIECHEN: If we are bound to historical		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are alternative new investments that could be made and are available. In other words, the totality of the total investment. I am not saying that is what happened. We have evidentiary matters on Mr Grot's belief that he needed to leave the country and we	
234567890123456	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further. Can you take a variation of Mr Peer's approach which would lead to a result that you think is right in the circumstances but which does not make use of DCF? MR WIECHEN: If we are bound to historical investment costs the value of the equipment, the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are alternative new investments that could be made and are available. In other words, the totality of the total investment. I am not saying that is what happened. We have evidentiary matters on Mr Grot's belief that he needed to leave the country and we will have to deal with that, but I am pushing you on	
2345678901234567	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further. Can you take a variation of Mr Peer's approach which would lead to a result that you think is right in the circumstances but which does not make use of DCF? MR WIECHEN: If we are bound to historical investment costs the value of the equipment, the value of labour force, of other small investments		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are alternative new investments that could be made and are available. In other words, the totality of the total investment. I am not saying that is what happened. We have evidentiary matters on Mr Grot's belief that he needed to leave the country and we will have to deal with that, but I am pushing you on this sense of let's assume there was an alternative	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further. Can you take a variation of Mr Peer's approach which would lead to a result that you think is right in the circumstances but which does not make use of DCF? MR WIECHEN: If we are bound to historical investment costs the value of the equipment, the value of labour force, of other small investments made to adding up all these numbers what we		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are alternative new investments that could be made and are available. In other words, the totality of the total investment. I am not saying that is what happened. We have evidentiary matters on Mr Grot's belief that he needed to leave the country and we will have to deal with that, but I am pushing you on this sense of let's assume there was an alternative where all this equipment, all this energy and all	
234567890123456789	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further. Can you take a variation of Mr Peer's approach which would lead to a result that you think is right in the circumstances but which does not make use of DCF? MR WIECHEN: If we are bound to historical investment costs the value of the equipment, the value of labour force, of other small investments made to adding up all these numbers what we cannot neglect in such kind of case is definitely a		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are alternative new investments that could be made and are available. In other words, the totality of the total investment. I am not saying that is what happened. We have evidentiary matters on Mr Grot's belief that he needed to leave the country and we will have to deal with that, but I am pushing you on this sense of let's assume there was an alternative where all this equipment, all this energy and all this idealism could be put?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further. Can you take a variation of Mr Peer's approach which would lead to a result that you think is right in the circumstances but which does not make use of DCF? MR WIECHEN: If we are bound to historical investment costs the value of the equipment, the value of labour force, of other small investments made to adding up all these numbers what we cannot neglect in such kind of case is definitely a return on investment. Nobody invests somewhere		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are alternative new investments that could be made and are available. In other words, the totality of the total investment. I am not saying that is what happened. We have evidentiary matters on Mr Grot's belief that he needed to leave the country and we will have to deal with that, but I am pushing you on this sense of let's assume there was an alternative where all this equipment, all this energy and all this idealism could be put? MR PEER: I think it is important to note	
23456789012345678901	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further. Can you take a variation of Mr Peer's approach which would lead to a result that you think is right in the circumstances but which does not make use of DCF? MR WIECHEN: If we are bound to historical investment costs the value of the equipment, the value of labour force, of other small investments made to adding up all these numbers what we cannot neglect in such kind of case is definitely a return on investment. Nobody invests somewhere without expecting any return. If you are just going		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are alternative new investments that could be made and are available. In other words, the totality of the total investment. I am not saying that is what happened. We have evidentiary matters on Mr Grot's belief that he needed to leave the country and we will have to deal with that, but I am pushing you on this sense of let's assume there was an alternative where all this equipment, all this energy and all this idealism could be put? MR PEER: I think it is important to note that the investment vis-à-vis the leases you are	
234567890123456789012	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further. Can you take a variation of Mr Peer's approach which would lead to a result that you think is right in the circumstances but which does not make use of DCF? MR WIECHEN: If we are bound to historical investment costs the value of the equipment, the value of labour force, of other small investments made to adding up all these numbers what we cannot neglect in such kind of case is definitely a return on investment. Nobody invests somewhere without expecting any return. If you are just going on the costs which actually occurred, we are		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are alternative new investments that could be made and are available. In other words, the totality of the total investment. I am not saying that is what happened. We have evidentiary matters on Mr Grot's belief that he needed to leave the country and we will have to deal with that, but I am pushing you on this sense of let's assume there was an alternative where all this equipment, all this energy and all this idealism could be put? MR PEER: I think it is important to note that the investment vis-à-vis the leases you are telling us is lost, but the equipment itself is not	
2345678901234567890123	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further. Can you take a variation of Mr Peer's approach which would lead to a result that you think is right in the circumstances but which does not make use of DCF? MR WIECHEN: If we are bound to historical investment costs the value of the equipment, the value of labour force, of other small investments made to adding up all these numbers what we cannot neglect in such kind of case is definitely a return on investment. Nobody invests somewhere without expecting any return. If you are just going on the costs which actually occurred, we are depriving actually the Claimant from earning		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are alternative new investments that could be made and are available. In other words, the totality of the total investment. I am not saying that is what happened. We have evidentiary matters on Mr Grot's belief that he needed to leave the country and we will have to deal with that, but I am pushing you on this sense of let's assume there was an alternative where all this equipment, all this energy and all this idealism could be put? MR PEER: I think it is important to note that the investment vis-à-vis the leases you are telling us is lost, but the equipment itself is not lost.	
234567890123456789012	reasonably in the circumstances in accordance with the assistance that people like you can give us to working out what has truly been lost? That is what I think our questions are really trying to work out in the circumstances. You have said you could do it but you don't think that would fairly value the loss that Mr Grot has suffered, and I understand that, but I want to push you a little bit further. Can you take a variation of Mr Peer's approach which would lead to a result that you think is right in the circumstances but which does not make use of DCF? MR WIECHEN: If we are bound to historical investment costs the value of the equipment, the value of labour force, of other small investments made to adding up all these numbers what we cannot neglect in such kind of case is definitely a return on investment. Nobody invests somewhere without expecting any return. If you are just going on the costs which actually occurred, we are		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	speculative for us to be able to use that methodology. I am inviting you to reflect how does a tribunal do justice? MR PEER: The scenario you have given us is not that the investment is lost; the scenario you have given us is that there is a delay in commencing the operations. THE PRESIDENT: I am giving you a scenario in which that investment is lost but there are alternative new investments that could be made and are available. In other words, the totality of the total investment. I am not saying that is what happened. We have evidentiary matters on Mr Grot's belief that he needed to leave the country and we will have to deal with that, but I am pushing you on this sense of let's assume there was an alternative where all this equipment, all this energy and all this idealism could be put? MR PEER: I think it is important to note that the investment vis-à-vis the leases you are telling us is lost, but the equipment itself is not	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia rised	al 13 Decem Vienna	
1	I have sat on the equipment disappears, the leases	708 14:30	1	the method. Hence, although income-based methods	710 14:34
2	are lost and the equipment has gone. As Mr Fortier		2	have been accepted in principle, there has been a	
3	says, this is one of those really curious cases		3	decided preference by tribunals for an asset-based	
4	where the leases has gone but the equipment remains.		4	method".	
5	That is very unusual.		5	l insist "by tribunals" because you are	
6	MR PEER: Precisely. I wonder if that		6	here to help us, as Mr Fortier says, but the	
7	helps Lars in his thinking?		7	decision as to what method will be used, if we come	
8	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Could I ask a		8	to damages, is with the Tribunal and not with the	
9	question? Mr Wiechen, you agree with me there are		9	expert.	
10	several methods of calculating damages? This is		10	If an expert says "if you tell me that we	
11	definitely not the only method to do it.		11	will not allow DCF, I am out of the game", I would	
12	MR WIECHEN: It depends on the specific		12	find that too German! I am sorry, but you	
13	case but in general, yes, I agree there are various		13	understood the joke. We come from the same region.	
14	methods to calculate damages, yes		14	MR WIECHEN: Yes. 100 kilometres.	
15	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I would say under any		15	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: That is the question.	
16	circumstances there are alternatives, and you say		16	There are alternative methods, and the very	
17	there are cases where there is no alternative? I do		17	convincing way of Professor Sands was try it out and	
18	a little reading also because it is so complicated		18	give us alternatives, and then we decide what is	
19	but I have never read in a book on these kind of		19	right, if we come to this decision.	
20	evaluation of damages that the person says the only		20	MR WECHEN: It doesn't make sense to	
21	way to come to a fair damage evaluation is the DCF.		21	express my opinion again, right? You just gave two	
22	I have never read that. You say it is so.		22	opportunities: either DCF, which may be too	
23	MR WIECHEN: It is for sure the most		23	speculative, or the net book value. But if you are	
24 25	credible way to determine damages in this specific case.		24 25	talking about net book value, this is an accounting figure, and this again brings us back to the initial	
1 2	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I want to go to the next point. We have a document, an informative	709 14:32	1 2	investment costs. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: The Tribunal has to	711 14:35
3	document, which had been introduced by Claimants.		3	decide which of the alternatives to choose, not the	
4	These are the draft articles on responsibility of		4	expert. You understand? That is why we need help.	
5	states for international wrongful acts. You have		5	To have a sound basis for a decision, and this help	
6	used this document for attribution, but there is		6	must come from both of you.	
7	also a chapter on the evaluation of damages in this		7	THE PRESIDENT: The problem is it is not	
8	very useful comment, and I will read you only one		8	that we are not giving you another opportunity to	
9	sentence which goes in the direction of what we have		9	express your view. Put yourselves in our position.	
10	just heard on this case. It is in the comment,		10	If you tell us there is no other way, we put you in	
11	page 103-104. There is a lengthy discussion on		11	a box which says well, he is not being very helpful,	
12	different methods of evaluation of damages, and of		12	so we will go to the other one, frankly because we	
13	course this is already dated because it is from		13	are looking for help, and an expert who tells us	
14	2008, this document, and they say there are		14	"there is only one way" creates a difficulty for us	
15	different methods. There is one where you start		15	because we know from our experience between us of	
16	from the net book value, and then there are and		16	probably over a hundred years of doing these cases	
17	this is what I have learned if the business is		17	that there are always other ways.	
18	not a going concern, they say, a DCF method would be		18	We have heard from Mr Peer, so one last	
19	"a range of inherently speculative elements, some of		19	opportunity for you to be persuaded by your	
20	which have a significant impact about the outcome,		20	neighbour from 100 kilometres away. Feel free to	
21	like discount rates, currency fluctuations,		21	say no, that is not your thing, you do not want to	
22	inflation figures, commodity prices, interest		22	do that.	
23	rates", and these are all speculations about the		23	MR WIECHEN: I apologise for maybe not	
24	future. That is why they say, "this has led		24	being helpful to you, but I stick to my prior	
25	tribunals to adopt a cautious approach to the use of		25	statements.	
	dianaburden.com ww	w.dianal		en.com Pages	

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi			nber 201 a, Austria
Zbigi 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 22 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 22 23 24 25 20 21 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 20 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. I have no more questions. I think it is fair to give the parties a brief opportunity to come back. Perhaps the way to do it is to each of their respective experts to give them a final chance. Claimant first? MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Mr President. May we confer? THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely. (Pause) Re-examination by Claimant MR ASTUNO: Mr Wiechen, and if Mr Peer wants to comment as well, I would appreciate his views on this question. There is obviously a lot of discussion about the speculative nature of Laguardia's profitability. Is it not the case, however, that given he was operating in a commodities industry, agriculture specifically, that there is a more reliable set of data and information and it is easier to predict future possible outcomes in this industry than it would be for other industries where outcomes, let's say, have much more variance in nature and unpredictability? MR WIECHEN: I think each valuation in various industries has somehow certain specifics and certain complexities. I cannot confirm that any	712	sed 1 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 24 25	Vienna The price of grain is driven by supply and demand We are dealing with mother nature. We don't know what is going to happen in a given year. The prices we have used here are not futures. If we were dealing with futures, I might agree with you that there is some more predictability to the pricing structure, but that is not the basis on which we have prepared this calculation, or that Deloitte has prepared this calculation. MR ASTUNO: I would like to ask a question regarding the organised plan of action that Mr Grot in our view clearly had. The fact that over 2800 ha of land were leased and that specific crops had been planted, specific equipment has been procured that is directly related to those crops, certain people have been hired with levels of expertise that are specifically tailored to the crops at issue and the farming practices at issue, looking at all of that together, just in that time period, the first half of 2010, does that not indicate that Mr Grot was organised in his plan of action? MR WIECHEN: I think I have to repeat myself. I think Mr Grot is a very reasonable investor with a great track record in Poland, and	, 714
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	sector is, let's say, easier or more difficult to project, so every industry has certain specifics. MR ASTUNO: It is true, however, that when you forecast commodities prices, it is easier to do that than it would be to, say, forecast Bitcoin as an example by today's standards, or some technological industry that has less years behind it and more volatility? MR WIECHEN: I would say one factor which may be considered, let's say, in the agricultural sector, is the market by itself. I think one of the less risky parts in valuing agricultural companies is basically the market, because there is always the market for agricultural products, so there is no threat that the company will face at a certain point in time a complete lack of demand which may be the case for a technology firm. MR PEER: If I might comment on that, I think you are referring to your reference earlier that this is a de-risked commodity industry or sector. I think that was the terminology you used? MR ASTUNO: Yes. MR PEER: I am not sure that that is what we are dealing with here, because there is a great deal of volatility in the prices for this sector.	713	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	some successful operations in southeastern Moldova. There has not been a very formalised business plan but, again, I put certain credibility on these operations and I am satisfied with what I have seen and delivered by Mr Grot. MR ASTUNO: That is all we have, Mr President. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Mr Kopecky? Any concluding questions for Mr Peer? MR KOPECKY: No, thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. I really do want to express our deep appreciation to both of you for all the work you have done. We do recognise both of you very much as completely independent experts who have done a tremendous service to this Tribunal and that is what this system is about. I know my colleagues, just from the lunchtime conversation, have very much appreciated both of your reports and both sets of counsel for making you available to us. We have found it extremely helpful from both of you, and I want to thank you. You are now released. I think you are free. If you are desperate to hear more you are welcome to stay, or to explore Vienna.	715 14:45

bigr) ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	lentia ised		nber 201 a, Austri
-	· ·	716			, 718
1	We will now move to closing arguments.	14:46	1	that there might be some other questions that the	14:49
2	It is 3.46 pm, and we can go as long as		2	Tribunal	
3 ⊿	you want. I think there is a desire to wrap up		3 ⊿	THE PRESIDENT: Would you like an	
4 5	within a reasonable period. You are each allowed up to 60 minutes.		4 5	opportunity to file something in writing, without prejudice to how long it may be or what the timings	
5 6			5 6	would be?	
7	Counsel, how long would you like now as a break to gather your thoughts? We have had a very		6 7	MR ASTUNO: Yes, we want to preserve that	
8	interesting exchange now and we would benefit from		8	right.	
9	your having a little moment to work out the		9	THE PRESIDENT: No, not preserve the	
10	exchanges that have taken place and thinking through		10	right. Do you want to do it? I am putting you on	
11	your final words to us.		11	the spot. Because it will help you for what	
12	This is me speaking personally, but I		12	Maybe you want a moment to reflect on it.	
13	would reiterate that this is the moment where less		13	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Reflect on the	
14	truly is more. We are completely on top of the		14	closings and then part of this reflection is	
15	dossier. We do not need to hear repetition of		15	Post-Hearing Briefs.	
16	anything that we have heard. What we really want		16	MR ASTUNO: Thank you, Professor.	
17	from each of you is to reflect on the totality of		17	THE PRESIDENT: Respondent?	
18	what has happened on these three days, and with your		18	MR KOPECKY: I don't know what to say yet	
19	respective brilliant advocacies, which can be very		19	because nothing has been said, but Respondent's	
20	short it doesn't need to be very long persuade		20	position would be that what was filed today was a	
21	us in one direction or the other direction. It is		21	new report and the ineptness of DCF was effectively	
22	the crystallisation of the essential issues		22	what Mr Peer set out in his first report. So there	
23	presented as persuasively as you can to us, what		23	was this opportunity. Something was filed today	
24	this case is really about, why respectively you are		24	which Mr Peer worked on all night, which everybody	
25	right and the other side is wrong and why we should		25	here appreciates, so I would be very careful with	
		717			710
1	lean in one direction rather than the other.	717 14:47	1	yet another submission on quantum which would	719 14:50
1 2	lean in one direction rather than the other. That is not something that takes a huge		1 2	provide yet another method of damage calculation,	
	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited			provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a	
2 3 4	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a		2 3 4	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to	
2 3 4 5	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and		2 3 4 5	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would	
2 3 4 5 6	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that		2 3 4 5 6	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there	
2 3 4 5 6 7	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you.		2 3 4 5 6 7	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause)		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have		2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have not heard from you on any aspect relating to		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed. MR ASTUNO: Just for the record, they were	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have not heard from you on any aspect relating to Post-Hearing Briefs yet and you may also want to		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed. MR ASTUNO: Just for the record, they were presentations. Mr Wiechen has not prepared a	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have not heard from you on any aspect relating to Post-Hearing Briefs yet and you may also want to reflect on that. It may be you don't want		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed. MR ASTUNO: Just for the record, they were presentations. Mr Wiechen has not prepared a fundamentally new evaluation methodology or	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have not heard from you on any aspect relating to Post-Hearing Briefs yet and you may also want to reflect on that. It may be you don't want Post-Hearing Brief, it may be you want short, or	14:47	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed. MR ASTUNO: Just for the record, they were presentations. Mr Wiechen has not prepared a fundamentally new evaluation methodology or approach. There were slighted variables within the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have not heard from you on any aspect relating to Post-Hearing Briefs yet and you may also want to reflect on that. It may be you don't want Post-Hearing Brief, it may be you want short, or very long. We have our own views on it but we want	14:47	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed. MR ASTUNO: Just for the record, they were presentations. Mr Wiechen has not prepared a fundamentally new evaluation methodology or approach. There were slighted variables within the DCF calculation that were modified, but at this	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have not heard from you on any aspect relating to Post-Hearing Briefs yet and you may also want to reflect on that. It may be you don't want Post-Hearing Brief, it may be you want short, or very long. We have our own views on it but we want to listen to you.	14:47	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed. MR ASTUNO: Just for the record, they were presentations. Mr Wiechen has not prepared a fundamentally new evaluation methodology or approach. There were slighted variables within the DCF calculation that were modified, but at this point I think it is important to reflect, as	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have not heard from you on any aspect relating to Post-Hearing Briefs yet and you may also want to reflect on that. It may be you don't want Post-Hearing Brief, it may be you want short, or very long. We have our own views on it but we want to listen to you. MR ASTUNO: We would mention in PO6, given	14:47	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed. MR ASTUNO: Just for the record, they were presentations. Mr Wiechen has not prepared a fundamentally new evaluation methodology or approach. There were slighted variables within the DCF calculation that were modified, but at this point I think it is important to reflect, as Professor Knieper has given us that opportunity and	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 10 11 2 3 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have not heard from you on any aspect relating to Post-Hearing Briefs yet and you may also want to reflect on that. It may be you don't want Post-Hearing Brief, it may be you want short, or very long. We have our own views on it but we want to listen to you. MR ASTUNO: We would mention in PO6, given the late filing of Mr Peer's report, that the	14:47	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed. MR ASTUNO: Just for the record, they were presentations. Mr Wiechen has not prepared a fundamentally new evaluation methodology or approach. There were slighted variables within the DCF calculation that were modified, but at this point I think it is important to reflect, as	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have not heard from you on any aspect relating to Post-Hearing Briefs yet and you may also want to reflect on that. It may be you don't want Post-Hearing Brief, it may be you want short, or very long. We have our own views on it but we want to listen to you. MR ASTUNO: We would mention in PO6, given	14:47	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed. MR ASTUNO: Just for the record, they were presentations. Mr Wiechen has not prepared a fundamentally new evaluation methodology or approach. There were slighted variables within the DCF calculation that were modified, but at this point I think it is important to reflect, as Professor Knieper has given us that opportunity and the Tribunal has agreed, so we will come back in due	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have not heard from you on any aspect relating to Post-Hearing Briefs yet and you may also want to reflect on that. It may be you don't want Post-Hearing Brief, it may be you want short, or very long. We have our own views on it but we want to listen to you. MR ASTUNO: We would mention in PO6, given the late filing of Mr Peer's report, that the Tribunal mentioned that if it deemed it necessary we would have the opportunity to file a Post-Hearing	14:47	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed. MR ASTUNO: Just for the record, they were presentations. Mr Wiechen has not prepared a fundamentally new evaluation methodology or approach. There were slighted variables within the DCF calculation that were modified, but at this point I think it is important to reflect, as Professor Knieper has given us that opportunity and the Tribunal has agreed, so we will come back in due course.	
$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \end{array}$	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have not heard from you on any aspect relating to Post-Hearing Briefs yet and you may also want to reflect on that. It may be you don't want Post-Hearing Brief, it may be you want short, or very long. We have our own views on it but we want to listen to you. MR ASTUNO: We would mention in PO6, given the late filing of Mr Peer's report, that the Tribunal mentioned that if it deemed it necessary we	14:47	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed. MR ASTUNO: Just for the record, they were presentations. Mr Wiechen has not prepared a fundamentally new evaluation methodology or approach. There were slighted variables within the DCF calculation that were modified, but at this point I think it is important to reflect, as Professor Knieper has given us that opportunity and the Tribunal has agreed, so we will come back in due course. THE PRESIDENT: But what time do you want	
$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 1 \end{array}$	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have not heard from you on any aspect relating to Post-Hearing Briefs yet and you may also want to reflect on that. It may be you don't want Post-Hearing Brief, it may be you want short, or very long. We have our own views on it but we want to listen to you. MR ASTUNO: We would mention in PO6, given the late filing of Mr Peer's report, that the Tribunal mentioned that if it deemed it necessary we would have the opportunity to file a Post-Hearing Brief. There has obviously been quite a dramatic	14:47	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed. MR ASTUNO: Just for the record, they were presentations. Mr Wiechen has not prepared a fundamentally new evaluation methodology or approach. There were slighted variables within the DCF calculation that were modified, but at this point I think it is important to reflect, as Professor Knieper has given us that opportunity and the Tribunal has agreed, so we will come back in due course. THE PRESIDENT: But what time do you want to start your closing? It is 4 o'clock. Shall we	
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 9\\ 20\\ 12\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22$	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have not heard from you on any aspect relating to Post-Hearing Briefs yet and you may also want to reflect on that. It may be you don't want Post-Hearing Brief, it may be you want short, or very long. We have our own views on it but we want to listen to you. MR ASTUNO: We would mention in PO6, given the late filing of Mr Peer's report, that the Tribunal mentioned that if it deemed it necessary we would have the opportunity to file a Post-Hearing Brief. There has obviously been quite a dramatic exchange on damages questions in the last hour,	14:47	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed. MR ASTUNO: Just for the record, they were presentations. Mr Wiechen has not prepared a fundamentally new evaluation methodology or approach. There were slighted variables within the DCF calculation that were modified, but at this point I think it is important to reflect, as Professor Knieper has given us that opportunity and the Tribunal has agreed, so we will come back in due course. THE PRESIDENT: But what time do you want to start your closing? It is 4 o'clock. Shall we say 4.30 pm?	
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 9\\ 20\\ 22\\ 23\\ 23\\ 23\\ 23\\ 23\\ 23\\ 23\\ 23\\ 23$	That is not something that takes a huge amount of time. To the extent that we are limited by time at all, my instinct is for you to have a little longer to reflect on what you want to say and a little less time in actually saying it, but that is a matter for you. Claimant first: how long do you feel you need to prepare for your closing? (Pause) While you are thinking about it, we have not heard from you on any aspect relating to Post-Hearing Briefs yet and you may also want to reflect on that. It may be you don't want Post-Hearing Brief, it may be you want short, or very long. We have our own views on it but we want to listen to you. MR ASTUNO: We would mention in PO6, given the late filing of Mr Peer's report, that the Tribunal mentioned that if it deemed it necessary we would have the opportunity to file a Post-Hearing Brief. There has obviously been quite a dramatic exchange on damages questions in the last hour, especially insofar as it pertains to other valuation	14:47	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	provide yet another method of damage calculation, because, as is clear to everybody, we operate on a budget, and so does Mr Peer, so just getting him to actually answer that may take far longer than would be appropriate or necessary in this case, and there were now two reports of Claimants. I would like to put that on record, that there was an opportunity to correct, it was given by the Tribunal, and something was filed. MR ASTUNO: Just for the record, they were presentations. Mr Wiechen has not prepared a fundamentally new evaluation methodology or approach. There were slighted variables within the DCF calculation that were modified, but at this point I think it is important to reflect, as Professor Knieper has given us that opportunity and the Tribunal has agreed, so we will come back in due course. THE PRESIDENT: But what time do you want to start your closing? It is 4 o'clock. Shall we say 4.30 pm? MR ASTUNO: That is fine.	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia ised	al 13 Decen Vienna	
1	have up to an hour, subject to the dispositions you	720 14:52	1	then I will hand it over to Mr Astuno for the final	, 722 16:35
2	have heard, but you are entitled to up to that	11.02	2	issue.	10.00
3	amount of time, and if you feel you need it you will		3	I would like to begin with attribution.	
4	not be punished in any way for using it. It really		4	As the opening laid out in greater detail,	
5	is your call as to what you want to do.		5	this case concerns a series of attributable acts and	
6	(Short break from 3.52 pm to 4.24 pm)		6	omissions which actually led to the destruction of	
7	THE PRESIDENT: Are we ready? Claimant is		7	ICS Laguardia SRL. These acts and omissions, as	
8	ready, Respondent is ready. Mr Gleason?		8	stated in the opening, stand on the record. In	
9	Closing submission by Claimant		9	fact, they have been bolstered by the testimony and	
10	MR GLEASON: First, we would like to thank		10	evidence that we have discussed over the last three	
11	everybody for the time and attention that they have		11	days. I am not going to readdress every single one	
12	given to this matter. We would again repeat our		12	of the acts and omissions on the very long pattern	
13	thanks to Schönherr for opening their doors and		13	of state conduct, but I will attempt to highlight	
14	welcoming us here for this proceeding. We thank the		14	those acts and omissions which were the subject of	
15	Tribunal for their time and attention but also being		15	the Tribunal's concern.	
16	tolerant of our perhaps American style of presenting		16	I would like to first look at the lease	
17	our case. We do appreciate your tolerance on that.		17	termination notifications which were signed and	
18	Again, our thanks to everybody. It has been very		18	stamped by the mayors. We talked about this a lot.	
19	interesting over the last few days.		19	In fact, Roger Gladei stated that this was "an	
20	This is not a case about a boardroom or		20	unqualified act of public authority". But it was	
21	some large business with multiple business divisions		21	strange. In fact, everybody who talked about these	
22	or complicated business structure. This is a case		22	lease termination notifications said at a bare	
23	about a man, a farmer, a farmer actually with a		23	minimum that they were strange, or unusual, or	
24	relatively simple business structure which, by all		24	curious. And the law is very clear. The mayors had	
			25	absolutely no authority to be involved in this	
25	accounts, should have been a success. We heard from				
25	accounts, should have been a success. We heard from	721			723
25		721 16:34	1	private matter.	
_	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact		1 2	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen	
1	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they				
1 2 3 4	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot		2 3 4	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by	
1 2 3 4	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened?		2 3	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated	723 16:36
1 2 3 4 5 6	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case?		2 3 4 5 6	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that	
1 2 3 4 5 6	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the		2 3 4 5	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local third party. These acts were all, at a minimum,		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it is also confirmed by the conversations Mr Grot had	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local third party. These acts were all, at a minimum, under the colour of authority. The record is clear		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it is also confirmed by the conversations Mr Grot had with President Zelenenco of the Floresti district,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local third party. These acts were all, at a minimum, under the colour of authority. The record is clear on this point.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it is also confirmed by the conversations Mr Grot had with President Zelenenco of the Floresti district, as well as Vice President Rusu.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local third party. These acts were all, at a minimum, under the colour of authority. The record is clear on this point. Now we are going to talk about four		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it is also confirmed by the conversations Mr Grot had with President Zelenenco of the Floresti district, as well as Vice President Rusu. Multiple witnesses acknowledged that this	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local third party. These acts were all, at a minimum, under the colour of authority. The record is clear on this point. Now we are going to talk about four points. We took your advice to heart, we haven't		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it is also confirmed by the conversations Mr Grot had with President Zelenenco of the Floresti district, as well as Vice President Rusu. Multiple witnesses acknowledged that this pattern of events, the termination, and then the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local third party. These acts were all, at a minimum, under the colour of authority. The record is clear on this point. Now we are going to talk about four points. We took your advice to heart, we haven't prepared a presentation or a PowerPoint. Wejust		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it is also confirmed by the conversations Mr Grot had with President Zelenenco of the Floresti district, as well as Vice President Rusu. Multiple witnesses acknowledged that this pattern of events, the termination, and then the subsequent dispositions, indicate that something	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local third party. These acts were all, at a minimum, under the colour of authority. The record is clear on this point. Now we are going to talk about four points. We took your advice to heart, we haven't prepared a presentation or a PowerPoint. Wejust have four point we would like to make.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it is also confirmed by the conversations Mr Grot had with President Zelenenco of the Floresti district, as well as Vice President Rusu. Multiple witnesses acknowledged that this pattern of events, the termination, and then the subsequent dispositions, indicate that something else was going on here.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local third party. These acts were all, at a minimum, under the colour of authority. The record is clear on this point. Now we are going to talk about four points. We took your advice to heart, we haven't prepared a presentation or a PowerPoint. Wejust have four point we would like to make. We are going to discuss attribution.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it is also confirmed by the conversations Mr Grot had with President Zelenenco of the Floresti district, as well as Vice President Rusu. Multiple witnesses acknowledged that this pattern of events, the termination, and then the subsequent dispositions, indicate that something else was going on here. The timing is very interesting. This is	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 3 14 15 16 17 18 19	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local third party. These acts were all, at a minimum, under the colour of authority. The record is clear on this point. Now we are going to talk about four points. We took your advice to heart, we haven't prepared a presentation or a PowerPoint. Wejust have four point we would like to make. We are going to discuss attribution. We are goes to discuss the process of		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it is also confirmed by the conversations Mr Grot had with President Zelenenco of the Floresti district, as well as Vice President Rusu. Multiple witnesses acknowledged that this pattern of events, the termination, and then the subsequent dispositions, indicate that something else was going on here. The timing is very interesting. This is happening just before the spring planting season.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local third party. These acts were all, at a minimum, under the colour of authority. The record is clear on this point. Now we are going to talk about four points. We took your advice to heart, we haven't prepared a presentation or a PowerPoint. Wejust have four point we would like to make. We are going to discuss attribution. We are goes to discuss the process of lease execution.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it is also confirmed by the conversations Mr Grot had with President Zelenenco of the Floresti district, as well as Vice President Rusu. Multiple witnesses acknowledged that this pattern of events, the termination, and then the subsequent dispositions, indicate that something else was going on here. The timing is very interesting. This is happening just before the spring planting season. Also, interestingly, as described by Mr Grot, he had	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 13 14 15 16 17 8 19 20 1	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local third party. These acts were all, at a minimum, under the colour of authority. The record is clear on this point. Now we are going to talk about four points. We took your advice to heart, we haven't prepared a presentation or a PowerPoint. Wejust have four point we would like to make. We are going to discuss attribution. We are goes to discuss the process of lease execution. We will talk about the realistic options		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it is also confirmed by the conversations Mr Grot had with President Zelenenco of the Floresti district, as well as Vice President Rusu. Multiple witnesses acknowledged that this pattern of events, the termination, and then the subsequent dispositions, indicate that something else was going on here. The timing is very interesting. This is happening just before the spring planting season. Also, interestingly, as described by Mr Grot, he had learned from the customs authorities that the local	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1 22 22	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local third party. These acts were all, at a minimum, under the colour of authority. The record is clear on this point. Now we are going to talk about four points. We took your advice to heart, we haven't prepared a presentation or a PowerPoint. Wejust have four point we would like to make. We are going to discuss attribution. We are goes to discuss the process of lease execution. We will talk about the realistic options for local remedies.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it is also confirmed by the conversations Mr Grot had with President Zelenenco of the Floresti district, as well as Vice President Rusu. Multiple witnesses acknowledged that this pattern of events, the termination, and then the subsequent dispositions, indicate that something else was going on here. The timing is very interesting. This is happening just before the spring planting season. Also, interestingly, as described by Mr Grot, he had learned from the customs authorities that the local third party, Bio-Alianta, had recently acquired and	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 3 4 15 16 17 18 19 20 1 22 3	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local third party. These acts were all, at a minimum, under the colour of authority. The record is clear on this point. Now we are going to talk about four points. We took your advice to heart, we haven't prepared a presentation or a PowerPoint. We just have four point we would like to make. We are going to discuss attribution. We are goes to discuss the process of lease execution. We will talk about the realistic options for local remedies. And, naturally, we will discuss the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it is also confirmed by the conversations Mr Grot had with President Zelenenco of the Floresti district, as well as Vice President Rusu. Multiple witnesses acknowledged that this pattern of events, the termination, and then the subsequent dispositions, indicate that something else was going on here. The timing is very interesting. This is happening just before the spring planting season. Also, interestingly, as described by Mr Grot, he had learned from the customs authorities that the local third party, Bio-Alianta, had recently acquired and imported modern farming equipment. Thus, the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1 21 22 22	the agricultural experts this morning, the only people who we have heard from other than fact witnesses who know about Moldovan agriculture, they said this morning this was a good idea. Mr Grot should have made a lot of money. So what happened? Why wasn't that the case? Well, unfortunately, as has been the subject of much of the discussion, his operations were fully destroyed by a series of acts and omissions of state actors for the benefit of a local third party. These acts were all, at a minimum, under the colour of authority. The record is clear on this point. Now we are going to talk about four points. We took your advice to heart, we haven't prepared a presentation or a PowerPoint. Wejust have four point we would like to make. We are going to discuss attribution. We are goes to discuss the process of lease execution. We will talk about the realistic options for local remedies.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Professor Rusu said that he had never seen anything like this in his life. Mr Gladei indicated that these termination notifications, which were by a public official, demonstrated an intent to do something by a certain date. In this case that something was to terminate valid lease rights of Laguardia SRL for the benefit of a local third party competitor. This is also confirmed by the written record, for example, the statement of Ms Ivanes, it is also confirmed by the conversations Mr Grot had with President Zelenenco of the Floresti district, as well as Vice President Rusu. Multiple witnesses acknowledged that this pattern of events, the termination, and then the subsequent dispositions, indicate that something else was going on here. The timing is very interesting. This is happening just before the spring planting season. Also, interestingly, as described by Mr Grot, he had learned from the customs authorities that the local third party, Bio-Alianta, had recently acquired and	

www.dianaburden.com

oign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confiden Revise	
1	registered almost immediately. The record is clear 1	724	
2	what the something else was.	2	
3	I would like to move on and talk about the	3	
4	dispositions a little bit more.	4	rights.
5	There is no question that registration of	5	We will come back to this lack of
6	leases is an act of public authority. There is also	6	notification and how it impeded Laguardia's ability
7	no question that the dispositions were issued as an	7	to seek effective local remedies shortly.
8	exercise of public authority, but irregularities	8	But I'm not done with the dispositions.
9	abound.	9	-
10	Let's start with Roger Gladei's	10) issues related to the dispositions. The hundreds of
11	presentation. It was perhaps a point I am not sure	11	
12	if it was noted in great detail by the Tribunal, but	12	
13	the Claimants find it interesting that Roger Gladei	13	,
14	actually started his presentation by showing that	14	
15	there were two versions of the dispositions in each	15	
16	village. There was one which was presumably used by	16	
17	Bio-Alianta to obtain ex parte injunctions, and we	17	7 hundreds and hundreds of people. This is especially
8	believe, although the record is not clear on	18	3 considering that the mayor had no problem issuing
19	notification, which I will get to, we believe that	19	9 hundreds of illegal lease termination notifications
20	these are the ex parte injunctions that Laguardia	20) individually addressed to landowners on a single
21	ultimately received at the bear minimum, through the	21	
22	court proceedings concerning the injunctions, and	22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
23	there was also another one which was sent as part of	23	·
24	a request made in the context of this arbitration;	24	
25	in other words, a request was made for these	25	-
1	dispositions to be sent to the legal expert for 1	725 .6:39 1	72 Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4
1	dispositions to be sent to the legal expert for analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was		Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4
1	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was	.6:39 1	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the
1 2 3	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that	.6:39 1 2 3	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened
1 2 3 4	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange.	.6:39 1 2 3 4	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera.
1 2 3 4 5	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that
1 2 3 4 5 6	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL.	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness Statements, for example, in support of ex parte
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There is no evidence that any of the landowners were ever	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to sisue leases, to return the leases and give copies
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to sisue leases, to return the leases and give copies
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There is no evidence that any of the landowners were ever	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to issue leases, to return the leases and give copies of the dispositions to Laguardia so that it could
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There is no evidence that any of the landowners were ever provided with these disposition, and as was	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to issue leases, to return the leases and give copies of the dispositions to Laguardia so that it could adjudicate its rights. We also know that even when
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There is no evidence that any of the landowners were ever provided with these disposition, and as was discussed at greater detail, there is no evidence	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 12	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to issue leases, to return the leases and give copies of the dispositions to Laguardia so that it could adjudicate its rights. We also know that even when ex parte injunctions were lifted, mayors, at least
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 16	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There is no evidence that any of the landowners were ever provided with these disposition, and as was discussed at greater detail, there is no evidence that these dispositions were ever properly	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12 12 12 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to issue leases, to return the leases and give copies of the dispositions to Laguardia so that it could adjudicate its rights. We also know that even when ex parte injunctions were lifted, mayors, at least the Mayor of Cosernita, failed to honour the court
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 3 4 15 16 17	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There is no evidence that any of the landowners were ever provided with these disposition, and as was discussed at greater detail, there is no evidence that these dispositions were ever properly communicated to Laguardia SRL We know that Laguardia SRL did not become	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to issue leases, to return the leases and give copies of the dispositions to Laguardia so that it could adjudicate its rights. We also know that even when ex parte injunctions were lifted, mayors, at least the Mayor of Cosernita, failed to honour the court decision which lifted the injunction.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There is no evidence that any of the landowners were ever provided with these disposition, and as was discussed at greater detail, there is no evidence that these dispositions were ever properly communicated to Laguardia SRL We know that Laguardia SRL did not become aware of these dispositions until they were used	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 14 15 17 18	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to issue leases, to return the leases and give copies of the dispositions to Laguardia so that it could adjudicate its rights. We also know that even when ex parte injunctions were lifted, mayors, at least the Mayor of Cosernita, failed to honour the court decision which lifted the injunction. There were other actors involved here.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There is no evidence that any of the landowners were ever provided with these disposition, and as was discussed at greater detail, there is no evidence that these dispositions were ever properly communicated to Laguardia SRL We know that Laguardia SRL did not become aware of these dispositions until they were used against him in ex parte injunction proceedings,	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to issue leases, to return the leases and give copies of the dispositions to Laguardia so that it could adjudicate its rights. We also know that even when ex parte injunctions were lifted, mayors, at least the Mayor of Cosernita, failed to honour the court decision which lifted the injunction. There were other actors involved here. This case is not just about mayors and we will talk
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 18 19 20	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There is no evidence that any of the landowners were ever provided with these disposition, and as was discussed at greater detail, there is no evidence that these dispositions were ever properly communicated to Laguardia SRL We know that Laguardia SRL did not become aware of these dispositions until they were used against him in ex parte injunction proceedings, which were filed again by that local third party	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to issue leases, to return the leases and give copies of the dispositions to Laguardia so that it could adjudicate its rights. We also know that even when ex parte injunctions were lifted, mayors, at least the Mayor of Cosernita, failed to honour the court decision which lifted the injunction. There were other actors involved here. This case is not just about mayors and we will talk about those other actors in just a minute. But
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There is no evidence that any of the landowners were ever provided with these disposition, and as was discussed at greater detail, there is no evidence that these dispositions were ever properly communicated to Laguardia SRL We know that Laguardia SRL did not become aware of these dispositions until they were used against him in ex parte injunction proceedings, which were filed again by that local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta.	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to issue leases, to return the leases and give copies of the dispositions to Laguardia so that it could adjudicate its rights. We also know that even when ex parte injunctions were lifted, mayors, at least the Mayor of Cosernita, failed to honour the court decision which lifted the injunction. There were other actors involved here. This case is not just about mayors and we will talk about those other actors in just a minute. But 1 just want to stop and acknowledge the role of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 0 1 22 22	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There is no evidence that any of the landowners were ever provided with these disposition, and as was discussed at greater detail, there is no evidence that these dispositions were ever properly communicated to Laguardia SRL We know that Laguardia SRL did not become aware of these dispositions until they were used against him in ex parte injunction proceedings, which were filed again by that local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. So not only was Laguardia prejudiced by	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 10 11 12 15 16 17 18 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to issue leases, to return the leases and give copies of the dispositions to Laguardia so that it could adjudicate its rights. We also know that even when ex parte injunctions were lifted, mayors, at least the Mayor of Cosernita, failed to honour the court decision which lifted the injunction. There were other actors involved here. This case is not just about mayors and we will talk about those other actors in just a minute. But 1 just want to stop and acknowledge the role of mayors in Moldovan villages. In the written
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 6 7 8 9 20 11 2 3 4 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 6 17 18 19 20 1 22 3 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There is no evidence that any of the landowners were ever provided with these disposition, and as was discussed at greater detail, there is no evidence that these dispositions were ever properly communicated to Laguardia SRL We know that Laguardia SRL did not become aware of these dispositions until they were used against him in ex parte injunction proceedings, which were filed again by that local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. So not only was Laguardia prejudiced by these dispositions, but so were the landowners. In	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23 24 24 24 25 24 25 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to issue leases, to return the leases and give copies of the dispositions to Laguardia so that it could adjudicate its rights. We also know that even when ex parte injunctions were lifted, mayors, at least the Mayor of Cosernita, failed to honour the court decision which lifted the injunction. There were other actors involved here. This case is not just about mayors and we will talk about those other actors in just a minute. But 1 just want to stop and acknowledge the role of mayors in Moldovan villages. In the written pleadings prior to this hearing, we heard about how
1	analysis, and the formatting of that disposition was actually different than the dispositions that Laguardia had in its possession. It is strange. There are differences between these documents, which is very curious, taking into consideration the issues concerning proper notification of these documents to Laguardia SRL. So I would like to turn to that notification issue. There are two problems with notification, as discussed by the Tribunal. There is no evidence that any of the landowners were ever provided with these disposition, and as was discussed at greater detail, there is no evidence that these dispositions were ever properly communicated to Laguardia SRL We know that Laguardia SRL did not become aware of these dispositions until they were used against him in ex parte injunction proceedings, which were filed again by that local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. So not only was Laguardia prejudiced by	.6:39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 10 11 12 15 16 17 18 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22	Mayor of Cosernita at a minimum, Bio-Alianta, how 16:4 the mayors blocked access of Laguardia to the fields, how the Mayor of Cosernita threatened Laguardia's employees, et cetera. Then we also heard from Mr Gladei that this went far beyond their normal roles as mayors, that this was not appropriate, not what normal mayors do. We also know that these mayors supported the Bio-Alianta civil lawsuits by filing witness statements, for example, in support of ex parte injunctions. We know that the mayors refused to issue leases, to return the leases and give copies of the dispositions to Laguardia so that it could adjudicate its rights. We also know that even when ex parte injunctions were lifted, mayors, at least the Mayor of Cosernita, failed to honour the court decision which lifted the injunction. There were other actors involved here. This case is not just about mayors and we will talk about those other actors in just a minute. But 1 just want to stop and acknowledge the role of mayors in Moldovan villages. In the written pleadings prior to this hearing, we heard about how Claimants attempted to inflate the role of the

	ARB 16 8 w Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi			nber 2017 a, Austria
Zbignie 1 I 2 0 3 0 4 5 5 1 6 2 7 0 8 0 9 5 10 1 12 2 13 1 14 0 15 1 16 1 17 1 18 1 20 0 21 1 22 5					a, Austria 730
25 t	Vir Grot's complaint seriously. We also know about the co-ordination of the prosecutor and Bio-Alianta n the third village, which was not discussed in great detail at this hearing, but of course in the	729 16:44	24 25 1 2	the registration process, was proceeding as planned. You heard Mr Grot say that he was receiving these assurances. This provided a higher level of assurance than perhaps would normally be	
4 0 5 1 7 5 8 4 9 0 10 1 11 0 12 0 13 14 4	village of Rosietici, and we know about the failure of police to investigate when requested. I could go on, but I am not going to. The record is very clear on these points. The written submissions do go further. The Tribunal has adequate information in front of them to make a decision concerning attribution. I want to remind the Tribunal one more time that this case is not only about dispositions, but it is about a pattern of state conduct. I would like to move on to my second point and that is concerning the process of lease execution. There was significant conversation		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	expected in a country like Moldova. Perhaps it was an unusual situation, but it appeared to be secure, and perhaps less risky than normal situations. But then there is another question that was talked about by the Tribunal, and it concerns the fee which was paid by Mr Grot, and whether the registration fees which were paid by Mr Grot affect these assurances in the context of turning what was otherwise a public act into a private act. Now, as a qualification, this question from Claimants' perspective should only be relevant for leases which were allegedly not validly concluded, which is around the demonstrative that Claimants presented shows the numberten per cent	
17 0 18 i 19 t 20 r 21 6 22 23 a 24 0	concerning whether the local cadastrals were acting n a public context or in a private context during the process of lease execution, prior to the registration of the leases, but during the lease execution process, principally in the fall of 2010. Let's start with what the experts said about this process. Roger Gladei said that if the cadastral agent in his free time has a private agreement with Laguardia to separately assist		17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	of the leases. That is the qualification Claimants would like to make concerning this argument But you heard Mr Grot. He was asked. He said that he only paid a registration fee, and it is very clear, and uncontroverted from the remainder of the record, that any fee he paid was invoiced from the mayor's office and wired directly to the mayor's office and no other payments were made. So, in other words, any payment made was made in a public	- 500 704

www.dianaburden.com

-	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia ised	al 13 Decen Vienna	
1	context.	732 16:48	1	fact, they did appeal in this case concerning	734 16:51
2	You have also heard about Mr Grot's	10:40	2	Disposition 1-A when the later State Chancellery	10:51
3	character from Mr Beril, as well as described in		3	case was in fact brought.	
1	many of the written witness statements. He is an		4	Again, this is a time-sensitive farming	
5	honest man and his very candid testimony in front of		5	situation, so keep in mind that if it takes one year	
5	this Tribunal shows that. It was evidenced also in		6	to go through the Administrative Court procedure and	
7	the context of this case by how he reacted when a		7	obtain a judgment which is final and binding,	
B	national government official requested a bribe to		8	because it is not appealed, given the context of the	
9	solve all of his problems in Floresti. At that time		9	situation that means that two farming seasons would	
0	his business was under attack, it was under siege.		10	have already been lost. Mr Grot would have been	
1	He was being threatened. You heard him talk about		11	able to bring the lawsuit when he was properly	
2	that meeting. All he had to do was pay the official		12	notified of the dispositions. We will get to that	
3	and perhaps there would have been a solution. He		13	in one second. Let's imagine for the sake of	
4	refused.		14	argument that Mr Grot had been notified properly at	
5	To summarise on this point, the entire act		15	some time in April 2011.	
6	of facilitating the execution of the lease		16	Well, the 2010-2011 situation would not	
7	agreements by public cadastral agents was a public		17	have been resolved, so farming season No.1 had been	
8	act. It was directed by higher level authorities;		18	lost and farming season No.2 would have been lost	
9	it was done in the context of a local mayor's		19	because as the case was being adjudicated the next	
0	office; it was at the office, presumably during		20	planting season arises and Mr Grot and the Claimants	
1	business hours, and definitely directly related to		21	are not able to complete or even conduct their	
2	cadastral activity; no special agreement was in		22	activities in that context.	
3	place. Again, it was a public act.		23	But, in reality, this situation would have	
4	I would like to move on to my third point		24	been exacerbated by the insufficient notice	
25	before I pass over to Mr Astuno, and that is		25	surrounding the dispositions as the ability to	
		733			735
1	concerning the realistic options for local remedies. The legal experts suggested that there were actually		1 2	exercise his rights would have been blocked by this delay concerning proper notification of	735 16:52
2	- ·				735 16:52
	The legal experts suggested that there were actually		2	delay concerning proper notification of	735 16:52
2 3 4	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we		2 3	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions.	735 16:52
2 3 4 5	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any		2 3 4	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court	735 16:52
234557	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants.		2 3 4 5 6 7	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only	735 16:52
2 3 4 5 7 8	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the	735 16:52
233455739	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti.	735
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery.	735
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public authority such as the police. We also need to look		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery. Now we know that the State Chancellery ultimately	16:52
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0 1 2	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public authority such as the police. We also need to look at this in the context of the severity and urgency		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery. Now we know that the State Chancellery ultimately did bring a proceeding challenging Disposition 1-A.	16:52
2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0 1 2 3	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public authority such as the police. We also need to look at this in the context of the severity and urgency of the situation. We cannot forget that this is a		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery. Now we know that the State Chancellery ultimately did bring a proceeding challenging Disposition 1-A. Now, Mr Grot tried to get the State Chancellery to	16:52
2345573901234	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public authority such as the police. We also need to look at this in the context of the severity and urgency of the situation. We cannot forget that this is a farming investment and that time is a very essential		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery. Now we know that the State Chancellery ultimately did bring a proceeding challenging Disposition 1-A. Now, Mr Grot tried to get the State Chancellery to act on its own, but ultimately required some police	16:52
23456739012345	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public authority such as the police. We also need to look at this in the context of the severity and urgency of the situation. We cannot forget that this is a farming investment and that time is a very essential ingredient to any farming project.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery. Now we know that the State Chancellery ultimately did bring a proceeding challenging Disposition 1-A. Now, Mr Grot tried to get the State Chancellery to act on its own, but ultimately required some police assistance to get the process going.	16:52
234567390123456	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public authority such as the police. We also need to look at this in the context of the severity and urgency of the situation. We cannot forget that this is a farming investment and that time is a very essential ingredient to any farming project. Now, in Mr Gladei's view, as a		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery. Now we know that the State Chancellery ultimately did bring a proceeding challenging Disposition 1-A. Now, Mr Grot tried to get the State Chancellery to act on its own, but ultimately required some police assistance to get the process going. I want to make it clear, the Claimants	16:52
2345673901234567	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public authority such as the police. We also need to look at this in the context of the severity and urgency of the situation. We cannot forget that this is a farming investment and that time is a very essential ingredient to any farming project. Now, in Mr Gladei's view, as a practitioner of Moldovan law, and as agreed by		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery. Now we know that the State Chancellery ultimately did bring a proceeding challenging Disposition 1-A. Now, Mr Grot tried to get the State Chancellery to act on its own, but ultimately required some police assistance to get the process going. I want to make it clear, the Claimants have never said that nobody, no public official in	16:52
23456789012345678	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public authority such as the police. We also need to look at this in the context of the severity and urgency of the situation. We cannot forget that this is a farming investment and that time is a very essential ingredient to any farming project. Now, in Mr Gladei's view, as a practitioner of Moldovan law, and as agreed by Professor Rusu, the administrative courts would have		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery. Now we know that the State Chancellery ultimately did bring a proceeding challenging Disposition 1-A. Now, Mr Grot tried to get the State Chancellery to act on its own, but ultimately required some police assistance to get the process going. I want to make it clear, the Claimants have never said that nobody, no public official in Moldova was ever willing to help there were many	16:52
234567390123456789	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public authority such as the police. We also need to look at this in the context of the severity and urgency of the situation. We cannot forget that this is a farming investment and that time is a very essential ingredient to any farming project. Now, in Mr Gladei's view, as a practitioner of Moldovan law, and as agreed by Professor Rusu, the administrative courts would have taken some time, at a minimum a year. That is		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery. Now we know that the State Chancellery ultimately did bring a proceeding challenging Disposition 1-A. Now, Mr Grot tried to get the State Chancellery to act on its own, but ultimately required some police assistance to get the process going. I want to make it clear, the Claimants have never said that nobody, no public official in Moldova was ever willing to help there were many officials in Moldova who acted within the context of	16:52
2345678901234567890	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public authority such as the police. We also need to look at this in the context of the severity and urgency of the situation. We cannot forget that this is a farming investment and that time is a very essential ingredient to any farming project. Now, in Mr Gladei's view, as a practitioner of Moldovan law, and as agreed by Professor Rusu, the administrative courts would have taken some time, at a minimum a year. That is perhaps in Mr Gladei's estimation a best case		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery. Now we know that the State Chancellery ultimately did bring a proceeding challenging Disposition 1-A. Now, Mr Grot tried to get the State Chancellery to act on its own, but ultimately required some police assistance to get the process going. I want to make it clear, the Claimants have never said that nobody, no public official in Moldova was ever willing to help there were many officials in Moldova who acted within the context of their normal duties that wasn't enough to save	16:52
23456739012345678901	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public authority such as the police. We also need to look at this in the context of the severity and urgency of the situation. We cannot forget that this is a farming investment and that time is a very essential ingredient to any farming project. Now, in Mr Gladei's view, as a practitioner of Moldovan law, and as agreed by Professor Rusu, the administrative courts would have taken some time, at a minimum a year. That is perhaps in Mr Gladei's estimation a best case scenario.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery. Now we know that the State Chancellery ultimately did bring a proceeding challenging Disposition 1-A. Now, Mr Grot tried to get the State Chancellery to act on its own, but ultimately required some police assistance to get the process going. I want to make it clear, the Claimants have never said that nobody, no public official in Moldova was ever willing to help there were many officials in Moldova who acted within the context of their normal duties that wasn't enough to save the investment in this case. There was a police	16:52
234567890123456789012	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public authority such as the police. We also need to look at this in the context of the severity and urgency of the situation. We cannot forget that this is a farming investment and that time is a very essential ingredient to any farming project. Now, in Mr Gladei's view, as a practitioner of Moldovan law, and as agreed by Professor Rusu, the administrative courts would have taken some time, at a minimum a year. That is perhaps in Mr Gladei's estimation a best case scenario.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery. Now we know that the State Chancellery ultimately did bring a proceeding challenging Disposition 1-A. Now, Mr Grot tried to get the State Chancellery to act on its own, but ultimately required some police assistance to get the process going. I want to make it clear, the Claimants have never said that nobody, no public official in Moldova was ever willing to help there were many officials in Moldova who acted within the context of their normal duties that wasn't enough to save the investment in this case. There was a police officer who made a request to the State Chancellery,	16:52
2345678901234567890123	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public authority such as the police. We also need to look at this in the context of the severity and urgency of the situation. We cannot forget that this is a farming investment and that time is a very essential ingredient to any farming project. Now, in Mr Gladei's view, as a practitioner of Moldovan law, and as agreed by Professor Rusu, the administrative courts would have taken some time, at a minimum a year. That is perhaps in Mr Gladei's estimation a best case scenario.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery. Now we know that the State Chancellery ultimately did bring a proceeding challenging Disposition 1-A. Now, Mr Grot tried to get the State Chancellery to act on its own, but ultimately required some police assistance to get the process going. I want to make it clear, the Claimants have never said that nobody, no public official in Moldova was ever willing to help there were many officials in Moldova who acted within the context of their normal duties that wasn't enough to save the investment in this case. There was a police officer who made a request to the State Chancellery, after Mr Grot had requested police assistance on one	16:52
234567890123456789012	The legal experts suggested that there were actually three options for resolving this situation, so we need to examine these three options and see if any of these options would have actually led to any sort of meaningful resolution for Mr Grot and the Claimants. The three options which were identified appear to be the administrative courts, the State Chancellery, and actually going to the public authority such as the police. We also need to look at this in the context of the severity and urgency of the situation. We cannot forget that this is a farming investment and that time is a very essential ingredient to any farming project. Now, in Mr Gladei's view, as a practitioner of Moldovan law, and as agreed by Professor Rusu, the administrative courts would have taken some time, at a minimum a year. That is perhaps in Mr Gladei's estimation a best case scenario.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	delay concerning proper notification of dispositions. To summarise on the Administrative Court procedures, that really was not an effective option for Mr Grot and the Claimants. It would not have provided any sort of meaningful resolution, not only concerning the dispositions, but concerning the holistic attack on his investment in Floresti. Let's talk about the State Chancellery. Now we know that the State Chancellery ultimately did bring a proceeding challenging Disposition 1-A. Now, Mr Grot tried to get the State Chancellery to act on its own, but ultimately required some police assistance to get the process going. I want to make it clear, the Claimants have never said that nobody, no public official in Moldova was ever willing to help there were many officials in Moldova who acted within the context of their normal duties that wasn't enough to save the investment in this case. There was a police officer who made a request to the State Chancellery,	16:52

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi		al 13 Decem Vienna	
-		736			738
1	· · · · ·	16:54	1	no requirement legally under the BIT to seek local	16:56
2	results of that State Chancellery challenge,		2	remedy. And, again, the real situation, the reality	
3	Disposition 1-A, led to court judgments invalidating		3	was that that there no realistic option for local	
4	Disposition 1-A.		4	remedies that would have allowed Mr Grot to preserve	
5	But, again, the problem here is timing,		5	his investment in this case.	
6	because the successful result concerning		6	With that, I will conclude my remarks and	
7	Disposition 1-A remember, the proceedings started		7	I will let Mr Astuno continue. Thank you.	
8	in, if my memory serves me, May of 2012, and		8	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr Gleason.	
9	ultimately was not resolved with a final binding		9	Mr Astuno?	
10	decision until January of 2015 and at that point		10	MR ASTUNO: Thank you to my colleague.	
11	it was well past the expiration of the four-year		11	Co-counsel, members of the Tribunal, to	
12	lease terms.		12	briefly summarise the quantum issues that have	
13	Perhaps, given this urgency, and the		13	already been flushed out before us, I want to start	
14	typical delays associated with going to court, not		14	by saying to value Laguardia at the time of its	
5	only in the Republic of Moldova, but in many		15	destruction one must first understand Mr Grot.	
16	countries, but specifically in this case in the		16	Laguardia was, after all, Mr Zbigniew Grot. The	
17	Republic of Moldova, perhaps going to the public		17	business plan was him.	
8	authorities was perhaps the best choice under this		18	I ask this Tribunal to look at his past	
9	circumstance.		19	profitability in Poland as of the year 2010, his	
20	Now Mr Grot did try to go to many public		20	present profitability in Moldova as of the year	
21	authorities as described in greater detail at		21	2010, and, most importantly, above all, a certainty,	
22	section 7K of the Reply Memorial, and he was		22	certainly a likelihood of future profitability at	
23	consistently ignored, and I am not going to go		23	the time that his investment was unlawfully taken	
24	through all of those again. They have been		24	from him.	
	sufficiently described in the written pleadings.		25	The Stefan Voda experience, albeit a	
25					
		737			
1		737 16:55	1	short-lived one, speaks for itself. It was a	739 16:59
1 2	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave		2	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a	
1 2 3	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to		2 3	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha	739 16:59
1 2 3 4	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss.		2 3 4	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a	
1 2 3 4 5	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in		2 3 4 5	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample	
1 2 3 4 5 6	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be		2 3 4 5 6	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had		2 3 4 5 6 7	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant	
123456789012	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants. You heard from him. He was almost in		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant testimony, I think we would all agree, mentioning	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants. You heard from him. He was almost in tears as he described how he just wanted to goback		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant testimony, I think we would all agree, mentioning that this land was fallow for three years. It was	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants. You heard from him. He was almost in tears as he described how he just wanted to goback home to Colorado and see his young son. So really		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant testimony, I think we would all agree, mentioning that this land was fallow for three years. It was unthought of that it could be turned into	
123456789012345	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants. You heard from him. He was almost in tears as he described how he just wanted to goback home to Colorado and see his young son. So really there was no local remedy to be found in the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant testimony, I think we would all agree, mentioning that this land was fallow for three years. It was unthought of that it could be turned into productivity, and this is a country that is	
1234567890123456	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants. You heard from him. He was almost in tears as he described how he just wanted to goback home to Colorado and see his young son. So really there was no local remedy to be found in the Moldovan court system, despite Respondent's		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant testimony, I think we would all agree, mentioning that this land was fallow for three years. It was unthought of that it could be turned into productivity, and this is a country that is predominantly defined by its agricultural community	
12345678901234567	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants. You heard from him. He was almost in tears as he described how he just wanted to goback home to Colorado and see his young son. So really there was no local remedy to be found in the Moldovan court system, despite Respondent's arguments, it just wasn't a realistic option at		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant testimony, I think we would all agree, mentioning that this land was fallow for three years. It was unthought of that it could be turned into productivity, and this is a country that is predominantly defined by its agricultural community in this part of the economy.	
123456789012345678	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants. You heard from him. He was almost in tears as he described how he just wanted to goback home to Colorado and see his young son. So really there was no local remedy to be found in the Moldovan court system, despite Respondent's arguments, it just wasn't a realistic option at least to obtain a remedy which would allow Mr Grot		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant testimony, I think we would all agree, mentioning that this land was fallow for three years. It was unthought of that it could be turned into productivity, and this is a country that is predominantly defined by its agricultural community in this part of the economy. Yet Mr Grot defied expectations beyond	
1234567890123456789	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants. You heard from him. He was almost in tears as he described how he just wanted to goback home to Colorado and see his young son. So really there was no local remedy to be found in the Moldovan court system, despite Respondent's arguments, it just wasn't a realistic option at least to obtain a remedy which would allow Mr Grot and the Claimants to preserve their investment in		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant testimony, I think we would all agree, mentioning that this land was fallow for three years. It was unthought of that it could be turned into productivity, and this is a country that is predominantly defined by its agricultural community in this part of the economy. Yet Mr Grot defied expectations beyond imagination. We heard that from the President of	
123456789012345678920	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants. You heard from him. He was almost in tears as he described how he just wanted to goback home to Colorado and see his young son. So really there was no local remedy to be found in the Moldovan court system, despite Respondent's arguments, it just wasn't a realistic option at least to obtain a remedy which would allow Mr Grot and the Claimants to preserve their investment in this case.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant testimony, I think we would all agree, mentioning that this land was fallow for three years. It was unthought of that it could be turned into productivity, and this is a country that is predominantly defined by its agricultural community in this part of the economy. Yet Mr Grot defied expectations beyond imagination. We heard that from the President of this district himself, who wasn't his friend;	
1234567890123456789021	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants. You heard from him. He was almost in tears as he described how he just wanted to goback home to Colorado and see his young son. So really there was no local remedy to be found in the Moldovan court system, despite Respondent's arguments, it just wasn't a realistic option at least to obtain a remedy which would allow Mr Grot and the Claimants to preserve their investment in this case. Claimants would like to make as a final		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 7 18 9 20 21 20 21	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant testimony, I think we would all agree, mentioning that this land was fallow for three years. It was unthought of that it could be turned into productivity, and this is a country that is predominantly defined by its agricultural community in this part of the economy. Yet Mr Grot defied expectations beyond imagination. We heard that from the President of this district himself, who wasn't his friend; rather, he was someone who came to know and trust	
12345678901234567890212	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants. You heard from him. He was almost in tears as he described how he just wanted to goback home to Colorado and see his young son. So really there was no local remedy to be found in the Moldovan court system, despite Respondent's arguments, it just wasn't a realistic option at least to obtain a remedy which would allow Mr Grot and the Claimants to preserve their investment in this case. Claimants would like to make as a final point on this issue that the arguments raised in		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant testimony, I think we would all agree, mentioning that this land was fallow for three years. It was unthought of that it could be turned into productivity, and this is a country that is predominantly defined by its agricultural community in this part of the economy. Yet Mr Grot defied expectations beyond imagination. We heard that from the President of this district himself, who wasn't his friend; rather, he was someone who came to know and trust and believe in Mr Grot and could attest to his	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 11 22 23	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants. You heard from him. He was almost in tears as he described how he just wanted to goback home to Colorado and see his young son. So really there was no local remedy to be found in the Moldovan court system, despite Respondent's arguments, it just wasn't a realistic option at least to obtain a remedy which would allow Mr Grot and the Claimants to preserve their investment in this case. Claimants would like to make as a final point on this issue that the arguments raised in opening concerning the erroneous factual assumptions		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant testimony, I think we would all agree, mentioning that this land was fallow for three years. It was unthought of that it could be turned into productivity, and this is a country that is predominantly defined by its agricultural community in this part of the economy. Yet Mr Grot defied expectations beyond imagination. We heard that from the President of this district himself, who wasn't his friend; rather, he was someone who came to know and trust and believe in Mr Grot and could attest to his character, but most importantly, and for the	
123456789011234567890212234	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants. You heard from him. He was almost in tears as he described how he just wanted to goback home to Colorado and see his young son. So really there was no local remedy to be found in the Moldovan court system, despite Respondent's arguments, it just wasn't a realistic option at least to obtain a remedy which would allow Mr Grot and the Claimants to preserve their investment in this case. Claimants would like to make as a final point on this issue that the arguments raised in opening concerning the erroneous factual assumptions that Respondent based its local remedies argument on		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant testimony, I think we would all agree, mentioning that this land was fallow for three years. It was unthought of that it could be turned into productivity, and this is a country that is predominantly defined by its agricultural community in this part of the economy. Yet Mr Grot defied expectations beyond imagination. We heard that from the President of this district himself, who wasn't his friend; rather, he was someone who came to know and trust and believe in Mr Grot and could attest to his character, but most importantly, and for the purposes of the portion of the analysis I am now	16:59
12345678901234567890123	point, December 2012, for Mr Grot to actually leave Moldova? That is the last question I would like to discuss. Keep in mind that Mr Grot at this point in time was terrified, and he had good reason to be terrified. He was threatened. A violent act had been carried out against him. He hired a bodyguard. Could Mr Grot have just gone and farmed somewhere else nearby right away? No, that wasn't a realistic option for him, or for the Claimants. You heard from him. He was almost in tears as he described how he just wanted to goback home to Colorado and see his young son. So really there was no local remedy to be found in the Moldovan court system, despite Respondent's arguments, it just wasn't a realistic option at least to obtain a remedy which would allow Mr Grot and the Claimants to preserve their investment in this case. Claimants would like to make as a final point on this issue that the arguments raised in opening concerning the erroneous factual assumptions		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	farming operation that, left to his own devices, a modest one moreover, 250 acres compared to 2830 ha under lease in the Floresti region, generated a profit of a margin of 40 per cent. Does that sample size, if you will, not indicate the potential, the likelihood at the very least, if not the certainty of its future success? Let us refer again, or think back to the testimony of Mr Beril, the former President of Moldova coming before us, in a very poignant testimony, I think we would all agree, mentioning that this land was fallow for three years. It was unthought of that it could be turned into productivity, and this is a country that is predominantly defined by its agricultural community in this part of the economy. Yet Mr Grot defied expectations beyond imagination. We heard that from the President of this district himself, who wasn't his friend; rather, he was someone who came to know and trust and believe in Mr Grot and could attest to his character, but most importantly, and for the	16:59

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revise			ber 2017 I, Austria
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 24 25	as to what lay ahead in the country of Moldova, and that dream, as Mr Fortier described it, it certainly was a dream to make an investment, to make an impact for investment, to be successful, it became a reality at that point. It still was a dream, of course, and that dream would be living itself out this very moment had the intervention not occurred, but let us also recognise that it was a reality if we would look at the actual data, if we look at the numbers. It was a reality of success, the profits, the history of Mr Grot's past operations. Never once was there a year where he didn't turn a profit, and on that basis we look at the two quantum reports before us. One truly is credible, backed up by locally validated data, and the other is an empty chair. The other is a report that sits on an empty chair and, despite the hard work of Mr Peer and his expertise, he admitted to us today that it is unworkable to value a business without any local input, without a specific understanding of the industry at issue, and his report then has to be entirely dismissed. We are looking, then, at another report that albeit was challenged in terms of the reliability and the history of profitability, but of	: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 2 2 3 4	I encourage this Tribunal to go back and look at the actual financial statements for the years of 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014. Laguardia's business model was negative, had negative earnings, and the mitigation efforts, albeit they were attempted, clearly were not successful and clearly cannot be taken into account to offset at a bare minimum the initial investment costs. Then we must talk about what could have been? What would have been the opportunity cost? Because to reimburse initial costs seven years later does not take into account seven years of an otherwise dream, that we I think can fairly say truly was a dream, being robbed from someone, someone who is a trusting man, someone who did nothing wrong, someone who only wanted to bring his expertise and make a valuable investment. On that basis we would stand by the interest rate, the pre-judgment interest rate that is put forth in our expert report, because it takes into account the expected return of someone like Mr Grot who would be willing to go to perhaps not the most likely of places, but nevertheless a place where the rule of law should be upheld and just	742
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 22 3 4 5 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	the two I just implore this Tribunal to understand it in terms of what is in front of it. Clearly one is more credible than the other, if not much more credible than the other and that is our valuation approach. I would end this discussion with a question. Why would it be reasonable to think that Mr Grot would have lost money for the first time in his farming career? Moving on to this discussion of if the future cashflows cannot be awarded, initial costs at a bare minimum would be reimbursed. To that point we would add that there cannot be an offset, there shouldn't even be a discussion of any sale of the equipment because there were negative earnings in every year when that equipment was beingsold, and why were there negative earnings? If we look back at the financial statements that were tabulated by the Respondent's quantum expert in table 2 of his report, because he was paying back interest on the debt. He had obligations that resulted from the destruction of his investment and those liabilities exceeded any slight modest offset in revenue that would have been achieved through the sale of equipment. Sort of bare minimum then, and again	: ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 16 7 18 19 20 1 22 3	compensation should be paid under the terms of the treaty. With that we complete our quantum analysis. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT : And your closing submission, I take it? MR ASTUNO : And our closing submission. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT : Can I ask whether either of my colleagues have a question for you in relation to any of that? I just have one quick question since you touched on it. What is the situation today as regards any ownership, in whole or in part, that Mr Grot has of the equipment that was brought to Moldova back in 2010/2011? What is your position on that? MR ASTUNO : Mr President, we would begin to answer that question by acknowledging that when Mr Grot left his investment, when his leases were taken from him he lost control over the entirety of his investments, including his equipment, and any transactions that subsequently occurred again do not amount to liabilities that that company still faced. There is a separate ownership structure	743

2 t 3 t 4 t 5 a 6 c 7 f 8 9 l 10 a 11 f 12 i 13 is 14 t 15 f	that was put in place. Although the name remains the same, Laguardia today is insolvent, as I believe this Tribunal understands. Mr Grot's investment in that equipment was too lost and, at the very least, any sale of that merchandise again did not at all compensate for losses that that company continued to face.	744 17:07	1 2 3	speaks for itself. The fact remains that Mr Grot is not at this point in time an owner of Laguardia	746 ^{17:10}
2 t 3 t 4 t 5 a 6 c 7 f 8 9 l 10 a 11 f 12 13 is 14 t 15 f	the same, Laguardia today is insolvent, as I believe this Tribunal understands. Mr Grot's investment in that equipment was too lost and, at the very least, any sale of that merchandise again did not at all compensate for losses that that company continued to	1,,	2	•	17.10
3 t 4 t 5 a 6 c 7 f 8 9 l 10 a 11 f 12 13 is 14 t 15 f	this Tribunal understands. Mr Grot's investment in that equipment was too lost and, at the very least, any sale of that merchandise again did not at all compensate for losses that that company continued to			not at this point in time an owner of Euglardia	
4 t 5 a 6 c 7 f 8 9 l 10 a 11 r 12 13 is 14 t 15 r	that equipment was too lost and, at the very least, any sale of that merchandise again did not at all compensate for losses that that company continued to			Agrobusiness. I hesitate to tell you about my	
5 a 6 c 7 f 8 9 l 10 a 11 h 12 13 is 14 t 15 h	any sale of that merchandise again did not at all compensate for losses that that company continued to		4	conversations with Mr Grot about this issue which	
6 c 7 f 8 9 l 10 a 11 h 12 13 is 14 t 15 h	compensate for losses that that company continued to		5	happened in the context of an attorney-client	
7 f. 8 9 I 10 a 11 h 12 13 is 14 t 15 h			6	relationship	
8 9 10 a 11 h 12 13 is 14 t 15 h			7	THE PRESIDENT: I am not asking you about	
9 10 a 11 h 12 13 is 14 t 15 h	THE PRESIDENT: It is not quite what		8	that.	
10 a 11 h 12 13 is 14 t 15 h	asked, and it was, if I may say, a slightly opaque		9	MR GLEASON: But the simple fact of the	
11 h 12 13 is 14 t 15 h	answer. We are just trying to work out what		10	matter is that this question could have been easily	
12 13 is 14 t 15 h	nappened to the equipment. Is it owned by		11	resolved had they attempted to bring these documents	
13 i 14 t 15 h	MR GLEASON: Unfortunately the situation		12	to Mr Grot's attention rather than Mr Wiechen's	
14 t 15 h	s not entirely clear. That is the simple fact of		13	attention. I am not sure why these exhibit which	
15 h	the matter. Perhaps it could have been clarified		14	touch on a factual matter weren't brought	
	had this issue been raised as an issue by Respondent		15	THE PRESIDENT: Am I right in thinking	
16 p	prior to this hearing, and they had the chance to		16	that the equipment identified in R-9 was transferred	
	raise the issue with Mr Grot, so I don't want to		17	to Laguardia Agrobusiness? That Mr Grot is no	
	speculate on the record concerning an issue which		18	longer an owner of Laguardia Agrobusiness, and that	
	am not entirely sure about, but I can tell you		19	in return a consideration was paid to him for the	
	that Mr Grot is no longer an owner of the company		20	sale of Laguardia Agrobusiness (R-11)	
	Laguardia Agrobusiness to which the Respondent		21	MR GLEASON: I would also mention that	
	ntroduced an exhibit earlier today saying the		22	some of this equipment, and I don't have the exact	
	equipment was put into this company.		22	details and it wasn't introduced on the record	
23 6	THE PRESIDENT: Is that accurate that the		23 24	because again this is an issue that was raised very	
	equipment was transferred to this company?		24 25	late in this proceeding, some of this equipment was	
		745			- 4-7
1	MR GLEASON: Some of it.	745 17:08	1	seized at a certain point.	747 17:11
2	THE PRESIDENT: How much of it?		2	MR FORTIER: It has been raised so it has	
3	MR GLEASON: I could not tell you off the		3	to be dealt with.	
4 t	op of my head but I believe the record is clear on		4	MR GLEASON: Sure, and unfortunately the	
5 t	hat point. The document that was submitted by		5	problem that I am having in dealing with this issue	
6 F	Respondent today is a document that was provided by		6	is that it was raised in a way that doesn't give us	
7 (Claimants in document production.		7	an adequate opportunity to find the answers to these	
8	THE PRESIDENT: And that is not disputed.		8	questions. That is my problem here and that is why	
9	MR GLEASON: There is no dispute		9	I do raise an objection to the fashion in which this	
	concerning the content of that document		10	information was brought into this proceeding.	
11	THE PRESIDENT: And what happened then to		11	THE PRESIDENT: But you will understand	
	Laguardia Agrobusiness? That was then sold in		12	that we as mere members of a Tribunal have somehow	
	accordance with R-13? Is that also an accurate		13	to work our way through the morass and do so	
	document?		14	accurately, so if we were by any chance to get to	
15	MR GLEASON: I don't remember off the top		15	the point of a valuation we would need to have	
	of my head what R-13 is.		16	answers to these questions because it would not be	
17	MR ASTUNO: What was the date, please?		17	right if either he continues to be the owner of this	
18	MR KOPECKY: 28 November 2012.		18	equipment for him to be compensated for its loss.	
19	THE PRESIDENT: Is that transfer?		19	Alternatively, if it were sold, for him to be	
20	MR KOPECKY: Yes. That is the		20	compensated again for, if you like, a value for	
	contribution in kind to Laguardia Agrobusiness.		21	which presumably he received a consideration of some	
22	THE PRESIDENT: So are the contents of R-9		22	sort.	
	not disputed either in that equipment was		23	MR GLEASON: Fair enough. May I confer	
	ransferred to Laguardia Agrobusiness?		24	for one moment with my colleague?	
25	MR GLEASON: All I can say is the document		25	MR KOPECKY: Maybe for the record, both	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			ıber 201 ı, Austri
1 2 3	exhibit were submitted with a counter seven months ago exactly. THE PRESIDENT: It is before us. We are	748 ^{17:12}	3	because we didn't hear Mr Grot talk at all when he was giving evidence about we saw that he was very	750 17:15
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 1 2 3 1 2 1 2 3 1 2 1 2	THE PRESIDENT: It is before us. We are going to have to find a way to sort it out. MR ASTUNO: Mr President, believe me, we share your desire in absolutely understanding entirely the financial transparency of this equipment issue and we would ask for the right to submit at some point in the near future an audit, if you will, a summary of exactly what was sold for what, and we also would like to reserve the right in that moment to make any argument that, whatever compensation was received, still should be taken into account in light of unsuccessful mitigation efforts and other losses that Laguardia had incurred on its balance sheet. THE PRESIDENT: We will take note of that and we will decide in due course how to proceed, but thank you. I think that extinguishes my interest in that. MR GLEASON: Can I add one more point? Unfortunately there is, because of the nature in which Mr Grot had to flee from Moldova, there is uncertainty concerning a fair amount of the equipment, what happened to it. Some of it was		4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22 32 24	was giving evidence about we saw that he was very touched, these were not happy times that he spent in Moldova but there is very little evidence before us on which to rest a claim for moral damages. MR WELLS: In terms of the two pieces of evidence, and you are right, there is a lot of evidence that wasn't discussed in this hearing. For example, Mr Ursu Veaceslav, his witness statement, the bodyguard that Mr Grot hired, which is also evidence of how scared he was. If you take a look at that witness statement, you will see Mr Veaceslav talk about the effects of these actions in the country. He identified the timing, for example, of when Mr Grot was affected by the conduct, and additionally you can take a look at the witness statement of Dr Zbylski, that is Mr Grot's physician in Colorado Springs. I think one of the issues that was raised in Respondent's memorial related to the fact that Mr Grot had had in the past some serious problems with anxiety and depression, or he had some not serious problems but he had had problems in the	
$1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \ 7 \ 8 \ 9 \ 10 \ 11 \ 12 \ 13 \ 14 \ 15 \ 16 \ 17 \ 18 \ 19 \ 22 \ 22 \ 22 \ 22 \ 22 \ 22 \ 22$	again seized in Civil Court proceedings and never returned, stolen in other fashions, et cetera, et cetera, so we would have to do some significant research to get to the bottom of those issues, but should the Tribunal find it necessary we would be happy to engage in those efforts. MR FORTIER: The individual Claimant, Mr Grot, is claiming moral damages. Is somebody going to brief us on the moral damages that you are claiming on behalf of Mr Grot? MR WELLS: It seems that the issue of moral damages in investor state arbitration, especially in ICSID cases, comes down to the question of can an individual claim those damages? There seems to be some deviationbetween whether an individual investor can claim them versus a company, the company itself should be awarded the compensation. So we have made, I would say two arguments: that it should either be awarded to Mr Grot, or Laguardia USA as the holding company, but they are alternative arguments. Would you like a submission on the facts related to the moral damages, or is it more MR FORTIER: I am familiar with the law, the Desert Line v Yemen decision in particular. I		$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 1\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	past with those issues, and that the conduct of the Respondent essentially increased those problems, so the depression and the anxiety increased. So we would turn the Tribunal's attention to those pieces of evidence. MR FORTIER: There were a number of witnesses who provided statements who were not examined. You know that they stand uncontradicted. We haven't heard anything about them. MR WELLS: They do stand uncontradicted, and we did submit which exhibit was? MR KOPECKY: But not uncontested. MR FORTIER: But you have not argued on the basis of any of these statements, any of the facts put on the record by those witnesses. MR WELLS: Those witness statements are in the record, though. MR FORTIER: Yes. MR WELLS: In terms of the short duration of these hearings, we would turn the Tribunal's attention to those pieces of evidence, yes MR FORTIER: If, at the end of the day, we will order Post-Hearing Briefs which we will discuss later, as the Chairman said it will be in your interest to remind us of the evidence of those	751

SID ARB 16 8 bigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confider Revise		
	Revise 752 1 17:19 1 2 3 nd 4 ity 5 al, 8 il 9 ge 11 pge 12 put 13 n 14 er 16 ally 17 ally 17 ally 17 and 14 and 14 <th>Image: Note: Note</th> <th>, Aust 754</th>	Image: Note: Note	, Aust 754
1 But before I do this, let me say that 2 sitting here and looking at Mr Grot, it gives me r 3 pleasure to do this. I agree with Claimants that 4 this is not a cliche BIT case of some multination 5 going against a South American state for bonds, at 6 we are all very aware of this. But it is a BIT cass 7 and it must be pleaded and decided like a BIT cass 8 and therefore I will not tell you a story like we 9 just heard. What I will say I will support with a 10 direct reference to evidence: name, date, page, 11 paragraph, exhibit page. 12 To get to my first point, and I have ten, 13 so we will try to be brief. 14 The factual record. 15 The witnesses heard in this hearing 16 provided important background to truly understat 17 certain events that transpired in those three 18 Woldova is a collectivistic society with a 19 Moldova is a collectivistic society with a 20 collectivistic past (Gladei, Day 2, 433:9). From 21 Professor Rusu and Mr Grot we learnt that village 22	al 3 al 4 nd 5 se 6 se, 7 8 9 10 11 12 14 14 14 14 14 14 15 14 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 15 14 14 15 15 16 16 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17	MR KOPECKY: I continue reading them into the record. I apologise for that. There are not that many. The mayor plays an important role in the community and this is not a role under a law. Mayors of small villages have very limited authority but as Professor Rusu explains, they enjoy the trust of the population second only to the church, as we heard (Rusu, Day 2, 408:19) and villagers rely on the mayors to solve their collective problems. At the same time, the mayors and the civil servants are insufficiently literate. As Professor Rusu testified, the mayor is not an expert in justice. The level of competence of these authorities is not that high (Rusu, Day 2, 332:8). And Professor Rusu also said the renal Registrar has only technical knowledge, technical expertise relating to the character (Rusu, Day 2, 332:11). Professor Rusu explained that for that reason City Hall decisions are often imperfect and contain reasonable errors (Rusu, Day 2, 407:15).	755

www.dianaburden.com

igni	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	ised	al 13 Decen Vienna	
		756	1		758
1 2	and maybe even for some Moldovan lawyers practising law in the capital, but not in a village of 300	17:25	1 2	The question is why so many villagers would seek termination of their leases with	17:27
2 3	souls.		2	Laguardia at the same time in that manner? And	
3 4	Yet that does not show a thickening plot,		4	Mr Fortier correctly called this a case of empty	
5	collusion or conspiracy, and much less does it show		5	chairs, and I hope I need not say that this is not	
6	a pattern of state conduct. Indeed, as in their		6	counsel's strategy.	
7	submission, Claimants in this hearing failed to		7	What seems strange to us is we will	
8	prove any conspiracy of public authorities, which		8	explain taking into account the collectivistic	
9	brings me to issue 2, namely that no conspiracy was		9	background, the character of Moldovan society and	
0	confirmed.		10	the prominent factual role of the mayor. Villagers	
11	Mr Grot testifies in paragraph 8 of his		11	often need and seek support of the mayor in solving	
12	second witness statement that a conspiracy reached		12	collective issues. In my opening that was	
13	up to the highest levels of government. He claims		13	speculation. Now we have multiple Moldovan	
4	to know this because Mr Beril told him, "in		14	witnesses corroborating this.	
5	July 2011 the Prime Minister himself was aware of		15	The witness, Mr Beril, is the former	
16	what was going on and that nothing would be done to		16	President of the district of Stefan Voda, to correct	
7	look into the matter", but Mr Beril did not		17	the closing of Claimants, not the President of the	
8	corroborate this statement at the hearing, despite		18	entire country. He is a friend of Mr Grot (Beril,	
9	repeated questioning and clarification requests		19	Day 1, 285:1) and appearing as a witness he was	
20	(Beril, Day 1, 277:1,19, 278:10, and 279:1).		20	asked to explain this, but he could only speculate.	
21	Mr Beril merely stated that "I am		21	I think there is no other way (Beril, Day 1, 281:8).	
22	convinced somewhat that [] the Vice-Minister of		22	Mr Beril saw these notices for the first	
23	agriculture would have brought this to the attention		23	time (Beril, Day 1, 283:24). He was not in Floresti	
24	of the Prime Minister (Beril, Day 1, 279:10).		24	or otherwise involved in Claimant's operation at the	
25	Mr Grot further testified in paragraph 7		25	time, (Beril, Day 1, 280:14) and he erroneously	
1	of his second witness statement that it was very	757	1	volunteers that the notices would be illegal just	759 17:29
	5	757 17:26	1	volunteers that the notices would be illegal just because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1,	
1 2 3	of his second witness statement that it was very clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands.			because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1,	
2	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands.		2	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not	
2 3	clear that someone at a high level in the government		2 3	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1,	759 17:29
2 3 4	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so		2 3 4	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed,	
2 3 4 5 6	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking		2 3 4 5	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and	
2 3 4 5 6 7	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet		2 3 4 5 6	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural		2 3 4 5 6 7	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of Mr Grot's accusation with that company, even when		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by villagers unhappy at not being paid and their lands	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of Mr Grot's accusation with that company, even when repeatedly asked, and nor did Mr Beril, the first		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by villagers unhappy at not being paid and their lands not being processed. Those villagers sought to sign	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of Mr Grot's accusation with that company, even when repeatedly asked, and nor did Mr Beril, the first two times he was asked about it (Beril, Day 1,		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by villagers unhappy at not being paid and their lands not being processed. Those villagers sought to sign or signed new leases with Bio-Alianta. They went to	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of Mr Grot's accusation with that company, even when repeatedly asked, and nor did Mr Beril, the first two times he was asked about it (Beril, Day 1, 274:21 and 275:1).		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by villagers unhappy at not being paid and their lands not being processed. Those villagers sought to sign or signed new leases with Bio-Alianta. They went to the mayor for advice, as is customary. She	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of Mr Grot's accusation with that company, even when repeatedly asked, and nor did Mr Beril, the first two times he was asked about it (Beril, Day 1, 274:21 and 275:1). So certainly there is no direct evidence		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by villagers unhappy at not being paid and their lands not being processed. Those villagers sought to sign or signed new leases with Bio-Alianta. They went to the mayor for advice, as is customary. She confirmed with the local council president, who told	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 5 6	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of Mr Grot's accusation with that company, even when repeatedly asked, and nor did Mr Beril, the first two times he was asked about it (Beril, Day 1, 274:21 and 275:1). So certainly there is no direct evidence of conspiracy and neither can such conspiracy be		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by villagers unhappy at not being paid and their lands not being processed. Those villagers sought to sign or signed new leases with Bio-Alianta. They went to the mayor for advice, as is customary. She confirmed with the local council president, who told her that first the existing contracts would	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of Mr Grot's accusation with that company, even when repeatedly asked, and nor did Mr Beril, the first two times he was asked about it (Beril, Day 1, 274:21 and 275:1). So certainly there is no direct evidence of conspiracy and neither can such conspiracy be inferred from any of the documents on record. That		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by villagers unhappy at not being paid and their lands not being processed. Those villagers sought to sign or signed new leases with Bio-Alianta. They went to the mayor for advice, as is customary. She confirmed with the local council president, who told her that first the existing contracts would have to be terminated. That is evidence Claimants	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 8 9 10 12 10 12 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of Mr Grot's accusation with that company, even when repeatedly asked, and nor did Mr Beril, the first two times he was asked about it (Beril, Day 1, 274:21 and 275:1). So certainly there is no direct evidence of conspiracy and neither can such conspiracy be inferred from any of the documents on record. That is my issue 3, the termination notices.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by villagers unhappy at not being paid and their lands not being processed. Those villagers sought to sign or signed new leases with Bio-Alianta. They went to the mayor for advice, as is customary. She confirmed with the local council president, who told her that first the existing contracts would have to be terminated. That is evidence Claimants put on record, and then the people signed these	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 16 7 18 9	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of Mr Grot's accusation with that company, even when repeatedly asked, and nor did Mr Beril, the first two times he was asked about it (Beril, Day 1, 274:21 and 275:1). So certainly there is no direct evidence of conspiracy and neither can such conspiracy be inferred from any of the documents on record. That is my issue 3, the termination notices. The hearing indeed permitted to clarify		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by villagers unhappy at not being paid and their lands not being processed. Those villagers sought to sign or signed new leases with Bio-Alianta. They went to the mayor for advice, as is customary. She confirmed with the local council president, who told her that first the existing contracts would have to be terminated. That is evidence Claimants put on record, and then the people signed these terminations.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of Mr Grot's accusation with that company, even when repeatedly asked, and nor did Mr Beril, the first two times he was asked about it (Beril, Day 1, 274:21 and 275:1). So certainly there is no direct evidence of conspiracy and neither can such conspiracy be inferred from any of the documents on record. That is my issue 3, the termination notices. The hearing indeed permitted to clarify any questions surrounding the termination notices		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by villagers unhappy at not being paid and their lands not being processed. Those villagers sought to sign or signed new leases with Bio-Alianta. They went to the mayor for advice, as is customary. She confirmed with the local council president, who told her that first the existing contracts would have to be terminated. That is evidence Claimants put on record, and then the people signed these terminations. We do not know and do not want to further	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 16 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 4 5 10 11 12 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of Mr Grot's accusation with that company, even when repeatedly asked, and nor did Mr Beril, the first two times he was asked about it (Beril, Day 1, 274:21 and 275:1). So certainly there is no direct evidence of conspiracy and neither can such conspiracy be inferred from any of the documents on record. That is my issue 3, the termination notices. The hearing indeed permitted to clarify any questions surrounding the termination notices signed by Varvareuca landowners in February 2011		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by villagers unhappy at not being paid and their lands not being processed. Those villagers sought to sign or signed new leases with Bio-Alianta. They went to the mayor for advice, as is customary. She confirmed with the local council president, who told her that first the existing contracts would have to be terminated. That is evidence Claimants put on record, and then the people signed these terminations. We do not know and do not want to further speculate who provided that Russian template, but it	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 8 19 20 1 22	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of Mr Grot's accusation with that company, even when repeatedly asked, and nor did Mr Beril, the first two times he was asked about it (Beril, Day 1, 274:21 and 275:1). So certainly there is no direct evidence of conspiracy and neither can such conspiracy be inferred from any of the documents on record. That is my issue 3, the termination notices. The hearing indeed permitted to clarify any questions surrounding the termination notices signed by Varvareuca landowners in February 2011 (C-95). But unlike Claimant stated in their		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by villagers unhappy at not being paid and their lands not being processed. Those villagers sought to sign or signed new leases with Bio-Alianta. They went to the mayor for advice, as is customary. She confirmed with the local council president, who told her that first the existing contracts would have to be terminated. That is evidence Claimants put on record, and then the people signed these terminations. We do not know and do not want to further speculate who provided that Russian template, but it doesn't matter because we know it was the people who	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 8 19 20 12 22 3	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of Mr Grot's accusation with that company, even when repeatedly asked, and nor did Mr Beril, the first two times he was asked about it (Beril, Day 1, 274:21 and 275:1). So certainly there is no direct evidence of conspiracy and neither can such conspiracy be inferred from any of the documents on record. That is my issue 3, the termination notices. The hearing indeed permitted to clarify any questions surrounding the termination notices signed by Varvareuca landowners in February 2011 (C-95). But unlike Claimant stated in their closing, these notices were not addressed from the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by villagers unhappy at not being paid and their lands not being processed. Those villagers sought to sign or signed new leases with Bio-Alianta. They went to the mayor for advice, as is customary. She confirmed with the local council president, who told her that first the existing contracts would have to be terminated. That is evidence Claimants put on record, and then the people signed these terminations. We do not know and do not want to further speculate who provided that Russian template, but it doesn't matter because we know it was the people who approached the mayor, and indeed the mayor testified	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 8 19 20 1 22	clear that someone at a high level in the government had decided Bio-Alianta would take over these lands. At the hearing Mr Grot explained why this was so clear to him. It is Mr Grot's knowledge of speaking to people, doing some homework on the internet (Grot, Day 1, 247:13). But the agricultural experts, local Moldovans we had here clearly were no such people, whilst familiar with Bio-Alianta, they did not associate anything along the lines of Mr Grot's accusation with that company, even when repeatedly asked, and nor did Mr Beril, the first two times he was asked about it (Beril, Day 1, 274:21 and 275:1). So certainly there is no direct evidence of conspiracy and neither can such conspiracy be inferred from any of the documents on record. That is my issue 3, the termination notices. The hearing indeed permitted to clarify any questions surrounding the termination notices signed by Varvareuca landowners in February 2011 (C-95). But unlike Claimant stated in their		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	because they were drafted in Russian. (Beril, Day 1, 281:15). He could only confirm that this was not the official document (Beril Day 1, 284:1). Indeed, it was a private notice for lessors to lessee, and the President correctly noted that Mr Beril's supposition is of "limited probative value". (Professor Sands, Day 1, 281:5.) Exhibit C-94, on the other hand, provides some background here. There were complaints by villagers unhappy at not being paid and their lands not being processed. Those villagers sought to sign or signed new leases with Bio-Alianta. They went to the mayor for advice, as is customary. She confirmed with the local council president, who told her that first the existing contracts would have to be terminated. That is evidence Claimants put on record, and then the people signed these terminations. We do not know and do not want to further speculate who provided that Russian template, but it doesn't matter because we know it was the people who	

-	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi		al 13 Decem Vienna	
1	The notifications were put in one envelope	760	1	(Gladei, Day 2, 349:22), for instance, when it is	762
2	and sent to Laguardia to make sure that they all	11.30	2	not signed (Gladei, Day 2, 349:7) and, in any event	11:33
3	arrived, perhaps to save postage, a strange premise		3	irrespective of registration, non-opposability or	
4	for us, I agree, but not for villagers living at or		4	unenforceability cannot be invoked by a party acting	
5	below the poverty line.		5	in bad faith (Rusu, Day 2, 328:8)	
6	The mayor's signature and stamp on these		6	Claimants, who had legal counsel, could	
7	notifications did not have any legal implications.		7	enforce their rights against Bio-Alianta, despite	
в	Mr Gladei, Claimants' expert, confirmed that it does		8	the dispositions.	
9	not mean anything "that the mayor put a signature		9	Let's briefly summarise what we learnt	
0	under any wording there" (Gladei, Day 2, 404:7) and		10	about the dispositions, my issue 6.	
1	Professor Rusu confirmed "this certification has no		11	The leases filed by Laguardia to Cosernita	
2	value" (Rusu, Day 2, 408:12).		12	and Varvareuca City Halls were non-compliant	
3	That is what the notices say, "for		13	(CEX 1), hundreds were not signed(R-14), many	
4	confirmation". A mayor is not a notary but who else		14	contained erasures (R-15 and R-16). Many leases	
5	to turn to in a village of 300 people?		15	were signed by persons other than the landowners	
6	The next issue centres on an important		16	(R-19) and, just for the record, Respondent does not	
7	clarification achieved in the course of the hearing		17	agree with Claimants' calculation in CH-2, but it	
8	regarding the differentiation between private and		18	need not be redone; it is simply a matter of	
9	public domain.		19	counting the pages.	
0	To issue No 4, the assistance by cadastral		20	A mayor who, as confirmed by Mr Gladei,	
1	agents.		21	shall exercise control over the register of	
2	Claimants reconfirmed in their opening		22	agricultural leases had to take measure to correct	
3	Mr Grot's testimony of paragraph 14 of his first		23	errors in the register (Gladei, Day 2,	
24	witness statement that the cadastral agents were		24	439:6-440:16).	
	paid a fee "in addition" to the registration fee		25	Mr Gladei acknowledged that since the	
25					
25		761			762
1	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign	761 ^{17:32}	1	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor	763 17:35
1	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9).	761 17:32	1 2	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and	
1 2 3	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants	761 17:32	1 2 3	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous	
1 2 3 4	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only	761 17:32	1 2 3 4	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2,	763 17:35
1 2 3 4 5	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4)	
1 2 3 4 5 6	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act in a private capacity to assist private parties in	761	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0 1	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act in a private capacity to assist private parties in executing a contract (Rusu, Gladei, Day 2,	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices. Both dispositions provide for the refusal	
123455739012	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act in a private capacity to assist private parties in executing a contract (Rusu, Gladei, Day 2, 353:23-356:14) but that is no exercise of public	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices. Both dispositions provide for the refusal "and" the deletion of registration of Laguardia	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0 1 2 3	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act in a private capacity to assist private parties in executing a contract (Rusu, Gladei, Day 2, 353:23-356:14) but that is no exercise of public authority (Gladei, Day 2, 356:19)	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices. Both dispositions provide for the refusal "and" the deletion of registration of Laguardia leases. Both dispositions are complex acts which,	
12345673901234	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act in a private capacity to assist private parties in executing a contract (Rusu, Gladei, Day 2, 353:23-356:14) but that is no exercise of public authority (Gladei, Day 2, 356:19) The second important example, my issue 5,	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices. Both dispositions provide for the refusal "and" the deletion of registration of Laguardia leases. Both dispositions are complex acts which, according to Professor Rusu, are common in Moldova	
123456789012345	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act in a private capacity to assist private parties in executing a contract (Rusu, Gladei, Day 2, 353:23-356:14) but that is no exercise of public authority (Gladei, Day 2, 356:19) The second important example, my issue 5, the legal effect of the dispositions.	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices. Both dispositions provide for the refusal "and" the deletion of registration of Laguardia leases. Both dispositions are complex acts which, according to Professor Rusu, are common in Moldova (Rusu, Day 2, 393:24). They are reasoned (in	
1234567890123456	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act in a private capacity to assist private parties in executing a contract (Rusu, Gladei, Day 2, 353:23-356:14) but that is no exercise of public authority (Gladei, Day 2, 356:19) The second important example, my issue 5, the legal effect of the dispositions. Professor Rusu reconfirmed that registration serves	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices. Both dispositions provide for the refusal "and" the deletion of registration of Laguardia leases. Both dispositions are complex acts which, according to Professor Rusu, are common in Moldova (Rusu, Day 2, 393:24). They are reasoned (in Romanian "motivata" we have had a conversation	
12345678901234567	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act in a private capacity to assist private parties in executing a contract (Rusu, Gladei, Day 2, 353:23-356:14) but that is no exercise of public authority (Gladei, Day 2, 356:19) The second important example, my issue 5, the legal effect of the dispositions. Professor Rusu reconfirmed that registration serves a declaratory purpose and a purpose of publicity	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices. Both dispositions provide for the refusal "and" the deletion of registration of Laguardia leases. Both dispositions are complex acts which, according to Professor Rusu, are common in Moldova (Rusu, Day 2, 393:24). They are reasoned (in Romanian "motivata" we have had a conversation about that) and they are based on a reasonable	
123456789012345678	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act in a private capacity to assist private parties in executing a contract (Rusu, Gladei, Day 2, 353:23-356:14) but that is no exercise of public authority (Gladei, Day 2, 356:19) The second important example, my issue 5, the legal effect of the dispositions. Professor Rusu reconfirmed that registration serves a declaratory purpose and a purpose of publicity (Ruse, Day 2, 327:2-3) and primarily fiscal	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices. Both dispositions provide for the refusal "and" the deletion of registration of Laguardia leases. Both dispositions are complex acts which, according to Professor Rusu, are common in Moldova (Rusu, Day 2, 393:24). They are reasoned (in Romanian "motivata" we have had a conversation about that) and they are based on a reasonable interpretation of the law (Rusu, Day 2, 332:13).	
1234567890123456789	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act in a private capacity to assist private parties in executing a contract (Rusu, Gladei, Day 2, 353:23-356:14) but that is no exercise of public authority (Gladei, Day 2, 356:19) The second important example, my issue 5, the legal effect of the dispositions. Professor Rusu reconfirmed that registration serves a declaratory purpose and a purpose of publicity (Ruse, Day 2, 327:2-3) and primarily fiscal administration (Rusu, Day 2, 337:6). He reconfirmed	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices. Both dispositions provide for the refusal "and" the deletion of registration of Laguardia leases. Both dispositions are complex acts which, according to Professor Rusu, are common in Moldova (Rusu, Day 2, 393:24). They are reasoned (in Romanian "motivata" we have had a conversation about that) and they are based on a reasonable interpretation of the law (Rusu, Day 2, 332:13). It was simply not entirely clear under the	
	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act in a private capacity to assist private parties in executing a contract (Rusu, Gladei, Day 2, 353:23-356:14) but that is no exercise of public authority (Gladei, Day 2, 356:19) The second important example, my issue 5, the legal effect of the dispositions. Professor Rusu reconfirmed that registration serves a declaratory purpose and a purpose of publicity (Ruse, Day 2, 327:2-3) and primarily fiscal administration (Rusu, Day 2, 337:6). He reconfirmed that registration does not create nor affect the	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices. Both dispositions provide for the refusal "and" the deletion of registration of Laguardia leases. Both dispositions are complex acts which, according to Professor Rusu, are common in Moldova (Rusu, Day 2, 393:24). They are reasoned (in Romanian "motivata" we have had a conversation about that) and they are based on a reasonable interpretation of the law (Rusu, Day 2, 332:13). It was simply not entirely clear under the law when exactly a refusal was still possible (Rusu,	
123456789012345678901	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act in a private capacity to assist private parties in executing a contract (Rusu, Gladei, Day 2, 353:23-356:14) but that is no exercise of public authority (Gladei, Day 2, 356:19) The second important example, my issue 5, the legal effect of the dispositions. Professor Rusu reconfirmed that registration serves a declaratory purpose and a purpose of publicity (Ruse, Day 2, 327:2-3) and primarily fiscal administration (Rusu, Day 2, 337:6). He reconfirmed that registration does not create nor affect the parties' rights (Prof Rusu, Day 2, 327:4). It does	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices. Both dispositions provide for the refusal "and" the deletion of registration of Laguardia leases. Both dispositions are complex acts which, according to Professor Rusu, are common in Moldova (Rusu, Day 2, 393:24). They are reasoned (in Romanian "motivata" we have had a conversation about that) and they are based on a reasonable interpretation of the law (Rusu, Day 2, 332:13). It was simply not entirely clear under the law when exactly a refusal was still possible (Rusu, Day 2, 334:4).	
12345678901234567890	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act in a private capacity to assist private parties in executing a contract (Rusu, Gladei, Day 2, 353:23-356:14) but that is no exercise of public authority (Gladei, Day 2, 356:19) The second important example, my issue 5, the legal effect of the dispositions. Professor Rusu reconfirmed that registration serves a declaratory purpose and a purpose of publicity (Ruse, Day 2, 327:2-3) and primarily fiscal administration (Rusu, Day 2, 337:6). He reconfirmed that registration does not create nor affect the	761	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices. Both dispositions provide for the refusal "and" the deletion of registration of Laguardia leases. Both dispositions are complex acts which, according to Professor Rusu, are common in Moldova (Rusu, Day 2, 393:24). They are reasoned (in Romanian "motivata" we have had a conversation about that) and they are based on a reasonable interpretation of the law (Rusu, Day 2, 332:13). It was simply not entirely clear under the law when exactly a refusal was still possible (Rusu,	
1234567890123456789012	(Grot, Day 1, 49:13) for helping "the landowner sign a contract (Grot, Day 1, 49:9). In their closing, however, Claimants referred to Mr Grot's amended testimony, that only the registration fee but no servicing fee was paid in their closing, but whether paid or not, the cadastral agents assistance provided to Mr Grot is not attributable to Respondent. The legal experts clarified that and agreed that the registrar may act in a private capacity to assist private parties in executing a contract (Rusu, Gladei, Day 2, 353:23-356:14) but that is no exercise of public authority (Gladei, Day 2, 356:19) The second important example, my issue 5, the legal effect of the dispositions. Professor Rusu reconfirmed that registration serves a declaratory purpose and a purpose of publicity (Ruse, Day 2, 327:2-3) and primarily fiscal administration (Rusu, Day 2, 337:6). He reconfirmed that registration does not create nor affect the parties' rights (Prof Rusu, Day 2, 327:4). It does not affect the validity of the lease, and Mr Gladei	761 17:32	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	mayor's duty to control is not a right, the mayor does not qualify as an aggrieved person and therefore may not challenge the possible erroneous registration of leases in court (Gladei, Day 2, 437:24-441:4) That is why the mayors issue Disposition 1-A and 2, (C-31 and C-48) and to recall Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices of the Varvareuca villagers. Disposition 2 was not based on the termination notices. Both dispositions provide for the refusal "and" the deletion of registration of Laguardia leases. Both dispositions are complex acts which, according to Professor Rusu, are common in Moldova (Rusu, Day 2, 393:24). They are reasoned (in Romanian "motivata" we have had a conversation about that) and they are based on a reasonable interpretation of the law (Rusu, Day 2, 332:13). It was simply not entirely clear under the law when exactly a refusal was still possible (Rusu, Day 2, 334:4). The dispositions concerned hundreds of	

) ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revis			nber 2017 a, Austria
1 2 3 4	refers to the registration authority on the one hand, and the lessee on the other (Rusu Day 2, 394:25-395:12) The lessee is the party obligated to register the lease agreement under Article 10(5) of	764 17:36	1 2 3 4	The first is exhibit C-33. Bio-Alianta sought an injunction in the ex parte proceedings. Bio-Alianta alleged that Laguardia's leases violated the law and on that basis a temporary injunction was	766 17:39
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	the Law on Agricultural Lease. The Dispositions are therefore addressed to the lessee, without individualising each lessor. The Dispositions were brought to Laguardia's knowledge, which according to Mr Gladei is the applicable standard (Gladei, Day 2, 448:17-18) Once Laguardia became aware of the Dispositions, it had to act in an active way to defend its rights (Rusu, Day 2, 378:9). Mr Gladei further acknowledged that, in any event, regardless of how it was communicated, Disposition 1-A entered into force (Gladei, Day 2, 448:17-18). As Professor Rusu opined, there was no obligation to send the Dispositions to the Territorial Office of State Chancellery for review of legality. The Law on Agricultural Lease does not provide for such "delegation" of powers by the state. Mr Gladei further admitted that the notice of remedy in Dispositions, while brief, sufficed to		5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1 22 23 24 25	granted – a temporary injunction – and it was soon to be lifted as shown in the second relevant exhibit, C-105. The Floresti District Court ruled in favour of Claimants and annulled the injunction in Cosernita. The pertinent facts and pleadings were summarised by the court. Those alone mention Disposition 1-A and the registration in the following way: counsel for Bio-Alianta had stated that, "lease contracts of the landowners were not registered at the Mayor's Office and by the Mayor's disposition their right was forbidden". We had that in re-direct. However, regardless of this, despite Disposition 1-A, the court ruled in favour of Claimants (cross-examination of Mr Gladei, Day 2, 446:18-448:20). In the opening I walked you through the entire reasoning of the court in its decision and from that it was apparent that only the civil law relationship under the leases was relevant for the court to annul the injunction only the civil law relationship – and Mr Gladei yesterday	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	permit Mr Grot, who had legal counsel at the time, to duly challenge Dispositions (Gladei, Day 2, 441:19-443:4). One year after Disposition 1-A had been issued, it was reviewed by the Territorial Office of State Chancellery, and since the deadline for the challenge was missed, the State Chancellery was not obliged to review it. The review was triggered, as we saw, by the Police Commissariat of Floresti, even though, according to Professor Rusu, it was not on the list of triggers under the law. (Prof Rusu, Day 2, 388:16-17): "the police is not in this category". The Territorial Office of State Chancellery filed its Statement of Claim (on record as C-42) and by that time had found it unlawful. This was a strong signal to Claimants that Respondent was on their side. Indeed, both dispositions could have been annulled much sconer and with suspensive effect, if only Laguardia tried and challenged them in Administrative Court. Issue 7. I would like to address the injunctions and the available remedies. Two exhibits are particularly relevant regarding the Cosernita injunctions and the annulment thereof.		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	confirmed that the courts' reasoning in that decision did not mention Disposition 1-A or registration (Gladei, Day 2, 452:20). And that was only the first of many instances in which Respondent's court system supported Claimants, and indeed it is Respondent's courts that are competent to address Mr Grot's issues in Moldova. Mr Gladei confirmed: Disputes among private parties are to be solved in common law courts or former economic courts (Gladei, Day 2, 435:16-18). Furthermore, ex parte interim relief is available under Moldovan law, (Gladei, Day 2, 443:14) and, as the injunctions on the record show, (exhibit C-033, C-034) such relief, if requested, is issued efficiently and promptly annulled if requested unduly. Claimants simply failed to properly make use of the available remedies against landowners and their bad faith competitor. That brings me to issue No 8, which is that, sadly, regrettably instead of taking that stretched hand, Mr Grot chose to take another route. He did not continue legal proceedings in Moldova (Grot, Day 1, 257:24). As Mr Grot clarified, his	767

	Revise		oer 20 Aust
 "good lawyer", Mr Nagacevschi, advised him to initiate investment arbitration instead (Grot, Day 1, 258:17) and so Mr Grot started preparing his BIT claim already in 2012 Mr Grot had the impression that he could not get justice in the courts of Moldova (Grot, Day 1, 260:13) and this impression, he explained, was based on "what Mr Grot's then lawyers told him a the time". His lawyers. (Grot Day 1, 260:17). And so Mr Grot left. With his eyes turned to ICSID, he abandoned his investment. He assigned certain rights. He confirmed that when he left he had no idea what would happen to his investment and that he was not interested to know (Grot, Day 1, 256:7) To sum up my previous eight points, Respondent is not responsible. Point 9, expert evidence. 	768 17:42	sed Vienna,	Aus 770
 9 Claimants failed to establish the damage 0 they claim to have incurred. When it comes to 1 quantum, our memory of the experts' very helpful 2 contributions hardly need refreshing. There is only 3 a few points to be highlighted regarding the basis of Deloitte's approach. 5 1. Deloitte insists on DCF, although 	2 2 2 2 2 2 2	 the land. Thus, if at all, Claimants could not possibly have achieved Visoca State Centre yields until as of year 3. Moreover, the agronomists testified their forecasts were applicable for the first 2-3 years, and in paragraph 31 of their report they explained such forecasts were the average of five years. 	
	769		
 unsuitable in this case. 2 2. Deloitte's report is based entirely on the agricultural reports of Dr Rurac and Dr Gumovschi, and that report was created in very close co-operation. As the agronomists stated, they worked with Deloitte on that report (Rurac, Day 3, 31:1) and also Mr Wiechen confirmed that he was reasonable satisfied with this fruitful collaboration (Wiechen, Day 3, 20:2). As a result of that fruitful 	17:44 2 4 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 7 8 9 7 1	 Second, we learned that smaller areas have 1 higher yields than larger areas. The statistics relied on regarding underreporting are for smaller fields only. Thus, there is no substance for the allegation that there is any underreporting. And third and finally, we learned that the agronomists never saw the equipment that they assume Laguardia would have used and they never visited the lands in question and, as Mr Rurac honestly admitted, they had no normative basis for their 	771

www.dianaburden.com

2 takes no pleasure in the failure of Mr Grot's investment, but pleasure is not the issue here. The 3 investment, but pleasure is not the issue here. The 4 issue here is whether the State can be blarmed for 5 it, not on supposition, not on speculation, but on 6 hard facts and the evidence on record 7 Members of the Tribunal, the answer is no. 8 Thank you. 9 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. 1 lask my colleagues whether they have any concluding 1 question. Could you provide us with a list of these 16 deficit lensamets? 17 MR KOPECKY: Respectfully, yes, because 18 the leases is four-page, you open the exhibit and 10 divide the number of pages by four. 20 MR KOPECKY: Respectfully, yes, because 18 the leases is four-page, you open the exhibit and 10 divide the number of pages by four. 20 MR KOPECKY: Respectfully, yes, because 18 the leases of the guestion to the Claimants, 21 you, since I posed the question to the Claimants, 22 wordt lis your position on the moral darmages in the <th>Confidential 13 December 2017 Revised Vienna, Austria</th>	Confidential 13 December 2017 Revised Vienna, Austria
24I am looking at the statement of 2524any additional information requested by the 2525Dr Zyblski, Colorado Springs. That is witness24any additional information requested by the 251statement CWS-11. "Mr Grot has described certain 17:511equipment, which obviously has been the statement of 	RevisedVienna, Austria772 :481both parties on what ideally, if anything, they 17:52774 17:522would like to happen next. It may be that we don't3decide it here and now because we will need an opportunity to discuss that.5Is there a need for any further written6submissions, if any, including the question of cost submissions? It would be helpful to hear from both parties on those aspects. I do not know,9Mr Gleason, whether that is you who wanted to speak on behalf of the Claimants?11MR GLEASON: I would like to confer with my colleagues.13THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely. Let's take five minutes so both sides can confer amongst themselves.16(Short break from 5.53 pm to 6.01 pm)17Closing remarks and future timetable a submission on costs, but concerning the timing we would defer to the Tribunal's preference on the a submission on costs, but concerning the timing we would defer to the Tribunal's preference on the anture of when that would be made.
773112222344445455676777189111111112122233444455556778101112141414151516161718191910101111111213141414141516161616171718191919110111111111111112113113114114115115115115115	24 any additional information requested by the
 6 various degree and I have prescribed such medication 7 and his experience in Moldova that likely had a very 8 substantial effect on his quality of life". 9 MR KOPECKY: Mr Fortier, with all respect 10 I would not like to end on this note, so I am going 11 to refer to section 32 of Respondent's Rejoinder. 12 I would not like to discuss Mr Grot's personal 13 feeling as the last thing I do at this hearing 14 MR FORTIER: I understand. 6 or quantum, Claimants are hesitant to go t 7 for costs and efficiency reasons. Our prefix 8 we would defer to the Tribunal as always 9 insue but we are not affirmatively request 10 brief there. 11 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr H 12 MR KOPECKY: As to costs Respondent on 13 preference would be a simple statement on 14 MR FORTIER: I understand. 	 equipment, which obviously has been the subject of 18:01 much discussion today, as well as perhaps moral damages or any other issue that the Tribunal deems necessary.
9MR KOPECKY:Mr Fortier, with all respect9issue but we are not affirmatively reque10I would not like to end on this note, so I am going10brief there.11to refer to section 32 of Respondent's Rejoinder.11THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr H12I would not like to discuss Mr Grot's personal12MR KOPECKY: As to costs Respondent of13feeling as the last thing I do at this hearing13preference would be a simple statement of14MR FORTIER: I understand.14possible not on 1 January please do not	6 or quantum, Claimants are hesitant to go that route7 for costs and efficiency reasons. Our preference
13 feeling as the last thing I do at this hearing13 preference would be a simple statement of14MR FORTIER: I understand.14 possible not on 1 January please do not	 9 issue but we are not affirmatively requesting a 10 brief there. 11 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Kopecky?
16 us all our gratitude for very fine closing 16 clarification whether there should be submi	 preference would be a simple statement of costs, if possible not on 1 January please do not worry, that was a silly attempt at a joke and just a clarification whether there should be submissions on
18 efficient and really very helpful in concentrating18 Tribunal.19 our minds on what you each respectively say, so19 Respondent sees no need for pos20 thank you very much for that. I personally found20 submissions. If so, then very short, just a	 Tribunal. Respondent sees no need for post-hearing submissions. If so, then very short, just above
22 colleagues are nodding their assent. 22 you.	 22 you. 23 THE PRESIDENT: Let me confer with my 24 colleagues.

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confie Rev	dentia rised		nber 201 a, Austr
$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\23\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\22\\23\\24\\25\end{array}$	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, both parties. There is commonality on a statement/submission. For our purposes I think what we just need is a simple statement with a breakdown. We do not need a long pleading on costs. We do not want to put you to that. We would like a detailed breakdown of the costs. MR KOPECKY: You mean including billed hours or just invoices? THE PRESIDENT: Not each hour, but a statement of the costs that have been incurred by each side. We know that you are both making requests for costs and so we have taken that, but I don't think we need further submissions MR KOPECKY: No proof of payment? It comes up at times. THE PRESIDENT: I don't think for this point. Given the nature of this case, the sums being requested, I don't think we would want to put you to additional time and trouble to do that, and I think a simple statement is absolutely fair enough. There is one question in relation to C-95 where there was one little line, the confirmation by the Mayor, if we could just have an agreed text from		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	tightly, but we reserve our position on that at this point. There is the question of the date for the cost statement. Frankly, there is no mad rush for it. We can say the end of January. If you want to do it earlier, that is absolutely fine. Let's say by January 31. Obviously it is filed separately. It does not get passed on to the other side, and we then have them. I think that covers absolutely everything. Those of you who have done ICSID cases before will know that this is the point where the Tribunal wants to satisfy itself that the parties feel they have had a fair hearing and have been treated respectfully and have had adequate time in accordance with the various Procedural Orders to make all of the arguments and submissions they wish to. Claimant? Are you comfortable that you have been treated appropriately and fairly? MR GLEASON: My colleague has made the point that the request for allocation of costs does hang out there, but otherwise he is satisfied, I think we all are satisfied with the conduct of the hearing, if that answers your question THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much.	778
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	 you on a rev C-95? MR KOPECKY: The text has been agreed. I think it is on record. THE PRESIDENT: It was the mayor's signature with the line that says MR KOPECKY: No, sorry. I was referring to C-94. MR GLEASON: I think we can agree. THE PRESIDENT: If you could email that by the end of the week to Ms Nitschke that would be excellent. MR KOPECKY: So will we with C-94. That was the confusion. THE PRESIDENT: We have heard you both. We are certainly not minded to ask you and we are hearing the common position of the parties. There is one possibility which is that we may, following deliberation, make a request to you, and you both have a chance to respond to it, for some further information. We would keep it very narrowly focused, give you an appropriate time, but not huge amounts of time, and it would be very narrowly dovetailed. We may not, but we want to reserve the possibility of coming back to you with some request for further information put very briefly and 	777	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 24 25	Respondent? MR KOPECKY: So is Respondent and would like to extend particular thanks to the Tribunal? THE PRESIDENT: Can I say, speaking personally, I have really appreciated the way, for the entirety of the proceedings, the very collegial, genial, good natured and very professional way of conducting the totality of this case, and that has continued through this hearing. We have also really appreciated your willingness to listen to us for our sometimes not so subtle hints on how we would wish you to proceed in terms of various issues. I would again, I haven't even conferred with my colleagues but if anyone is looking for a self Christmas present, or some equivalent thing, the book you may want to take a look at is a book by I think he is now decreased, a very eminent barrister called Richard Du Cann which is called "The Art of the Advocate". It is just a really useful guide. I don't want to impose a particular cultural approach. Every community and legal culture has its own way of doing these things, and we all come to them with our cultural baggage, but it provides at least one way of thinking about these things. The chapters give you a sense of it:	779

bigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confidential Revised	13 December 20 Vienna, Austr
 Chapter 3: The essentials of advocacy. Chapter Cross-examination: aims, duties and dangers. Chapter 8: The style of cross-examination. But is just a way of comparing notes. You will have your own legal systems your own way of dealing w those things. It also has some terrific anecdote in it about major cockups in advocacy, none of wh have happened here, I should say, we have not go that situation, but it is quite an entertaining read and it is published by Penguin Books. That is all I wish to say. I thank you, our interpreters, I thank my assistant Lea, I that the court reporters who have worked as always heroic conditions. We are deeply grateful. I thank Frauke Nitschke, who is an absolute pleasure to work with. I can tell you th I have worked with many, many international secretariats, they are all terrific but some are more terrific than others, and amongst all of the terrific ones Frauke is as good as it gets in term of an international secretariat and a real credit that community, and we, you may have noticed, hav very good relationship as arbitrators, we have be consensual on everything. We hope that will continue, who knows, but there is every suppositi 	at it e in ith es nich t to d nk s in nat e ns to ve a een	
 that it will. I thank both of them. I am privileged to call Yves and Rolf friends as well a colleagues. It is an absolute pleasure and a privilege to sit with them. I have really appreciated the way you have approached this ca The ball is now in our court. You have given us everything that we need. It is now for to do our work. Thank you very much. Safe trave back to wherever you are going. Not very far in this case; a little bit further in this case. Happy holiday season, Happy New Year, happy everythi That closes the hearing. Thank you very much. (The hearing was closed at 6.12 pm) 	ase. us els n ing.	

ICSID ARB 16 8	w
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

	•			
	581/7 602/9 602/13	612/22 614/11 614/16	551/9 551/23 552/14	708/11 708/22 710/13
MR ASTUNO: [156]	606/24 622/22 623/1	614/24 616/1 616/9	553/20 554/1 554/24	710/19 711/22 712/22
581/16 581/23 585/14	624/2 624/8 632/8	616/12 616/16 616/19	555/15 555/23 557/2	713/8 714/22
585/16 586/3 586/21	672/23 687/19 690/6	616/22 617/22 618/6	559/1 559/5 559/10	MS CRACIUNEANU:
587/12 588/2 589/3	690/15 690/19 691/24	618/17 618/25 619/6	559/13 561/6 561/9	[4] 559/14 559/20
589/8 589/14 590/6	693/16 694/22 695/4	619/9 619/13 619/22	561/13 561/18 562/19	561/23 562/1
590/10 590/21 590/24	695/10 695/22 696/1	620/3 620/17 621/4	562/22 569/4 569/15	MS PERNT: [1] 541/3
591/11 592/9 592/19	747/1 749/6 749/23	621/15 622/17 625/13	569/20 569/25 570/20	PROFESSOR
593/13 593/23 594/14	751/5 751/12 751/17	625/22 625/24 627/11	571/20 572/12 573/5	KNIEPER: [43] 555/24
594/19 595/5 595/11	751/21 772/19 773/13	627/13 627/25 628/8	573/16 574/4 574/14	556/12 562/12 562/20
595/17 596/2 596/12	MR GLEASON: [88]	628/11 628/18 629/4	575/7 575/13 575/24	563/4 564/19 565/5
596/16 596/19 596/21	533/13 533/25 534/14	630/7 631/8 631/19	576/17 577/3 577/9	566/13 567/2 568/1
597/2 597/6 597/21	535/1 535/12 535/15	632/9 637/12 638/17	578/3 578/10 578/20	568/6 568/23 604/11
598/1 598/4 598/10	535/19 536/20 537/8	638/21 639/12 679/19	583/4 583/9 583/12	604/23 605/2 605/5
598/23 599/10 599/15	537/22 539/3 540/12	679/24 680/2 715/10	584/6	605/8 605/16 605/18
599/21 600/2 600/25	541/7 541/10 541/12	718/17 745/17 745/19	MR WELLS: [6]	624/10 624/19 625/7
601/7 601/24 602/5	541/24 542/3 542/7	747/24 751/11 752/7	749/10 750/6 751/9	625/12 635/20 636/15
602/15 603/17 604/5	542/11 542/15 542/20	754/5 755/1 772/16	751/15 751/18 752/1	680/3 680/13 680/18
607/2 608/8 610/15	542/23 543/2 543/14	773/8 775/11 776/7	MR WIECHEN: [143]	683/10 684/11 684/23
618/4 618/14 618/24	543/17 543/25 544/11	776/14 777/1 777/5	585/6 585/20 586/10	685/2 686/13 686/18
619/3 632/16 633/1	544/16 545/3 545/12	777/11 779/1	586/25 587/20 588/8	687/18 699/24 708/7
633/8 633/16 633/22	545/17 546/5 546/20	MR PEER: [90] 639/7	589/7 589/10 589/21	708/14 708/25 710/14
634/2 634/5 634/9	546/24 547/2 547/5	639/13 640/12 660/4	590/9 590/14 590/23	711/1 718/12 772/12
634/2 634/5 634/9	547/15 548/8 548/14	660/10 660/18 661/4	591/3 591/22 592/12	THE INTERPRETER:
635/11 635/15 635/18	548/21 549/2 549/9	661/10 661/19 661/23	592/24 593/15 594/2	[3] 562/4 573/12
659/23 660/8 660/12	549/15 550/3 550/5	662/2 662/12 662/20	594/18 594/23 595/14	583/24
660/17 660/23 661/8	550/8 550/13 550/16	663/3 663/11 663/15	595/22 596/8 596/14	THE PRESIDENT:
661/14 661/20 661/24	551/1 551/7 551/10	663/19 663/25 664/4	596/18 596/20 596/24	[158] 533/2 533/16
662/4 662/15 662/22	551/15 552/2 552/8	664/8 664/21 665/3	597/4 597/9 597/23	534/12 534/16 534/19
663/8 663/12 663/16	552/15 556/16 556/25	665/11 665/21 666/3	598/3 598/8 598/15	534/22 535/8 535/13
663/21 664/2 664/6	577/16 577/20 582/17	666/11 666/22 667/2	599/1 599/13 599/20	535/16 536/5 536/10
664/16 664/25 665/5	582/20 583/5 583/10	667/16 667/22 667/25	600/1 600/6 601/3	536/15 537/3 537/12
665/14 665/25 666/7	584/2 584/14 611/5	668/4 668/9 668/15	601/13 602/3 602/8	537/19 538/3 538/6
666/18 666/24 667/11	614/6 614/13 619/5	668/21 669/3 669/9	602/12 602/20 603/24	539/4 539/17 540/2
667/19 667/23 668/3	637/25 720/9 744/11	669/15 669/19 670/5	604/21 605/1 605/3	540/8 540/20 540/24
668/6 668/10 668/17	744/25 745/2 745/8	670/22 671/4 671/20	605/6 605/9 605/17	541/5 542/13 551/14
668/23 669/6 669/11	745/14 745/24 746/8	672/1 672/5 672/14	606/20 606/23 607/22	552/17 556/18 568/24
669/17 669/25 670/6	746/20 747/3 747/22	672/19 673/4 673/9	609/3 609/14 609/17	569/13 569/17 569/22
670/11 671/1 671/15	748/20 754/18 754/24	673/13 673/21 673/25	610/2 610/8 611/3	570/1 570/23 571/6
671/23 672/4 672/10	774/10 774/18 777/7	674/3 674/10 674/15	611/23 612/15 613/4	571/24 572/21 573/14
672/16 672/21 672/24	778/19	674/21 675/4 675/9	613/19 614/2 614/23	573/23 574/5 574/20
673/7 673/12 673/16	MR GUMOVSCHI:	675/16 675/23 676/2	615/9 615/22 615/25	575/11 575/20 576/2
673/22 674/1 674/7	[32] 541/23 543/16	676/10 676/19 677/5	616/8 616/11 616/14	576/25 577/4 577/14
674/12 674/17 674/24	543/24 544/10 544/15	677/9 677/25 678/8	616/17 616/20 617/12	577/18 577/22 578/18
675/7 675/14 675/18	545/2 545/11 545/16	678/12 678/20 679/2	619/8 619/10 619/18	578/21 579/17 579/21
675/25 676/5 676/15	546/4 548/19 550/4	679/21 680/1 680/7	619/23 620/12 621/1	580/10 580/20 581/15
677/2 677/6 677/21	552/4 553/3 553/17	686/14 686/21 690/12	621/8 622/2 622/20	581/17 582/5 584/15
678/4 678/10 678/16	554/5 557/15 558/13	690/17 691/23 691/25	622/25 623/5 624/5	584/25 585/9 595/8
678/23 679/6 712/6	559/24 561/7 562/8	694/16 694/23 695/8	624/18 624/22 625/9	604/9 606/8 607/6
712/10 713/2 713/21	563/17 565/4 565/20	699/4 701/6 701/16	625/20 625/23 626/10	608/14 609/12 609/15
712/10 715/2 713/21	566/19 567/5 568/5	707/4 707/19 708/5	627/12 627/22 628/4	609/21 610/19 610/23
718/6 718/15 719/10	568/10 578/22 580/3	713/17 713/22	628/10 628/14 628/20	611/8 613/14 613/24
718/6 718/15 719/10	580/16 581/1 584/7	MR RURAC: [76]	629/17 630/14 631/15	614/4 614/15 615/16
743/17 745/16 748/4	MR KOPECKY: [92]	534/18 541/11 541/22	631/21 632/7 633/13	615/23 618/21 632/6
MR FORTIER: [57]	534/21 536/6 536/12	542/2 542/6 542/10	633/21 633/24 634/4	632/11 632/22 633/7
552/20 553/15 553/19	537/16 539/5 539/25	542/18 542/22 542/25	634/8 634/13 634/19	637/8 637/13 638/2
553/24 554/2 554/20	540/5 540/23 571/2	543/13 543/23 544/9	634/24 635/10 635/14	638/19 638/22 639/2
555/12 555/19 556/9	579/2 579/19 581/11	544/14 545/1 545/10	635/17 636/1 636/22	639/8 640/10 659/2
556/12 555/19 556/9	604/10 605/20 606/9	545/15 546/3 546/14	682/22 683/12 684/20	659/21 660/15 670/9
	606/22 607/1 607/5	546/21 547/1 547/4	685/1 685/15 690/11	679/15 680/14 690/5
558/20 559/4 559/8 559/11 559/18 559/22	607/7 608/2 608/12	547/7 547/18 548/13	693/18 695/19 695/23	696/23 697/9 697/19
561/4 561/8 561/12	608/22 610/3 610/11	549/1 549/8 549/14	697/6 697/10 698/7	698/12 699/3 699/10
561/16 561/22 561/24	610/17 610/21 610/25	549/20 550/7 550/10	698/22 702/5 702/23	699/25 701/12 702/2
562/6 577/25 578/7	611/7 611/10 612/7	550/15 550/20 551/4	703/9 703/16 705/14	702/7 703/3 703/11
302/0 311/23 310/1				
	I	www.dianaburden.com	1	1

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-78
	612/15	583/13 584/9 584/13	250 acres [1] 739/3	351:15 [1] 761/24
THE PRESIDENT:	1200 [1] 554/12	2007-2010 [2] 583/7	256:7 [1] 768/15	353:23-356:14 [1]
[48] 703/24 706/2	13 [5] 528/21 533/1	584/5	257:24 [1] 767/25	761/12
707/8 707/23 711/6	590/14 745/13 745/16	2008 [1] 709/14	258:17 [1] 768/3	356:14 [1] 761/12
711/25 712/8 715/7	13 November [2] 659/10 659/11		26 [1] 558/7	356:19 [1] 761/13 36 kilograms [1]
715/11 718/2 718/8	13 November 2017 [1]	2009-2012 [1] 573/2 2010 [30] 583/7 583/8	260:13 [1] 768/7 260:17 [1] 768/9	557/23
718/16 719/19 719/23	659/8	584/5 586/23 587/8	27 [6] 556/3 556/4	37 per cent [1] 597/18
720/6 738/7 743/4	14 [4] 569/1 572/16	587/12 588/18 589/9	556/7 556/20 556/24	378:9 [1] 764/14
743/8 744/7 744/23	760/23 762/13	598/8 615/20 631/14	557/2	388:16-17 [1] 765/12
745/1 745/7 745/10	140 [3] 645/11 645/13	647/13 663/1 663/16	274:21 [1] 757/14	389,528 [1] 607/13
745/18 745/21 746/6 746/14 747/10 748/2	667/16	663/17 663/21 665/1	275:1 [1] 757/14	393:24 [1] 763/15
748/16 752/2 753/25	142 [1] 535/24	665/8 666/21 668/5	277:1,19 [1] 756/20	394:25-395:12 [1]
754/7 754/21 772/8	143 [1] 535/25	669/14 686/9 693/22	278:10 [1] 756/20	764/3
773/14 774/12 774/17	144 [4] 535/25 536/8	714/21 729/21 730/20	279:1 [1] 756/20	395:12 [1] 764/3
775/10 775/22 775/25	536/19 537/21	730/20 738/19 738/21	279:10 [1] 756/24	4
776/9 776/16 777/3	145 [1] 535/25	771/19	28 November 2012 [3]	
777/8 777/13 778/24	15 [5] 539/13 540/6	2010-2011 [1] 734/16	611/22 611/25 745/18	4 tons [1] 645/14
779/3	584/21 590/24 762/14	2010/2011 [1] 743/16	2800 [2] 574/5 714/13	4-year [1] 645/21 4.24 pm [1] 720/6
0	15 per cent [4] 550/18 550/20 551/4 551/5	566/12 567/7 567/14	280:14 [1] 758/25	4.30 pm [1] 719/22
	150 [1] 683/9	579/23 583/2 589/12	281:15 [1] 759/3 281:5 [1] 759/8	4.5 [2] 583/19 583/22
0.53 [1] 568/14	16 [5] 558/23 606/1	631/15 646/3 650/25	281:8 [1] 758/21	40 [2] 626/8 626/8
033 [1] 767/15	632/4 694/8 762/14	663/14 663/19 663/20	2822 [1] 529/10	40 per cent [1] 739/5
034 [1] 767/15	16 January [1] 607/2	664/11 664/12 664/15	2830 [7] 570/12 572/1	40-50 kg [1] 560/11
09 [1] 607/12	16 January 2017 [1]	668/6 668/7 694/16	574/4 574/9 699/23	402,000 [1] 616/7
1	607/1	734/15 734/16 742/2	700/22 739/3	404:7 [1] 760/10
1 billion [1] 565/24	160 [1] 558/2	743/16 756/15 757/21	283:24 [1] 758/23	407:15 [1] 755/23
1 January [1] 775/14	1615 [1] 530/7	771/19	284:1 [1] 759/4	408:12 [1] 760/12
1 per cent [2] 647/23	17 [2] 606/2 765/12	2011-2014 [1] 584/10	285:1 [1] 758/19	408:19 [1] 755/10
655/23	18 [9] 607/14 608/20	2012 [18] 531/13	29 [1] 769/22	410:16 [1] 753/22
1,250,000,000 [1]	613/4 613/16 626/1	565/10 565/18 565/19	3	410:23 [1] 753/25
566/1	627/19 764/11 764/17 767/11	565/22 565/25 567/7	3.46 pm [1] 716/2	42 [1] 765/15 43 [2] 575/3 576/4
1-16 [1] 606/1	19 [3] 531/7 626/1	573/2 584/10 584/12 611/22 611/25 663/14	3.52 pm [1] 720/6	433:9 [1] 753/20
1-2 per cent [1]	762/16	736/8 737/2 742/3	30 [5] 546/9 546/14	435:16-18 [1] 767/11
692/19	19 kilograms [1]	745/18 768/4	571/19 637/13 704/1	437:24-441:4 [1]
1-A [1] 766/11	557/24	2013 [4] 612/15 613/1	30 per cent [1] 588/20	763/5
1.15 [1] 568/15 1.37 pm [1] 659/21	1991 [2] 557/20 560/8	663/14 742/3	300 [3] 572/2 756/2	439:6-440:16 [1]
1.4 [1] 667/9		2014 [6] 567/7 567/14	760/15	762/24
1.4 million [1] 649/8	2	584/10 635/23 663/14	3000 [2] 570/17	440:16 [1] 762/24
1.4 tons [1] 645/14	2 million [1] 649/20	742/3	571/20	441:19-443:4 [1]
1.9 million [1] 649/5	2-3 [1] 770/23	2015 [1] 736/10	31 [7] 548/16 548/23	765/3
10 [4] 604/17 607/12	2.08 [1] 568/16	2016 [1] 613/2	629/6 629/16 763/7	441:4 [1] 763/5
764/4 771/15	2.16 pm [1] 659/21	2017 [8] 528/21 533/1	770/23 778/7	443:14 [1] 767/14
10 December [1]	2.2 [1] 568/16	592/16 607/1 613/2	31 per cent [1] 693/22	
659/10	2.7 million [1] 694/16 2.75 million [1]	633/9 649/25 659/8	313.84 [1] 573/18 31:1 [1] 769/7	446:18-448:20 [1] 766/20
10 March [1] 589/13	590/21	204 [1] 607/13 20:2 [1] 769/10	32 [2] 629/6 773/11	448:17-18 [2] 764/11
10 per cent [1] 646/14	2.85 [2] 583/19 583/23	21 [3] 574/7 574/8	327:2-3 [1] 761/18	764/17
100 [4] 549/23 559/20	2.87 [1] 583/18	598/10	327:4 [1] 761/21	448:20 [1] 766/20
559/24 561/1	20 [3] 597/1 597/11	21210 [1] 529/15	328:8 [1] 762/5	45 [1] 659/5
100 kilometres [2] 710/14 711/20	619/20	213:14 [1] 753/23	33 [1] 766/1	45 kilograms [1]
1010 [1] 531/7	20 per cent [9] 546/11	22,000 [1] 626/5	332:11 [1] 755/20	558/1
104 [1] 709/11	547/13 547/17 548/10	23 [1] 600/12	332:13 [1] 763/18	45 per cent [3] 647/1
105 [1] 766/7	548/11 550/1 550/7	23 per cent [1] 647/21	332:8 [1] 755/16	647/16 647/24
10:21 [1] 770/7	551/3 644/3	24 [1] 602/13	334:4 [1] 763/21	451,000 [1] 616/7
11 [6] 581/14 584/22	20-30 [1] 571/19	247:13 [1] 757/7	337:6 [1] 761/19	451,711 [1] 607/12
607/12 612/11 746/20	200 tons [5] 645/13	25 [4] 555/5 570/19	34 [1] 633/9	452:20 [1] 767/3
773/1	666/20 667/13 667/15	570/22 584/22	349:22 [1] 762/1	46 [4] 544/19 544/22
11.10 [1] 584/24	668/25		349:7 [1] 762/2	545/14 545/25
11.28 [1] 584/24	2006-2010 [1] 583/8	631/13	35 per cent [1] 652/9	46,032 [1] 607/13
12 [2] 607/12 629/5	2007 [7] 565/21 565/23 569/3 571/18	25.9 per cent [1]	35-45 per cent [1] 692/21	47 [4] 544/19 545/4 545/14 545/25
12 July 2013 [1]	000120 00010 07 1/ 10	629/9	032/21	040/20
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
4	900,000 [1] 699/22	729/23 731/7 732/2	ACHAIBOU [1] 531/5	769/15 769/25
	94 [7] 535/5 535/10	732/11 735/10 742/10		adapt [1] 640/2
48 [1] 763/7 492:18 [2] 769/14	535/11 759/9 759/25	744/19 746/3 746/4	achieve [4] 533/20	add [8] 557/17 557/20
770/3	777/7 777/12	746/7 750/3 750/14	533/22 617/19 673/20	558/2 561/24 626/4
493:1 [1] 769/14	95 [3] 757/22 776/23	751/9 757/13 762/10	achieved [6] 547/24	735/24 741/13 748/21
498:25 [1] 769/20	777/1	763/17 779/24 780/7	609/10 625/6 741/24	added [5] 552/8
499:16 [1] 769/20	•	above [5] 585/13	760/17 770/20	557/24 597/6 598/19
499:6 [1] 769/21	<u>A</u>	588/20 728/15 738/21	acknowledge [2]	658/7
49:13 [1] 761/1	a big [1] 557/5	775/20	689/23 727/21	adding [1] 705/18
49:9 [1] 761/2	a huge [1] 594/19	absent [1] 706/14	acknowledged [5]	addition [3] 548/4
4R4 [1] 529/11	a result [4] 769/11	absolute [3] 705/1	600/8 620/13 723/14	730/11 760/25
	769/17 769/24 770/8	780/16 781/3	762/25 764/15	additional [19] 535/12
5	a translation [1]	absolutely [11]	acknowledging [1]	535/13 535/15 537/3
5 January 2017 [1]	549/10	555/24 607/7 699/6	743/19	537/10 539/12 605/11
592/16	a.cusnir [1] 531/14	712/9 722/25 748/6	acquired [3] 615/21	627/10 630/2 644/20
5 tons [1] 560/9	a.guzun [1] 531/14	771/16 774/13 776/21	688/3 723/22	651/21 656/3 656/6
5-year [7] 643/18	abandoned [1] 768/11	778/6 778/10	acquisition [2] 573/1	656/10 657/12 726/24
644/1 644/9 645/19	ability [5] 668/16	academy [1] 564/13	609/24	774/24 775/5 776/20
667/6 667/10 671/12	670/20 700/22 726/6 734/25	accept [5] 636/20	acres [1] 739/3	additionally [1]
5.53 [1] 774/16		687/23 689/21 696/8	act [16] 705/1 722/20	750/17
50 [1] 549/23	able [23] 539/24	704/13	724/6 726/15 730/2	address [10] 537/15
50 per cent [2] 588/16	540/23 570/4 575/7 580/25 586/8 606/18	acceptable [2] 540/8	730/12 731/11 731/11	539/13 539/24 540/23
652/11		618/20	732/15 732/18 732/23	591/22 605/22 646/23
507:7 [1] 770/6	611/12 641/4 641/6	accepted [2] 702/6	735/14 737/7 752/18	763/24 765/22 767/7
51 [2] 531/12 616/25	645/10 645/12 648/18 652/1 658/11 673/14	710/2	761/9 764/13	addressed [7] 538/11 606/16 608/20 726/20
52 [1] 597/18	674/25 693/23 700/9	accepting [1] 680/12 access [2] 641/6	acted [5] 553/4 553/6 553/21 735/19 771/21	757/23 757/24 764/6
528 [1] 528/1	702/2 707/2 734/11	727/2	acting [5] 553/16	addressing [2] 612/24
53 [1] 628/2	734/21	accommodate [1]	553/18 665/7 729/17	612/24
59 [1] 618/1	abound [1] 724/9	640/2	762/4	adequate [3] 729/8
5LN [1] 529/6	about [118] 534/2	accordance [4] 585/9	action [2] 714/12	747/7 778/15
6	534/5 534/7 540/4	705/2 745/13 778/16	714/22	adjournment [1]
6 per cent [1] 552/1	545/19 545/21 546/6	accorded [1] 697/5	actions [2] 750/15	659/21
6,000 [1] 561/20	552/10 556/1 559/18	according [8] 557/4	773/3	adjudicate [1] 727/14
6.01 [1] 774/16	561/17 562/9 562/12	569/10 613/2 631/19	active [1] 764/13	adjudicated [1]
6.12 pm [1] 781/14	562/14 563/12 563/15	646/15 763/14 764/9	activities [2] 681/20	734/19
60 [1] 716/5	565/14 566/10 566/16	765/10	734/22	adjudicators [1]
604 [1] 702/11	570/10 572/4 575/16	accordingly [1]	activity [8] 574/23	688/16
61 [2] 627/16 627/19	576/16 580/19 581/9	628/25	665/13 681/10 681/22	adjust [5] 651/25
616 [1] 530/7	581/22 582/21 587/16	account [15] 590/22	685/14 685/14 700/10	673/11 673/13 673/14
62 [1] 626/1	591/6 593/24 603/4 604/16 608/22 614/7	614/21 615/1 615/7	732/22	692/6
66 [1] 558/24	614/12 614/13 615/25	628/13 630/22 655/18	actors [3] 721/10 727/18 727/20	adjusted [3] 547/12 694/21 694/25
7	630/17 633/3 635/1	655/25 656/7 706/10 742/7 742/13 742/22	acts [8] 709/5 721/9	adjustment [5] 552/1
	639/16 642/15 643/11	742/17 742/13 742/22	721/11 722/5 722/7	598/21 599/19 600/24
75 [1] 558/24	646/4 646/14 647/9	accountant [2] 617/18		641/19
781 [1] 528/1 798,000 [1] 586/10	647/12 647/16 649/4	696/6	actual [10] 552/14	administration [2]
756,000 [1] 386/10	649/5 652/19 654/24	accountants [3]	607/10 616/16 640/18	683/16 761/19
	658/2 666/8 666/10	588/14 634/4 696/13	660/7 666/3 666/10	administrative [6]
8	671/10 672/5 672/11	accounted [1] 641/25	679/23 740/9 742/2	555/7 733/9 733/18
80 [2] 698/11 698/14	673/12 673/15 676/4	accounting [13] 587/4		734/6 735/4 765/21
80 per cent [2] 557/10	680/23 683/6 688/22	588/11 609/6 609/10	559/15 563/6 576/8	Administrative Court
560/17	698/14 699/19 699/22	609/12 609/21 610/11	576/14 579/25 595/15	[3] 734/6 735/4 765/21
800,000 [2] 640/23	700/5 701/13 702/4	635/7 679/8 679/14	599/7 608/21 614/10	administrator [3]
693/8	703/7 703/21 704/1	700/6 706/21 710/24	620/15 632/19 640/17	607/19 617/19 634/2
80202 [1] 530/8	709/20 709/23 710/24 712/14 715/17 716/24	accounts [2] 609/20	641/15 643/16 645/23	admiration [2] 680/22
83 per cent [1] 660/14	712/14 715/17 716/24 717/10 720/20 720/23	720/25	648/11 648/22 649/2 663/5 663/7 665/19	681/1 admit [1] 538/21
840,000 [4] 572/4	721/3 721/14 721/21	accuracy [1] 603/24 accurate [5] 544/24	671/11 671/14 683/14	admit [1] 538/21 admitted [6] 728/14
572/5 572/7 572/12	722/18 722/21 724/3	549/1 583/4 744/24	702/19 704/8 705/22	728/16 740/18 764/24
887,000 [3] 573/3 626/7 661/1	726/9 726/25 727/19	745/13	705/23 717/6 719/5	770/3 771/10
	727/20 727/23 728/10	accurately [1] 747/14	720/23 722/6 724/14	adopt [1] 709/25
9	728/19 728/22 728/24	accusation [1] 757/11		advanced [2] 560/25
9.32 [1] 533/1	729/3 729/11 729/11	accused [1] 649/10	733/10 737/2 737/25	755/25
L		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 528-781
Α	agents [4] 732/17	650/16 651/21 652/3	585/13 586/11 586/13	627/8 631/11 642/14
advantage [1] 555/16	760/21 760/24 761/7	654/11 656/8 658/12	590/12 594/2 596/6	647/7 647/9 654/21
advice [2] 721/15	aggressive [1] 550/22	665/11 665/14 665/20	596/17 604/2 605/4	656/19 676/7 686/4
759/14	aggrieved [1] 763/2	667/11 670/24 671/7	609/2 610/11 611/12	693/12 701/9 709/13
advised [2] 564/21	ago [10] 567/21	671/20 672/1 672/7	613/9 614/6 617/7	727/25 734/10 738/13
768/1	580/15 606/14 616/4	673/18 674/16 674/20	618/10 618/15 632/5	768/4
advisement [1]	616/15 629/13 656/25	675/7 678/8 684/2	637/20 639/18 642/25	also [79] 530/11
579/19	688/2 688/13 748/2	684/3 684/6 685/5	644/21 664/5 664/12	544/18 550/17 560/21
adviser [1] 564/21	agree [54] 535/7	686/5 693/25 694/19	664/17 670/1 676/3	567/12 570/13 570/21
advisers [2] 543/22	536/7 543/13 543/15	695/7 696/3 697/17	677/11 680/25 682/4	581/24 583/14 588/19
771/19	543/23 544/9 544/12	699/9 713/10 713/12	682/17 683/7 683/22	590/2 595/16 597/11
advocacies [1] 716/19	545/1 545/10 548/17	713/14 721/1 726/11	684/3 684/17 685/3	603/1 603/9 609/5
advocacy [2] 780/1	548/18 548/20 550/4	739/16 757/7 762/22	688/8 688/20 689/16	610/4 612/1 617/18
780/7	550/5 552/3 552/5	764/5 764/21 769/3	689/18 694/1 694/8	618/12 619/24 620/14
Advocate [1] 779/19	557/14 557/16 579/8	769/19 770/1 770/11	694/13 695/25 698/12	622/10 623/12 624/16
affairs [1] 668/12	620/5 622/18 622/21	770/13 770/15	699/14 700/10 700/25	625/4 628/2 630/22
affect [3] 731/9	647/3 652/20 660/9	agriculture [18] 536/1	702/14 704/13 705/18	634/21 635/3 635/16
761/20 761/22	660/10 662/12 663/23	538/2 554/19 565/24	707/18 707/18 707/18	636/3 637/2 640/6
affected [4] 566/3	664/17 668/11 668/18	565/25 569/3 588/22	709/23 714/19 715/6	643/24 646/25 648/15
566/11 726/2 750/17	673/1 673/17 674/9	589/1 592/25 593/7	715/14 717/4 718/24	650/13 651/20 659/9
affects [2] 594/21	675/16 676/19 681/13	634/15 672/19 672/21	720/24 721/11 726/13	664/3 668/11 669/1
673/3	682/12 683/21 685/15 687/7 689/12 700/2	672/23 686/8 712/17 721/3 756/23	732/9 732/12 736/24	669/24 682/14 684/17
affirmatively [1] 775/9			738/16 738/21 739/12	685/23 686/2 695/9
aforementioned [1]	703/18 708/9 708/13 714/6 730/3 739/12	agrobusiness [21] 555/8 557/10 561/22	744/5 745/25 750/2 753/6 754/2 760/2	701/23 708/18 709/7 717/12 720/15 723/9
602/3	752/20753/3760/4	611/3 611/19 612/11	763/24 770/2 770/19	723/11 723/20 724/6
afraid [1] 601/12	762/17 777/8	612/14 661/18 661/23	773/9 773/16 778/17	724/23 726/22 727/5
after [23] 539/9 553/3	agreed [15] 539/11	662/7 662/10 662/17	778/23 779/23 780/11	727/8 727/14 728/6
554/7 562/13 562/17	539/23 540/1 540/3	662/20 744/21 745/12	780/18 780/19	728/19 728/24 732/2
571/5 579/14 591/14	545/13 606/3 686/17	745/21 745/24 746/3	allegation [2] 707/24	732/6 733/11 740/8
592/2 605/12 636/9	686/20 686/23 687/20	746/17 746/18 746/20	771/5	745/13 746/21 748/11
637/8 639/22 650/25	719/18 733/17 761/9	agrochemicals [1]	alleged [21] 607/9	750/11 755/17 769/8
663/25 664/1 664/15	776/25 777/2	559/8	611/5 612/5 627/24	770/3 779/9 780/6
664/18 664/25 689/17	agreeing [1] 674/14	agronomist [4] 554/8	640/18 640/21 640/22	alternative [11]
735/23 738/16 765/4	agreement [8] 535/7	554/10 564/13 576/1	640/24 646/2 649/17	591/11 622/14 693/3
afternoon [1] 639/21 afterwards [2] 554/8	535/10 540/10 663/2	agronomists [9]	650/1 650/22 651/8	700/13 701/3 703/5
555/3	663/3 729/25 732/22	552/24 554/1 559/17	655/16 657/4 664/1	707/11 707/17 708/17
again [60] 541/13	764/4	564/15 576/23 769/6	664/10 664/15 666/20	710/16 749/21
544/19 566/1 583/16	agreements [10]	770/1 770/21 771/7	684/11 766/3	Alternatively [2]
584/13 605/12 605/13	551/22 552/10 592/19	agronomists' [1]	allegedly [3] 614/22	655/11 747/19
605/15 612/17 615/10	612/7 636/5 636/6	769/20	627/17 731/14	alternatives [3]
619/4 621/13 632/18	636/8 636/21 683/19	agronomy [4] 559/17		708/16 710/18 711/3
633/24 634/11 634/12	732/17	563/2 563/18 695/7	allocated [1] 572/8	although [11] 537/13
634/18 634/21 635/13	Agribusiness [1]	ahead [2] 639/13	allocation [2] 587/14	545/8 551/18 592/15
636/4 640/7 651/11	610/15	740/1	778/21	601/16 649/25 702/13
653/18 654/15 655/20	agricultural [101] 530/17 530/18 536/23	aims [1] 780/2 albeit [3] 738/25	allow [9] 605/24 625/17 634/11 641/6	710/1 724/18 744/1 768/25
661/11 662/13 664/5	536/25 537/6 537/12	740/24 742/6	701/17 701/24 702/16	always [10] 555/5
664/22 665/18 666/12	552/23 552/25 554/9	Alexandru [1] 531/12	710/11 737/18	560/8 563/15 617/20
668/22 669/4 672/2	561/11 567/1 575/5	Alianta [18] 561/6	allowance [1] 606/7	689/12 696/15 711/17
688/20 689/4 693/14	575/9 576/5 588/23	561/12 645/10 668/14	allowed [5] 677/21	713/13 775/8 780/13
695/5 695/25 702/2	588/25 589/5 592/15	723/22 724/17 725/21	699/23 702/4 716/4	am [124] 533/1 533/15
710/21 710/25 715/3	592/21 593/22 594/25	726/24 727/1 727/9	738/4	540/4 545/18 545/20
720/12 720/18 725/20	595/4 604/1 604/4	728/25 757/3 757/9	almost [5] 544/17	554/6 554/17 555/8
728/17 732/23 734/4	612/6 616/24 617/5	759/13 762/7 766/1	551/12 694/13 724/1	555/9 555/11 555/25
736/5 736/24 738/2	617/8 617/10 617/14	766/3 766/13	737/12	560/1 563/6 570/6
739/9 741/25 743/23 744/5 746/24 747/20	617/17 617/24 617/25	alignment [1] 630/5	alone [2] 752/22	570/7 570/16 571/10
749/1 779/13	618/3 618/9 619/12	all [105] 534/11	766/11	571/12 571/13 574/10
again to [1] 653/18	619/17 619/22 620/2	544/12 553/23 554/13	along [3] 608/11	575/2 576/9 577/2
against [7] 538/12	620/15 620/20 623/11	556/9 557/3 560/4	730/23 757/10	577/8 581/23 582/14
700/25 725/19 737/8	626/18 642/12 643/12	560/19 563/20 569/8	alongside [3] 589/5	584/24 584/24 601/12
753/5 762/7 767/19	643/15 643/25 644/10	569/9 576/10 577/12	603/20 726/25	604/2 604/3 604/4
agency [1] 581/6	644/13 645/7 645/15	578/11 578/12 578/13	already [20] 540/2	607/24 612/23 612/24
agent [1] 729/24	649/17 650/6 650/12	578/14 579/2 582/3	616/25 625/6 626/16	614/6 614/12 614/13
		www.dianaburdon.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
Α	and March 2011 [1]	731/22 731/25 733/4	581/21 611/12 611/19	573/9 574/9 594/7
am [86] 615/4	646/3	733/5 733/15 735/7	638/2 660/21 688/14	594/8
615/11 615/13 618/5	ANDREI [3] 530/18 532/2 533/2	740/20 741/14 741/23	712/12 720/17	areas [16] 567/23
620/4 621/8 623/21	ANDREI GUMOVSCHI	743/11 743/14 743/22 744/5 747/14 748/12	appreciated [4] 715/19 779/5 779/10	567/24 569/9 570/13 571/20 571/22 571/22
629/9 630/8 632/3		751/14 751/14 754/11	781/5	571/24 572/18 574/7
637/5 638/12 639/4	[2] 532/2 533/2 ANDREW [1] 530/4	756/8 757/17 757/20	appreciates [1]	574/24 579/24 604/3
640/1 641/7 641/8	ANDRIAN [1] 531/11	760/7 760/10 762/2	718/25	701/4 771/1 771/2
650/9 653/10 653/12	anecdotes [1] 780/6	764/15 771/5 772/10	appreciation [3]	argued [1] 751/13
653/17 659/5 662/4	animals [1] 560/22	774/5 774/6 774/24	598/18 682/12 715/13	argument [4] 731/18
662/16 668/10 669/24	ANISSA [1] 531/5	775/3	appreciations [1]	734/14 737/24 748/12
672/2 672/5 672/9	ANN [1] 529/22	anybody [2] 638/25	681/12	arguments [10] 539/1
672/18 672/20 673/12	ANNA [1] 531/10	726/1	approach [25] 582/25	547/11 638/11 716/1
674/25 678/13 680/6	annual [3] 537/6	anyone [2] 659/14	590/17 597/4 597/12	737/17 737/22 749/19
680/22 680/25 681/1	568/1 664/5	779/14	607/3 617/3 623/21	749/21 773/17 778/17
681/3 684/3 688/9	annul [1] 766/24	anything [15] 565/16	643/3 649/11 649/12	arises [1] 734/20
688/14 688/17 688/20 688/21 689/14 691/21	annulled [3] 765/19	608/11 608/21 616/17	651/2 651/3 652/20	arm's [1] 603/5
692/10 693/14 694/12	766/8 767/16	622/1 622/6 698/13	656/14 680/24 681/23	around [5] 639/1
696/9 698/1 698/8	annulment [1] 765/25	703/20 703/21 716/16	682/5 703/7 705/12	645/14 693/8 700/14
698/20 700/4 700/15	annum [1] 572/12	723/3 751/9 757/10	706/22 709/25 719/14	731/15
702/9 702/10 706/11	another [14] 593/3	760/9 774/1	741/5 768/24 779/21	arrangements [1]
706/14 706/19 706/22	610/14 620/2 622/20	anyway [1] 698/25	approached [2]	665/9
707/3 707/9 707/13	662/1 662/10 671/20	anywhere [1] 654/15	759/23 781/5	arrive [6] 550/6
707/16 710/11 710/12	711/8 719/1 719/2	apart [2] 706/20	approaches [2]	552/12 559/24 586/9
713/23 715/4 718/10	724/23 731/6 740/23	770/16	547/21 702/20	598/18 630/3
722/11 724/11 729/5	767/23	apologies [1] 551/19	appropriate [16]	arrived [5] 534/4
736/23 739/24 744/19	answer [15] 547/6	apologise [7] 604/6	591/2 634/18 635/14	558/25 654/22 670/24
746/7 746/13 746/15	561/25 562/2 584/4	608/23 639/18 640/8	642/5 648/10 648/16	760/3
747/5 749/24 750/1	606/16 622/23 624/10	711/23 753/25 755/3	651/7 651/11 651/23	art [2] 632/7 779/19
756/21 772/24 773/10	660/10 664/9 684/13 691/4 719/5 743/19	apologising [1] 639/15	656/13 657/9 658/18 703/1 719/6 727/7	article [2] 688/11 764/4
781/1	744/10 772/7	apparent [2] 556/22	777/21	articles [1] 709/4
amended [2] 647/4	answers [5] 562/14	766/22	appropriately [1]	articulated [1] 688/13
761/4	581/23 747/7 747/16	Apparently [1] 594/24		as [296]
America [1] 530/8	778/24	appeal [2] 733/23	approval [1] 606/5	ascertain [3] 570/5
American [3] 563/25	ante [9] 589/6 592/5	734/1	approximately [7]	580/25 614/6
720/16 753/5	597/8 597/12 612/3	appealed [2] 733/25	572/5 572/16 580/18	ask [28] 546/1 548/17
among [2] 767/9 770/9	649/10 649/12 651/2	734/8	586/9 589/10 660/14	557/1 571/10 573/4
amongst [3] 553/12	680/23	appear [3] 641/2	694/15	582/18 584/3 593/24
774/14 780/19	anxiety [3] 750/24	643/13 733/9	approximation [5]	601/8 611/6 611/20
amount [11] 599/4	751/3 773/5	appeared [2] 643/6	661/15 661/22 662/2	614/9 624/11 659/24
599/8 626/14 634/6	any [99] 539/2 539/10	731/4	662/19 674/6	674/19 674/23 679/12
648/24 699/21 703/18	540/25 543/11 543/21	appearing [2] 585/20	April [1] 734/15	680/6 680/15 682/21
717/3 720/3 743/24	545/6 555/3 555/4	758/19	arable [4] 556/7 560/9	685/8 708/8 714/11
748/24	568/8 572/20 573/4	appears [3] 636/13	560/11 569/9	738/18 743/9 748/8
amounts [4] 586/24	575/23 576/20 579/13	717/25 752/16	ARB [1] 528/5	772/10 777/15
702/18 704/5 777/22	579/25 582/16 590/1	appendices [1] 656/4	ARB/16/8 [1] 528/5	asked [16] 551/3
analyse [1] 588/17	591/19 594/12 598/5	appendix [3] 633/6	Arbitral [8] 528/14	562/25 578/13 583/1
analysed [2] 609/6	599/19 599/25 602/3 610/5 610/5 615/8	679/21 679/22	532/4 532/10 532/16	583/4 585/23 615/23
697/14	615/21 620/24 621/6	applicable [2] 764/10 770/22	543/20 552/20 635/20 680/18	636/20 640/13 658/15 691/2 731/19 744/9
Analysing [1] 594/3	621/7 621/8 621/19	application [1] 656/11		757/12 757/13 758/20
analysis [36] 546/3	622/1 623/2 623/17	applied [9] 588/5	543/20	asking [12] 570/25
587/21 588/4 588/7	635/8 644/15 647/8	593/16 594/9 630/6	arbitration [5] 538/22	575/2 579/13 614/12
589/3 592/5 592/6	652/13 652/16 653/4	650/17 650/18 650/20	545/8 724/24 749/12	614/13 621/8 672/5
593/17 597/2 599/12	656/2 657/3 657/21	650/24 651/10	768/2	674/18 691/21 706/11
601/11 601/13 605/12	657/25 658/23 663/23	apply [7] 548/4 591/2	Arbitrator [3] 528/15	706/22 746/7
612/1 612/3 612/18	669/24 677/22 679/13	601/17 602/20 634/19	528/16 545/8	asking about [1]
613/11 617/3 621/13	679/18 681/15 683/15	635/16 672/8	arbitrators [4] 529/8	614/13
623/12 623/16 624/5 624/7 624/23 630/7	684/18 684/22 685/20	applying [6] 589/2	545/9 689/10 780/23	aspect [3] 621/23
634/13 635/1 635/13	688/10 691/1 694/25	590/17 591/15 594/5	are [320]	622/20 717/11
635/17 636/14 676/7	705/21 706/17 708/15	600/9 628/21	area [12] 566/8 570/8	aspects [6] 581/20
678/6 685/19 725/2	712/25 715/9 717/11	appreciate [11]	570/12 570/17 570/19	637/3 643/1 677/11
739/24 743/4	720/4 725/12 726/12	541/18 570/12 581/16	570/23 570/23 571/19	684/23 774/8

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

A essumed [17] 620/12 64/16 737/10 537/1 637/1 7677 assention [6] 607/22 627/10 6677/12 637/1 637/1 637/1 637/1 637/1 637/1 637/1 637/1 607/2 669/16 669/12 659/16 669/12 657/1 657/14 537/1 637/1 757/2 537/1 637/1 637/1 657/1 assention [2] 69/12 assumes [1] 69/12 assumes [1] 69/2 537/1 637/1 757/2 580/12 657/14 assensen [1] 737/14 assumes [1] 69/2 assumes [1] 69/2 580/12 657/16 659/22 657/16 assensen [1] 59/14 assumes [1] 69/2 assumes [1] 69/2 580/12 657/16 659/22 657/16 assessen [1] 57/12 580/12 589/59/16 589/15 637/12 657/16 659/12 669/7 589/15 637/12 657/17 603/1 660/21 660/1 589/15 637/12 657/12 589/15 637/12 657/12 77/14 77/14/17 74/12 589/15 67/12 657/12 603/1 660/17 67/12 589/15 657/12 657/12 77/14 77/14/17 74/12 589/15 67/12 603/1 660/17 67/12 589/15 67/12 589/15 67/12 77/14/17 74/12 589/15 67/12 603/1 660/17 67/12 589/15 67/12 589/15 67/12 589/15 67/12 589/15 67/12 589/15 67/12	Zbigniew Plotr Grot et al		Revised		Pages 528-781
assent [1] 228/19 228/19 228/19 228/19 228/19 228/17 <th228 17<="" th=""> <th228 17<="" th=""> <th228 17<="" th=""><th>Δ</th><th>assumed [17] 626/15</th><th>646/18</th><th>737/10</th><th>637/1 683/17 697/7</th></th228></th228></th228>	Δ	assumed [17] 626/15	646/18	737/10	637/1 683/17 697/7
Baserion (f) C28/4 629/11 629/14 C38/2 3 C B Desite [26] 533/14 607/2 68/26 68/27 63/17 68/27 53/16 68/27 53/16 68/27 53/16 68/27 50/12 57/23 57/417 56/7 58/15 58/24 64/20					
Base Intol B 001/10 0				В	
b0//.25 660/15 660/2 660/12<				back [36] 533/7 541/2	
068/07 665/0 667/12 6667/12 567/14 567/14 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
assertions [2] 6339 669/15 639/25 6339 649/20 6437 657/20 667/20 657/20 667/20 657/20 667/20 657/20 667/20 657/20 667/20 667/20 667/20 667/20 667/20 677/20 667/20 667/20 667/20 667/20 667/20 677/20 677/20 667/20 667/20 677/20 667/20 677/20 77/20 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
669/15 assumes [1] 69/2 755/16 756/8 649/9 658/7 659/15 657/2 663/2 667/16 682/14 assessed [1] 598/14 assessed [1] 598/14 621/16 668/2 668/16 621/16 668/2 668/16 621/16 668/2 668/16 621/16 668/2 668/16 621/16 668/2 668/16 621/16 668/2 668/17 711/16 668/2 568/16 628/16 703/2 0 706/17 711/16 668/2 568/16 724/8 724/8 728/6 738/17 771/10 668/2 668/16 724/8 724/8 728/6 738/17 771/10 668/2 668/17 771/10 668/2 668/16 724/8 724/8 728/6 738/17 771/10 668/2 668/17 668/16 668/2 16 724/17 743/16 777/24 771/10 668/2 668/17 668/17 661/2 74/27 751/18 726/15 737/23 771/10 668/2 668/17 668/17 661/2 668/17 668/17 661/2 668/17 668/17 661/2 668/17 668/17 661/2 668/17 668/17 661/2 668/17 668/17 661/2 668/17 668/17 661/2 668/17 668/17 661/2 668/17 668/17 661/1 660/17 758/15 577/2 0 725/2 470/17 58/11 578/15 577/2 0 725/2 470/17 58/11 578/15 577/2 0 725/2 470/17 58/11 578/15 557/15 560/15 577/2 0 558/15 567/10 558/15 569/15 56	assertions [2] 669/12				
assessing [1] essuming [2]					
b82/14 secsessing (1) secsessing (1) secses (1) secsessing	assess [2] 623/3				
assessing (1) 548/14 assessing (1) 678/21 assessing (1) 678/21 assessing (1) 678/21 assessing (1) 678/21 assessing (1) 658/21 667/14 657/1 667/22 628/2 608/1 627/22 628/2 70/11 22 667/1 607/2 068/2 608/2 608/1 627/22 628/2 608/1 627/22 628/2 608/1 627/22 628/2 608/1 627/22 628/2 70/11 22 667/1 607/2 068/2 608/2 608/1 627/22 628/2 608/1 627/22 628/2 608/1 627/22 628/2 608/1 627/22 628/2 608/1 627/22 628/2 608/1 627/22 67/2 70/14 70/13 70/2 70/14 70/15 677/20 70/14 70/15 707/20 70/14 70/15 70/20 50/15 70/20 50/16 50/15 50/16 50/15 50/16 50/16 50/16 50/16 50/16	682/14				
assessing [1] 569/23 569/23 569/23 569/24	assessed [1] 598/14				
assessment [8] Sög/2 6 (837) 6 (82/12) Control (1) Control (1) <thcontrol (1)<="" th=""> Control (1) Control</thcontrol>	assessing [1] 678/21				
585/26 436/3 662/12 c2919 6301 663/1 <td>assessment [8]</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	assessment [8]				
bbs/1 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs/2 bbs	585/24 636/3 662/12				
6363 05014 6553 655/1 26587 6553 655/1 225 74/19 781/9	663/1 665/21 667/14				
asset [11] B3/15 B3/12	676/19 678/4				
bbb/s bbb/s cbs/s/1 cbs/s/1 <thcb 2<="" s="" th=""> <thcb 2<="" s="" th=""> <thcb 2<<="" s="" td=""><td>asset [11] 587/5 587/7</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></thcb></thcb></thcb>	asset [11] 587/5 587/7				
610/10 615/19 668/19 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/15 710/3 650/21 662/21 70/21 75/16 750/9 759/10 753/16 750/25 72/30/25 553/8 556/22 550/24 553/8 556/22 550/24 553/8 556/22 560/24 553/8 556/25 250/24 553/8 556/25 256/24 553/8 556/25 256/24 553/8 556/25 256/24 553/8 556/25 256/24 560/16 560/12 560/16 56/7/2 560/15 567/25 256/71 573/16 756/25 72/3 553/8 556/2 560/24 560/16 560/12 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/2 560/15 560/12 560/16 560/15 567/2 560/15 567/15 560/14 560/15 560/16 560/15 560/16	605/14 609/7 609/8				
bbb/s 584/4 <td< td=""><td>610/10 615/19 668/19</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	610/10 615/19 668/19				
asset [5] 586/19 607/20 609/2 609/16 630/16 630/16 630/16 669/2 669/25 67/27 700/25 609/24 611/4 613/9 613/24 614/20 614/25 613/24 614/25 615/27 613/24 614/25 613/3 615/15 611/2 615/1 731/2 73	668/21 682/15 710/3				
assets [61] 568/19 05/1/2 60/1/2 60/1/2 60/1/2 568/12 173/24 F4/4/4 76/1/2 607/20 60/1/2 60	asset-based [1] 710/3				
607/20 608/2 608/6 699/16 609/2 699/16 609/2 699/16 609/2 699/16 609/2 699/17 609/18 599/16 589/7 599/10 539/14 550/25 550/24 609/12 609/19 609/2 699/17 609/18 715/21 765/23 767/13 763/16 758/9 759/10 539/14 550/25 550/24 539/14 550/25 550/24 553/14 550/25 550/24 553/14 550/25 550/24 553/16 550/27 553/15 550/24 553/15 550/24 553/15 550/24 553/15 550/24 553/15 550/24 553/15 550/24 553/15 550/24 553/16 550/24 553/16 550/24 553/16 550/24 553/16 550/24 553/16 550/24 553/16 550/24 553/16 550/24 553/16 550/24 553/25 550/24		01//4 01/// 020/20			
6087/6 608/10 609/2 693/6 6447/ 6847/2 700/14 /03/6 707/12 733/16 7589/3 9710 539/14 550/2 550710 609/12 601/14 613/9 693/2 6417/16 99/13 757/12 753/16 7589/3 9710 539/16 7589/3 9710 558/16 560/12 56074 613/2 6417/2 641/2 613/2 6417/6 99/13 757/12 757/20 757/20 558/16 560/12 560/14 613/2 6417/2 614/2 731/2 733/12 767/20 758/16 560/12 560/15 558/16 560/12 560/15 613/2 6417/2 641/8 652/16 622/16 730/17 731/10 557/10 558/15 560/12 566/15 567/22 568/15 567/22 57/10 57/10 57/16 57/17 568/11 561/16 560/16 50/17 661/16 560/16 560/16 57/17 567/20 570/10 770/18 738/77 369/16 77/17 27/12 572/2 572/2 572/2 572/2 572/2 572/2 572/2 572/2 572/1 567/11 567/20 577/2 57/16 57/19 592/19 597/18 592/19 597/19 592/2 597/15 597/19 592/2 597/15 597/19 592/2 597/15 597/19 592/2 597/15 597/19 592/2 597/15 597/19 592/2 597/15 597/19 592/2 597/15 597/19 597/2 572/2 577/10 577/12 572/2 567/15 568/15 597/2 597/10 577/19 597					
609/12 609/19 609/12 694/13 699/17 699/18 715/21 765/23 767/13 553/8 556/2 567/10 609/24 611/14 613/9 600/53 77/20 785/16 560/12 560/16 553/8 556/2 566/7 613/25 614/20 614/22 731/2 731/2 533/8 556/2 566/7 563/8 567/2 568/18 613/96 615/12 615/13 731/2 731/2 730/21 731/1 731/10 557/25 558/1 558/3 568/15 567/22 568/14 625/23 625/24 6267 730/21 731/1 731/10 557/8 567/11 567/22 568/18 568/2 570/16 571/19 568/14 568/11 625/23 625/24 6267 658/13 608/16 632/15 568/12 568/14 568/14 568/14 568/14 568/14 568/14 568/14 568/12 568/14 568/14 641/26 441/6 641/8 659/22 722/1 732/25 568/22 570/16 571/19 568/21 657/19 568/21 628/24 548/14 568/14 643/16 642/16 643/16 644/17 659/22 722/1 732/25 568/21 662/19 568/21 628/14 568/21 628/14 568/21 628/14 568/21 628/14 568/21 628/14 568/21 628/14 568/21 628/14 568/21 628/14 568/21 628/24 568/21 628/24 568/21 628/24 568/21 628/24 568/21 628/24 568/21 628/24 568/21 628/24 568/21 628/24 568/21 628/24 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
609/24 611/14 613/9 asurance T2 625/11 average [46] 533/20 bagage [1] 79/23 562/4 566/2 566/7 613/26 614/20 614/23 731/2 533/22 546/11 547/14 balance [5] 60015 566/15 567/22 566/7 613/26 616/2 625/16 730/21 731/1 731/1 731/10 557/25 558/3 558/3 558/3 558/3 578/3 579/15 587/11 598/8 600/15 69/17 601/15 598/8 600/17 601/6 600/15 600/17 601/5 600/15 600/17 601/5 600/15 600/17 601/5 600/15 600/17 601/5 600/16 600/17 601/5 600/17 601/17 601/17 598/8 600/17 601/16 600/17 601/17 601/17 600/17 601/17 601/17 600/16 600/17 601/17 600/16 600/17 600/16 600/17 600/17 601/17 600/17 601/17	609/12 609/19 609/21				
613/24 614/20 614/23 assurance [2] 02/31 average [45] 533/20 baggag [1] 7/9/23 56/4 567/2 568/7 613/9 615/12 615/12 615/13 615/12 615/12 615/12 615/12 615/12 615/12 66/15 657/2 568/13 615/9 615/12 615/12 615/13 64/16 625/15 557/12 558/15 658/3 748/16 569/15 657/12 568/13 567/19 589/16 669/2 566/1/ 625/10 626/21 627/8 655/13 600/16 632/15 558/12 568/14 658/17 588/12 568/14 658/17 balancing [1] 704/15 600/5 600/17 601/15 641/11 641/13 641/22 738/7 738/9 Astument [1] 529/14 558/12 568/14 658/17 balancing [1] 778/16 600/5 600/17 601/15 601/15 601/16 600/20 618/12 61/10 60/20 618/12 61/10 60/20 618/12 61/12 61/10 60/20 618/12 61/12 61/12 61/16 600/5 602/17 60/12 60/12 618/12 61/12 61/12 61/12 61/12 62/22 621/10 60/20 60/17 60/12 618/12 61/12 61/12 61/12 61/12 61/12 62/22 621/12 62/24 62/14 62/21 62/12 621/12 61/12 61/12 61/12 61/12 62/22 621/12 61/12 61/12 61/12 61/12 62/22 621/12 61/12	609/24 611/14 613/9				
61/2/50/15/2/51/3 assurances [3] 547/18 548/10 552/6 600/16 600/18 601/21 578/12 579/15 581/11 61/9/6 15/2/52/52 625/22 730/21 731/1 731/10 559/4 568/12 568/14 568/3 600/16 600/18 601/21 578/12 577/15 558/3 625/23 625/24 626/7 655/13 607/15 661/8 655/13 607/15 677/15 557/8 557/11 567/12 balancing [1] 781/6 600/6 602/16 641/1 641/16 641/2 ASTUNO [9] 530/4 558/12 568/14 658/17 balancing [1] 781/6 600/6 612/1 641/1 641/18 641/22 ASTUNO [9] 530/4 558/12 569/14 658/17 balancing [1] 781/6 600/6 602/16 641/2 641/6 641/8 659/22 722/1 732/25 558/14 568/45 58/11 balancing [1] 781/6 600/16 600/16 600/16 606/6 602/16 641/2 641/6 641/6 659/22 722/1 732/25 558/14 568/46 58/11 balancing [1] 781/1 611/2 641/2 642/10 615/15 616/4 617/9 684/17 501/1 stack [2] 732/10 758/14 558/14 588/14 559/14 602/6 02/16 630/12 637/16 630/12 637/16 630/12 637/16 630/12 637/16 630/12 637/16 630/23 637/2 637/6 630/23 637/2 637/6 630/23 637/2 637/6 630/23 637/2 637/6 630/23 637/2 637/6 630/23 637/2 637/6 630/23 637/2 637/6 630/23 637/2 637/6 630/23 637/2 637/6 630/23 637/2 637/					
615/9 615/12 615/13 615/13 616/6 625/16 625/18 625/10 625/24 625/18 625/10 625/24 625/24 626/7 assurances [3] 73/021 731/1 731/10 assure [1] 649/11 659/25 666/22 566/24 557/25 558/3 558/3 500/16 601/26 559/25 568/24 558/15 668/21 528/4 558/15 668/22 566/24 568/12 568/14 568/15 558/4 568/21 559/25 568/24 568/12 568/14 568/15 558/4 568/12 568/22 570/16 571/19 568/22 570/16 571/12 568/12 584/14 584/15 591/3 667/1 667/10 671/12 575/20 572/5730/10 attack [2] 657/2 710/10 assistant [2] 520/19 760/20 761/7 780/12 780/	614/25 615/2 615/3				
615/13 6166 625/16 730/21 731/1 731/10 557/25 558/1 558/3 746/16 584/4 586/13 597/19 625/18 625/20 625/24 625/21 627/8 638/14 [49/11 ASTUNO [9] 530/4 559/4 566/22 566/24 559/4 566/22 526/24 559/8 660/27 627/15 568/12 568/14 568/17 568/12 568/14 568/17 568/12 568/14 568/17 568/22 572/13 528/3 568/25 572/15 568/14 568/17 568/25 572/13 528/3 568/25 572/13 528/3 568/25 572/13 528/3 568/25 572/16 571/19 568/22 572/14 568/12 568/14 568/17 568/25 572/16 571/19 568/25 572/16 52/16 62/26 661/12 62/22 621/16 62/26 62/24 621/16 62/26 62/24 621/16 62/26 62/24 621/16 62/26 62/2 621/16 62/26 62/24 621/16 62/26 62/24 621/16 62/26 62/24 621/16 62/26 62/2 621/16 62/26 62/2 621/16 62/26 62/2 621/16 62/26 62/2 621/16 62/26 62/2 621/16 62/26 62/2 621/16 62/26 62/2 621/16 62/26 62/2 621/16 62/2 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
625/18 625/20 625/22 assure [1] 649/11 559/4 626/22 560/24 balancer [1] 704/15 599/8 600/17 601/5 625/23 625/24 626/7 ASTUNO [9] 530/4 567/8 567/11567/12 balancing [1] 704/15 600/15 601/16 604/20 624/10 626/21 627/8 659/2 570/16 571/19 balancing [1] 704/15 601/15 601/16 604/20 641/12 641/18 641/22 657/8 567/11 657/12 balancing [1] 704/15 600/15 601/16 604/20 642/26 552/24 621/8 659/22 722/1 732/25 568/12 568/14 568/17 balancing [1] 704/15 601/16 604/20 642/26 552/24 621/8 Athena [1] 529/14 563/14 584/14 584/14 591/3 balank [1] 629/23 618/12 619/2 620/6 642/16 644/17 585/21 602/19 barister [1] 779/18 627/18 629/17 629/23 621/16 62/17 653/13 507/20 assistating [1] 663/24 585/21 602/19 barrister [1] 741/14 631/12 634/14 635/1 64/27 645/15 730/10 751/15 632/15 632/16 632/24 637/2 637/2 637/2 637/16 657/16 657/16 657/16 657/1 705/27 702/24 639/17 632/16 648/17 642/16 651/16 632/16					
023/23 023/24 0207 658/12 602/16 568/12 568/12 568/17 668/12 568/17 666/15 608/16 612/1 026/10 026/21 627/8 659/22 722/1 732/25 568/12 568/12 568/17 568/12 568/17 568/12 568/17 615/15 61/16 61/4 617/9 041/11 641/13 641/25 659/22 722/1 732/25 578/17/38/9 572/2 572/3 583/7 584/12 584/14 591/3 584/12 584/14 591/3 584/12 562/16 621/16 62/12 62/24 621/20 62/12 62/24 621/16 62/12 62/24 621/16 62/16 621/16 62/12 62/24 621/16 62/16 62/14 621/16 62/16 621/16 62/16 621/16 62/16 621/16 62/16 621/16 62/16 621/16 62/17 629/23 630/23 631/2 631/16 63/16 632/16 630/23 631/2 631/16 63/17 630/11 638/12 63/16 630/23 631/2 631/16 631/12 63/24 631/12 63/24 631/12 63/24 631/12 63/16 631/12 63/16 63/16 632/16 631/12 63/16 63/16 632/16 631/12 63/16 63/12 63/16 63/16 63/24 631/12 63/16 63/12 63/16 63/12 63/16 63/12 63/16 63/17 63/11 63/16 63/24 631/12 63/16 63/16 63/24 631/12 63/16 63/16 63/24 63/16 63/24 63/16 63/24 63/16 63/24 63/16 63/24 63/16 63/24 63/16 63/24 63/11 63/16 63/24 63/11 63/16 63/24 63/11 63/16					
62/010 620/10 260/21 62/16 659/22 722/1 732/25 568/22 570/16 571/19 Batti [1] 561/10 615/15 616/4 617/9 641/2 641/5 641/8 Atelier [1] 529/14 S58/14 584/14 bars [1] 721/25 742/8 618/12 641/26 621/4 642/3 652/24 661/8 Atelier [1] 529/14 S58/14 584/14 591/3 bars [1] 779/18 624/14 641/29 662/15 682/17 542/20 542/22 770/4 595/21 602/8 602/19 bars [2] 642/10 63/21 684/14 693/13 700/11 assigned [1] 768/11 Attack [2] 732/10 735/9 663/16 64/16 64/8 644/9 64/17 684/6 729/25 730/10 f78/18 attack [2] 653/24 673/20 695/27 70/24 averages [9] 547/1 663/16 653/16 658/16 651/16 653/16 658/16 651/16 653/16 658/16 651/16 653/16 658/16 651/16 653/16 658/16 651/16 653/16 658/16 651/11 663/16 658/16 651/11 663/16 658/16 651/11 681/1 681/1 681/12 68/22 651/11 681/1 681/1 681/12 68/23 680/11 681/1 681/12 68/23 680/11 681/1 681/6 705/3 73/5/ 735/23 f751/4 751/21 756/23 f751/4 751/21 756/23 f751/4 751/21 756/23 651/16 65/76 65/71 652/14 65/24 651/16 65/76 63/16 682/11 681/26 682/11 681/2 <	625/23 625/24 626/7				
164 1/12 64 1/13 64 1/25 738/7 738/9 738/7 738/9 572/2 572/3 583/7 bank [1] 629/23 618/12 619/2 620/6 641/11 64 1/13 641/125 748/7 738/9 Atlenar [4] 542/20 583/14 584/15 584/11 581/12 584/12 542/22 621/12 621/24 621/12 621/12 621/24 621/12 621/12 621/24 621/12 621/12 621/24 621/12 621/12 621/24 621/12 621/12 621/24 621/12 621/12 621/24 621/12 621/12 621/24 621/12 621/12 621/24 621/12 621/12 621/24 621/12 621/12 621/12 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/14 631/14 631/12 631/14 631/14	626/10 626/21 627/8				
64/17/164/17/364/124 Atelier [1] 529/14 583/14 584/8 584/11 58a/14 584/8 584/11 58a/14 584/8 584/11 542/20 542/22 621/20 621/24 624/4 624/14 624/17 626/22 684/18 693/10 693/11 693/13 700/11 attachment [1] 663/6 643/16 644/16 603/16 643/16 644/16 631/12 581/24 631/12 631/12 631/16 633/16 684/6 729/25 730/10 attacked [1] 695/7 attacked [1] 695/7 6677/ 667/10 67/116 720/125 730/10 6677/ 667/10 67/116 720/125 647/13 635/12 637/14 635/12 637/14 635/12 637/14 635/12 637/14 635/12 637/12 637/2 65/14 65/10 62/617 630/11 646/8 648/9 648/17 646/8 648/9 648/17 646/8 648/9 648/17 646/8 648/9 648/17 646/8 648/9 648/17 646/14 65/10 62/617 630/11 646/8 648/9 648/17 646/14 65/16 65/7 65/7 65/7 65/14 65/16 65/7 65/7 65/7 65/7 65/7 65/7 65/7 65/					
642/15 652/12 661/6 Athena [4] 542/20 558/12 68/1/3 741/12 741/25 742/8 62/14 62/1/1 62/22 662/15 662/16 68/1/1 663/16 643/16 64/1/6 663/16 643/16 64/1/6 663/16 643/16 64/1/6 663/16 643/16 64/1/6 653/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 63/12 63/1/10 653/23 65/1/10 653/23 65/1/10 653/23 65/1/10 653/23 65/1/10 653/23 65/1/10 653/1/	641/11 641/13 641/22				
662/16 684/17 542/20 542/22 770/4 595/21 602/8 602/19 barrister [1] 779/18 627/8 629/17 629/23 684/18 693/10 693/11 attachment [1] 663/6 603/16 643/16 644/16 648/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 687/14 638/21 609/12 641/21 644/19 644/21 761/10 678/18 attacked [1] 665/10 678/18 594/12 548/13 584/5 642/9 645/5 647/13 662/14 653/16 658/16 657/11 666/12 669/22 657/14 651/1 66/12 669/22 657/14 651/1 66/12 669/22 682/14 687/14 688/12 68/17 658/18 670/25 677/13 657/1 66/12 66/12 681/1 681/1 681/6 681/14 63/14 681/14 63/15 683/24 681/14 63/15 68/24 681/1 681/6 681/14 63/14 681/14 63/15 68/24 681/14 63/24 681/14 63/14 681/14 63/15 63/24 681/14 63/14 681/14 63/14 681/14 63/14 681/14 63/14 681/14 63/14 681/14 63/14 681/14 63/14 681/14 63/14 681/14 63/14 681/14 63/14 681/14 63/14 681/14 63/14 681	642/3 652/24 661/8				
684/18 693/10 093/11 attachment [1] 663/6 603/13 700/11 663/16 643/16 644/6 base [3] 642/10 630/23 631/2 631/10 assigned [1] 768/11 assist [5] 543/20 644/6 644/9 644/17 668/21 687/14 638/24 633/33 637/2 637/6 684/6 729/25 730/10 735/9 attacked [1] 695/7 647/7 667/10 671/12 base [3] 642/10 630/23 631/2 631/10 assistanc [6] 695/7 643/15 735/23 767/10 667/7 667/10 671/12 base [3] 642/10 643/68 648/9 648/17 assistant [2] 529/19 attaining [1] 665/10 attempted [3] 727/24 597/19 622/4 658/17 658/16 653/16 658/16 657/11 6663/16 653/16 653/16 653/16 657/11 6661/16 653/16 658/16 667/11 665/16 653/16 658/16 667/11 665/16 653/16 658/16 667/11 6661/16 653/16 658/16 668/11 681/1 681/1 681/6 681/12 68/12 682/26 868/16 682/13 682/15 868/16 682/24 682/26 88/16 682/13 682/26 868/24 681/14 682/26 868/24 682/14 682/26 869/26 685/11 693/16 593/24 682/24 682/26 682/24 682/14 682/26 687/26 682/13 682/24 681/14 682/26 682/24 682/14 682/26 682/24 682/14 682/26 682/24 682/14 682/26 682/24 682/14 682/26 682/24 682/14 682/26 682/24 682/14 682/26 682/24 682/14 682/26 682/24 </td <td>662/15 682/16 684/17</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	662/15 682/16 684/17				
693/13 /00/11 attack [2] 732/10 644/8 644/9 644/17 686/21 687/14 631/12 634/14 635/1 assigned [1] 768/11 attacked [1] 695/7 667/2 695/27 70/24 590/16 595/21 609/12 641/8 644/9 644/17 668/21 687/14 mased [39] 588/24 631/12 634/14 635/1 635/3 637/2 637/6 664/8 729/25 730/10 7110 attacked [1] 695/7 673/20 695/27 70/24 590/16 595/21 609/12 644/8 644/19 644/17 761/10 attaining [1] 665/10 657/16 657/16 651/16 651/16 651/16 651/16 657/11 666/12 669/23 760/20 761/7 attaining [1] 665/10 attemptel [3] 727/24 597/19 622/4 658/16 651/16 651/16 657/11 661/12 669/22 780/12 775/15 attemptel [3] 727/24 787/19 622/4 658/17 658/18 670/25 672/3 672/2 672/26 63/2/4 658/16 651/16 681/16 681/26 68/2/4 688/11 726/23 726/23 746/11 642/1 651/10 65/20 68/11 693/15 693/24 68/11 693/15 693/24 68/11 693/15 693/24 68/11 693/16 69/26 68/11 693/16 69/26 68/14 69/26 68/27 68/11 693/15 693/24 68/11 693/15 693/24 68/11 693/15 693/24 68/11 693/15 693/24 68/11 693/15 693/24 68/11 693/15 693/24 68/11 693/15 693/24 68/11 693/15 693/24 68/11 693/15 693/24 68/11 693/	684/18 693/10 693/11				
assigned [1] / 68/11 735/9 667/7 667/10 671/12 based [39] 588/24 633/3 637/2 637/6 684/6 729/25 730/10 attacked [1] 695/7 attacked [1] 695/7 attacked [1] 695/7 67/7 667/10 671/12 based [39] 588/24 633/3 637/2 637/6 assistance [6] 695/17 attaining [1] 665/10 attaining [1] 665/10 attaining [1] 665/10 641/21 64/19 64/21 730/12 678/18 attaining [1] 665/10 594/6 594/7 595/2 651/16 653/16 658/16 657/11 666/12 669/22 760/20 761/7 attempt [2] 722/13 775/15 594/6 594/7 595/2 651/16 653/16 658/16 657/11 66/12 669/22 726/23 742/6 746/11 attention [10] 588/4 656/12 656/21 656/23 682/13 682/15 683/24 681/12 681/23 682/25 680/11 681/1 681/6 730/17 720/15 746/12 746/13 attexte [2] 739/22 710/1 710/3 737/24 682/13 682/15 683/24 683/14 680/24 688/1 730/17 739/25 attexte [2] 739/22 731/1 169/13 682/15 702/11 763/8 763/10 763/17 703/22 704/6 706/18 736/14 assucciate [2] 570/7 attexte [2] 739/22 746/5 attexte [2] 739/22 746/5 74/2/17 70/18 656/26 601/22 669/34 761/8 731/2 772/14	693/13 700/11				
assist [5] 543/20 735/9 667/7 667/10 67 /712 Dast [35] 363/2 653/7 657/7 684/6 729/25 730/10 attacked [1] 695/7 attained [2] 663/2 641/2 644/19 644/21 641/2 644/19 644/21 assistance [6] 695/17 attaining [1] 665/10 594/6 594/13 642/9 645/5 647/13 642/9 645/5 647/13 652/14 655/7 656/7 assistance [2] 597/10 attaining [1] 665/10 594/6 594/17 595/2 651/16 653/16 657/14 665/16 657/14 666/12 66/22 705/3 735/15 attempted [3] 722/13 597/19 622/4 658/17 658/18 670/25 672/3 673/24 680/4 681/12 681/23 682/5 680/11 681/1 681/6 assisted [2] 697/2 742/6 746/11 attempted [3] 727/24 656/12 656/23 694/21 693/24 688/14 682/15 683/24 681/14 682/16 683/16 681/14 681/6 726/23 739/17 attempted [3] 727/24 f557/16 567/15 656/15 710/1 710/3 737/24 692/5 693/24 684/14 682/15 683/24 681/14 682/16 683/16 681/14 682/16 682/16 693/24 681/14 682/16 682/16 693/24 681/14 682/16 682/16 693/24 681/14 682/16 682/16 693/24 681/14	assigned [1] 768/11				
684/6 729/25 730/10 attacked [1] 695/7 673/20 695/2 770/24 530/21 639/27 108/12 641/12 644/19 644/11 781/10 attained [2] 663/4 678/18 attaining [1] 665/10 642/84/13 584/5 642/9 645/5 647/13 652/14 655/7 656/7 705/3 735/15 735/23 attempt [2] 722/13 751/5 594/6 594/7 595/2 651/16 653/16 658/16 657/11 666/12 669/22 705/3 735/15 735/23 attempt [2] 722/13 775/15 awarages [9] 547/1 661/10 626/17 630/11 642/8 648/9 648/17 780/12 attempt [2] 722/13 775/15 awarages [9] 547/1 651/16 653/16 653/16 657/11 666/12 669/22 780/12 attempt [2] 722/13 775/15 awarages [9] 547/1 681/12 681/23 682/5 680/11 681/1 681/6 assistant [2] 50/16 attempted [3] 727/24 awaraig [1] 645/18 682/15 683/12 681/1 681/1 681/6 assistant [2] 530/16 591/13 598/12 720/11 656/12 656/23 694/21 696/2 697/9 692/16 695/4 681/1 681/6 692/13 682/5 681/1 681/6 692/13 693/24 684/3 686/24 688/11 681/24 682/2 682/16 680/16 69/24 692/9 690/21 696/2 697/9 691/24 682/2 682/16 680/16 809/26 69/24 681/16 692/26 69/17 701/8 701/8 703/22 704/6					
761/10 attained [2] 053/24 averages [9] 04/11 610/10/02/01/10/01/10/02/01/10/00/01/10/02/01/10/00/01/10/02/01/10/00/01/10/02/01/10/00/01/10/02/01/10/00/01/10/00/01/10/02/01/10/02/01/10/00/01/10/02/01/10/00/01/10/02/01/10/01/00/					
assistance [0] 050/17 attaining [1] 665/10 594/6 594/7 595/2 651/16 653/16 658/16 657/11 666/12 669/22 705/3 735/15 735/23 attempt [2] 722/13 597/19 622/4 658/17 658/18 670/25 672/3 673/24 880/4 assistant [2] 529/19 attemptel [3] 727/24 award [15] 591/6 682/13 682/15 683/24 680/11 681/1 681/1 681/1 assisted [2] 697/2 742/6 746/11 642/11 1651/10 654/20 685/11 693/15 693/24 684/3 686/24 688/11 Assoc [2] 530/16 591/13 598/12 720/11 657/3 657/5 658/15 710/1 710/3 737/24 692/5 692/9 694/1 530/17 associate [2] 552/25 751/12 756/23 693/15 702/11 763/8 763/10 763/17 703/22 704/6 706/18 757/10 associate [2] 552/25 atternue [1] 746/5 awarding [1] 687/3 awarding [1] 687/3 basic [1] 683/23 713/24 717/25 718/11 765/14 739/25 612/14 602/4 641/7 589/25 590/19 711/12 711/15 713/13 73/48 734/19 736/6 751/1 attributable [2] 722/5 612/14 602/4 647/68/9 591/4 591/10 591/23 734/8 734/19 736/6 656/2 661/22 669/24 668/24 688/24 688/24 689/24 708/18 709/2 657/10 692/6 695/4 739/25 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
705/3 735/15 735/23 760/20 761/7 attaining [1] 605/10 394/1 939/2 658/17 603/21 657/17 603/24 67/17 600/12 68/22 assistant [2] 529/19 780/12 attempted [3] 727/24 597/19 622/4 658/18 670/25 672/3 673/24 680/4 assisted [2] 697/2 742/6 746/11 642/11 651/10 654/20 682/11 693/15 693/24 688/11 691/2 682/2 681/24 682/2 682/16 Assoc [2] 530/16 591/13 598/12 720/11 657/3 657/5 658/15 710/1 710/3 737/24 692/5 692/9 694/1 682/11 692/12 696/22 694/21 696/2 697/9 689/11 690/22 692/3 Assoc [2] 530/16 591/13 598/12 720/11 657/3 657/5 658/15 710/1 710/3 737/24 695/2 696/17 701/8 692/2 694/1 695/2 696/17 701/8 associate [2] 552/25 751/4 751/21 756/23 687/11 692/13 693/5 752/22 754/20 754/21 695/2 696/17 701/8 703/22 704/6 706/18 757/10 739/25 attest [2] 739/22 awarde [3] 741/11 768/8 769/2 708/18 709/13 710/5 703/22 704/6 706/18 703/22 704/6 706/18 703/22 704/6 706/18 703/22 704/6 706/18 711/12 711/15 713/13 713/24 717/25 718/11 768/8 769/2 708/18 709/13 710/5 734/8 734/19 736/6 711/12 711/15 713/13 713/24 717/25 718/11 746/5 803/25 587/1 587/1 587/1 587/1 587/1	assistance [6] 695/17				
7/80/22 75/15 averaging [1] 645/18 681/12 681/23 682/5 680/11 681/1 681/6 780/12 assistant [2] 529/19 742/6 746/11 averaging [1] 645/18 682/13 682/15 683/24 684/14 681/2 682/2 682/16 assisted [2] 697/2 742/6 746/11 attempted [3] 727/24 742/6 746/11 656/12 656/23 694/21 696/2 697/9 689/11 691/2 692/9 689/11 691/2 683/24 688/11 690/22 692/9 689/11 690/22 692/9 689/11 690/22 692/9 692/5 692/9 694/1 703/22 704/6 706/18 703/22 704/6 706/18 703/22 704/6 706/18 703/22 704/6 706/18 703/22 704/6 706/18 703/22 704/6 706/18 703/27 711/15 713/24 717/25 718/11 703/25 75/19 713/24 717/25 718/11 703/25 75/5 713/24 717/25 718/11 703/25					
assistant [2] 529/19 attempted [3] 727/24 award [15] 591/6 682/13 682/15 683/24 681/24 682/26	760/20 761/7				
780/12 attempted [3] 72/1/4 award [15] 59/16 662/13 663/14 663/24 681/24 682/2 682/16 682/2 682/16 assisted [2] 697/2 742/6 746/11 642/11 651/10 654/20 685/11 693/24 684/3 686/24 688/11 726/23 attention [10] 588/4 656/12 656/21 656/23 694/21 696/2 697/9 689/11 690/22 692/3 730/17 591/13 598/12 720/11 657/3 657/5 658/15 710/1 710/3 737/24 699/15 692/9 694/1 720/15 746/12 746/13 687/11 692/13 693/5 752/22 754/20 754/21 695/2 696/17 701/8 757/10 751/4 751/21 756/23 693/15 702/11 763/8 763/10 763/17 703/22 704/6 706/18 739/25 attest [2] 739/22 749/17 749/19 awarde [3] 741/11 768/8 769/2 708/18 709/13 710/5 736/14 associate [2] 570/7 615/11 626/20 627/2 610/12 611/21 612/9 585/25 587/1 587/6 734/8 734/19 736/6 652/2 637/2 649/18 attributable [2] 722/5 761/8 62/4 668/7 668/9 589/22 500/15 590/19 741/15 741/20 742/12 656/2 661/22 669/23 701/2 761/8 62/4 668/7 668/9 591/25 595/3 597/14 748/22 750/2 754/9 699/22 700/2 701/4 attribution [4] 709/6 725/18 736/1 753/6 598/16 599/5 60	assistant [2] 529/19				
assisted [2] 659/12 attention [10] 588/4 656/12 656/12 656/23 694/21 696/26 697/9 689/11 690/22 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/1 692/5 692/9 692/5 692/9 692/1 692/5 692/9 692/1 692/5 692/9 692/1 692/5 692/1 692/5 692/1 692/5 692/1 692/5 692/1 692/5 692/1 692/5 692/1 692/5 692/1 692/5 692/1 701/7 703/2 703/2 704/6 703/2 704/6 704/6 692/5 691/1 703/2 702/1 703/2 702/1 708/18 703/2 703/2 703/2 703/2 703/2 703/2 703/2					
726/23 attention [10] 588/4 656//2 650/21 656/23 694/2 1 056/2 697/9 689/1 1 690/22 69//3 Assoc [2] 530/16 591/13 598/12 720/11 657/3 657/5 658/15 710/1 710/3 737/24 692/5 692/9 694/1 associate [2] 552/25 757/10 692/5 52/25 751/4 751/21 756/23 693/15 702/11 763/8 763/10 763/17 703/22 704/6 706/18 associated [5] 648/25 739/25 749/17 749/19 bases [1] 575/19 711/12 711/15 713/13 associated [5] 50/7 648/25 610/12 611/21 612/9 585/25 587/1 587/6 734/8 734/19 736/6 assume [20] 570/7 615/11 626/20 627/2 610/12 611/21 612/9 585/25 587/1 587/6 734/8 734/19 736/6 630/22 6037/6 649/18 656/2 669/24 662/4 668/7 668/9 591/4 591/10 591/23 742/21 746/24 747/16 656/2 661/22 669/23 658/5 697/20 699/21 668/10 669/24 693/14 591/25 595/3 597/14 748/22 750/2 754/9 699/22 700/2 701/4 702/20 703/5 707/17 748/9 756/15 764/12 600/14 605/10 613/10 722/17 774/3 699/22 700/2 701/4 611/21 613/7 away [6] 560/14 580/3 617/13 617/16 620/3 624/24 628/21 630/4 725/17 771/7 771/7 635/23 687/	assisted [2] 697/2				
Assoc [2] 530/16 530/17 associate [2] 552/25 757/10 associate [2] 552/25 757/10 739/25 associate [2] 570/7 657/9 692/6 657/9 692/6 736/14 74/1 736/14 74/1 736/14 74/1 736/14 74/1 736/14 74/1 736/14 74/1 736/14 74/1 736/14 74/7 746/5 attorney-client [1] 746/5 610/12 615/11 626/20 637/2 659/2 761/8 612/14 656/2 661/22 661/22 669/2 721/18 722/3 699/22 700/2 701/4 702/20 702/20 703/5 707/7 615/1 62/2 668/10 668/10 669/24 69/22 700/2 701/2 725/18					
530/17 associate [2] 552/25 757/10 associated [5] 648/25 757/10 attest [2] 739/22 associated [5] 648/25 657/9 695/4 736/14 739/25 attorney [1] 746/5 attorney [1] 746/5 attorney client [1] 746/5 745/14 622/2 657/9 695/4 736/14 741/11 749/17 749/19 attributable [2] 722/5 761/8 612/16 656/2 661/22 661/22 669/23 655/5 697/20 699/21 700/2 703/22 701/4 702/20 703/5 703/22 701/2 649/18 668/10 656/2 661/22 669/24 668/10 668/10 669/24 668/10 669/24 668/10 669/24 703/22 700/2 701/4 709/2 703/22	Assoc [2] 530/16				
associate [2] 552/25 757/10 attest [2] 739/22 associated [5] 648/25 657/9 692/6 695/4 736/14 749/17 749/17 assume [20] 570/7 615/11 626/20 627/2 630/22 637/6 649/18 656/2 661/22 669/23 657/9 692/26 692/4 736/14 749/17 749/17 assume [20] 570/7 615/11 626/20 627/2 630/22 637/6 649/18 656/2 661/22 669/23 657/9 699/21 708/18 709/6 761/8 attribution [4] 709/6 652/5 697/20 699/21 656/2 661/22 669/23 657/9 699/22 700/2 699/22 700/2 701/4 709/22 703/5 707/17 699/22 700/2 701/4 699/22 700/2 701/4 709/22 703/5 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
757/10 attest [2] 739/22 awarded [3] 741/11 708/8709/22 708/18 709/12 708/18 709/12 708/18 709/12 708/18 709/12 708/18 709/12 711/12 711/15 713/13 713/24 717/25 718/11 711/12 711/15 711/20 742/12 585/25 587/1 590/19 741/15 741/20 742/12 741/15 741/20 742/12 741/15 741/20 742/12 742/21 746/24 747/16 748/22 750/2 750/2 750/2 754/9 742/21 746/24 747/16 748/22 750/2 750/2 754/9 748/22 750/2 754/9 756/15 764/12 598/16 599/5 600/10 756/14 759/2 759	associate [2] 552/25				
associated [5] 648/25 657/9 692/6 695/4 736/14 attorney [1] 746/5 assume [20] 570/7 615/11 626/20 627/2 630/22 637/6 649/18 656/2 661/22 669/23 657/5 697/20 699/21 630/22 637/6 649/18 656/2 661/22 669/23 657/5 697/20 699/21 630/22 700/2 701/4 702/20 703/5 707/17 702/20 703/5 707/17 701/7 auditing [1] 613/7 August [2] 635/23 687/7 700/14 711/20 742/21 746/24 747/25 756/15 764/12 591/25 593/3 742/21 746/24 741/25 756/12 748/22 750/27 756/15 764/12 598/16 599/5 600/10 756/14 759/22 756/15 764/12 598/16 599/5 600/10 756/14 759/22 756/15 764/12 687/7					
657/9 692/6 695/4 attorney-client [1] aware [18] 579/22 basically [30] 585/21 718/19 719/3 725/25 736/14 746/5 attorney-client [1] 746/5 610/12 611/21 612/9 585/25 587/1 587/6 734/8 734/19 736/6 615/11 626/20 627/2 630/22 637/6 649/18 attributable [2] 722/5 662/4 668/7 668/9 589/22 590/15 590/19 741/15 741/20 742/12 630/22 637/6 649/18 attribution [4] 709/6 668/10 669/24 693/14 591/25 595/3 597/14 748/22 750/2 754/9 656/2 661/22 669/23 685/5 697/20 699/21 audit [1] 748/9 668/10 669/24 693/14 598/16 599/5 600/10 748/22 750/2 754/9 699/22 700/2 701/4 702/20 703/5 707/17 auditing [1] 613/7 away [6] 560/14 580/3 617/13 617/16 620/3 624/24 628/21 630/4 525/17 687/7 700/14 711/20 687/7 700/14 711/20 624/24 628/21 630/4 725/17					
730/14 746/5 610/12 611/21 612/9 585/25 587/1 587/6 734/8 734/19 736/6 assume [20] 570/7 615/11 626/20 627/2 610/12 611/21 612/9 585/25 587/1 587/6 734/8 734/19 736/6 630/22 637/6 649/18 attributable [2] 722/5 662/4 668/7 668/9 668/10 599/25 590/15 590/19 741/15 741/20 742/12 656/2 661/22 669/23 attribution [4] 709/6 668/10 669/24 693/14 591/25 595/3 597/14 748/22 750/2 754/9 635/5 697/20 699/21 699/22 700/2 701/4 721/18 722/3 729/9 668/10 669/24 693/14 598/16 599/5 600/10 756/14 759/2 759/22 600/14 605/10 613/10 audit [1] 748/9 auditing [1] 613/7 away [6] 560/14 580/3 617/13 617/16 620/3 624/24 628/21 630/4 525/17 687/7 700/14 711/20 687/7 700/14 711/20 624/24 628/21 630/4 725/17					
assume [20] 57077 615/11 626/20 627/2 630/22 637/6 649/18 656/2 661/22 669/23 685/5 697/20 699/21 699/22 700/2 701/4 702/20 703/5 707/17 771/7 August [2] 635/23	736/14				
615/11 626/20 62/72 761/8 662/4 668/7 668/9 591/4 591/10 591/23 742/21 746/24 747/16 630/22 637/6 649/18 attribution [4] 709/6 668/10 669/24 693/14 591/25 595/3 597/14 748/22 750/2 754/9 656/2 661/22 669/23 audit [1] 748/9 662/4 668/7 668/9 591/4 591/10 591/23 742/21 746/24 747/16 699/22 700/2 701/4 audit [1] 748/9 audit [1] 748/9 756/15 764/12 600/14 605/10 613/10 772/17 774/3 auditing [1] 613/7 away [6] 560/14 580/3 617/13 617/16 620/3 624/24 628/21 630/4 525/17					
630/22 637/6 649/18 attribution [4] 709/6 668/10 669/24 693/14 591/25 595/3 597/14 748/22 750/2 754/9 656/2 661/22 669/23 attribution [4] 709/6 668/10 669/24 693/14 591/25 595/3 597/14 748/22 750/2 754/9 685/5 697/20 699/21 audit [1] 748/9 audit [1] 748/9 756/15 764/12 500/14 605/10 613/10 722/17 774/3 90/22 700/2 701/4 auditing [1] 613/7 away [6] 560/14 580/3 617/13 617/16 620/3 624/24 628/21 630/4 525/17					
036/2 061/22 069/23 721/18 722/3 729/9 685/5 697/20 699/21 721/18 722/3 729/9 699/22 700/2 701/4 audit [1] 748/9 702/20 703/5 707/17 auditing [1] 613/7 August [2] 635/23 685/7 700/14 711/20	630/22 637/6 649/18				
685/5 697/20 699/21 audit [1] 748/9 756/15 764/12 600/14 605/10 613/10 772/17 774/3 699/22 700/2 701/4 auditing [1] 613/7 August [2] 635/23 756/15 764/12 600/14 605/10 613/10 772/17 774/3 600/14 605/10 613/10 617/13 617/16 620/3 624/24 628/21 630/4 725/17	656/2 661/22 669/23				
auditing [1] 613/7 away [6] 560/14 580/3 617/13 617/16 620/3 become [2] 681/9 702/20 703/5 707/17 August [2] 635/23 687/7 700/14 711/20 6124/24 628/21 630/4 725/17	685/5 697/20 699/21				
702/20 703/5 707/17 771/7 August [2] 635/23 687/7 700/14 711/20 624/24 628/21 630/4 725/17	699/22 700/2 701/4				
	771/7	nuguai [2] 000/20	00111 100/14 / 11/20	52-1/2+ 520/2+ 000/+	123/11
			L		

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

zbigiliew Floti Glot et al		Revised		Fages 520-70
В	536/13 536/24 537/18	694/25 724/18 724/19	571/22 597/17 623/21	695/24 697/1 711/6
becomes [2] 681/24	537/21	733/25 739/22 744/2	643/11 687/1	715/13 715/15 715/19
685/12	before [35] 533/11	745/4 748/5	bigger [4] 567/23	715/20 715/22 747/25
been [168] 535/23	539/8 548/16 550/25	believes [1] 653/22	567/24 570/23 600/15	763/11 763/13 765/18
553/23 554/23 555/4	553/24 571/4 572/23	belittle [1] 691/11	biggest [2] 565/22	773/21 774/1 774/7
555/11 558/10 558/14	573/3 578/16 579/11	belly [1] 704/19	601/23	774/14 776/1 776/12
561/2 561/2 562/11	580/18 587/11 587/17	belly-up [1] 704/19	Bilateral [1] 688/10	777/14 777/18 781/1
563/20 564/4 564/8	591/19 605/22 606/11	belonged [1] 581/11	bill [1] 657/11	bottom [2] 569/2
564/10 564/18 564/20	608/25 610/23 658/19	below [2] 644/5 760/5		749/4
571/9 571/17 578/4	664/25 681/18 684/12	bemused [1] 672/2	billion [1] 565/24	bought [1] 587/25
579/4 579/10 580/2	687/17 693/15 697/22 723/19 732/25 738/13	benchmark [1] 561/3	bills [2] 587/22 657/10	
580/8 585/23 586/14		benchmarking [16] 593/17 620/25 621/13	binding [3] 733/24 734/7 736/9	705/15 box [7] 651/25 654/12
587/11 588/1 588/13	739/11 740/14 748/3 750/5 752/22 753/1	622/5 622/25 623/3	Bio [18] 561/6 561/12	670/19 670/20 671/3
590/7 590/8 591/11	778/11	623/4 623/16 623/22	645/10 668/14 723/22	706/23 711/11
592/16 592/17 595/16	began [1] 660/1	624/5 624/17 624/20	724/17 725/21 726/24	brands [1] 611/16
009/14 009/15 012/21	begging [1] 730/18	634/13 634/25 642/15	727/1 727/9 728/25	breach [13] 612/6
013/13/014/9/015/3	begin [8] 543/9 585/5	642/16	757/3 757/9 759/13	640/24 646/2 649/17
015/5 015/5 015/0	585/11 599/18 599/24	benefit [7] 582/10	762/7 766/1 766/3	650/1 650/22 651/8
615/20 615/24 617/12	722/3 730/17 743/18	633/17 658/11 690/21	766/13	657/5 664/2 664/10
620/1 629/12 630/6	beginning [12] 565/13		Bio-Alianta [18] 561/6	
633/15 636/24 637/24	606/22 612/2 624/14	benefits [2] 570/10	561/12 645/10 668/14	breached [2] 688/11
638/20 640/8 640/25	626/14 627/3 627/4	701/1	723/22 724/17 725/21	752/18
641/14 641/25 642/3 642/5 644/10 645/15	629/1 631/5 642/1	Bereshnikov [1]	726/24 727/1 727/9	breaches [3] 627/24
642/5 644/10 645/15 646/24 648/4 648/6	664/11 682/24	564/14	728/25 757/3 757/9	684/11 688/21
646/24 648/4 648/6 649/10 649/25 650/4	begins [1] 663/19	BERIL [20] 530/14	759/13 762/7 766/1	break [9] 572/12
650/24 650/25 651/4	behalf [6] 530/2 531/2	690/21 728/20 732/3	766/3 766/13	584/21 584/24 637/11
651/5 651/6 651/22	591/18 749/10 773/15	739/10 756/14 756/17	bit [21] 556/1 561/8	638/16 659/4 716/7
651/23 652/2 652/4	774/10	756/20 756/21 756/24	562/14 568/15 592/21	720/6 774/16
652/9 652/18 658/2	behind [1] 713/7	757/12 757/13 758/15	640/19 654/12 684/13	breakdown [3] 694/3
658/21 660/22 661/8	being [36] 533/7	758/18 758/21 758/22	688/21 700/6 704/25	776/4 776/7
661/11 662/3 662/15	536/15 538/18 547/22	758/23 758/25 759/2	705/10 724/4 726/25	brevity [1] 752/5
665/16 665/23 666/17	564/1 570/9 577/6	759/4	738/1 752/18 753/4	bribe [2] 728/21 732/8
668/6 669/22 669/25	579/11 585/18 594/16	Beril's [1] 759/6	753/6 753/7 768/3	brief [8] 585/22 712/3
669/25 670/10 673/15	594/17 594/18 598/14	beside [2] 666/13	781/10 Bitagin [4] 713/5	717/14 717/21 749/9
675/3 675/5 675/9	602/11 604/7 607/12	666/15	Bitcoin [1] 713/5	753/13 764/25 775/10
675/11 675/13 675/15	637/4 644/6 656/13	besides [2] 564/17	bits [1] 535/15	briefly [12] 582/17
675/17 678/9 681/14	672/23 674/13 674/16 676/17 679/4 680/20	572/18 best [9] 591/10 623/11	black [5] 651/25	585/19 598/25 599/16 633/10 694/18 696/24
685/11 689/22 690/9	696/13 711/11 711/24	679/10 680/20 694/7	654/12/670/19/670/20 671/3	702/8 738/12 762/9
690/10 691/18 692/8	720/15 732/11 734/19	695/5 728/4 733/20	blamed [1] 772/4	702/8738/12702/9
693/3 693/11 693/23	720/13 732/11 734/19	736/18	blocked [2] 727/2	Briefs [3] 717/12
694/5 697/1 697/2	759/12 776/19	beta [5] 596/11 596/14	735/1	718/15 751/23
697/4 697/5 697/11	belief [2] 585/9 707/15	596/15 655/22 677/16	board [2] 639/25	brilliant [1] 716/19
097713 09977 700/20	believe [66] 536/3	better [5] 547/17	649/3	bring [7] 676/1 696/1
103/0103/23103/4	560/19 560/23 564/16	564/24 564/24 617/20	boardroom [1] 720/20	
707/25 709/3 710/2	577/21 588/6 588/20	682/22	bodyguard [2] 737/8	742/17 746/11
710/2 714/14 714/15	591/8 592/23 592/25	between [25] 528/6	750/11	brings [6] 616/6 622/
714/17 715/2 717/21	595/1 601/6 602/16	553/5 553/10 553/10	bold [1] 567/25	710/25 756/9 767/21
718/19 720/18 720/25 721/7 722/9 732/13	602/18 602/24 604/8	553/11 556/22 594/16	bolstered [1] 722/9	771/15
733/23 734/10 734/10	608/9 608/11 619/20	603/4 603/7 638/19	bonds [1] 753/5	Britain [1] 690/1
734/14 734/17 734/17	621/9 631/23 631/25	641/17 646/3 646/4		broader [1] 538/1
734/18 734/24 735/1	636/24 644/4 644/14	657/4 658/25 668/13	709/16 710/23 710/24	broadly [2] 537/22
736/24 737/8 738/13	645/5 646/13 647/13	674/15 680/6 680/13	779/16 779/16	538/11
741/24 742/11 742/11	647/24 648/3 648/16	687/2 687/12 711/15	books [2] 609/21	brought [11] 553/8
744/14 744/15 746/10	649/7 650/22 651/4	725/5 749/15 760/18	780/10	565/17 576/16 630/18
747/2 752/21 765/4	652/3 652/21 652/23	between February [1]	borne [2] 656/24	699/21 734/3 743/15
765/19 772/1 775/1	656/14 657/8 657/24	646/3	657/3	746/14 747/10 756/23
776/11 777/2 778/14	658/18 671/13 676/25	beyond [5] 653/12	both [37] 541/18	764/8
778/19 780/23	677/13 677/20 678/9	657/12 681/4 727/6	545/13 547/5 552/22	Bucharest [3] 542/13
beet [2] 536/11 537/24	678/14 678/17 679/10	739/18	552/24 552/24 588/5	543/2 770/5
beetroot [2] 536/11	683/8 683/11 692/2	biased [2] 617/22	630/13 637/18 638/1	budget [1] 719/4
536/12	693/3 693/4 694/13 694/15 694/18 694/20	697/18 big [7] 557/5 557/7	642/24 649/18 658/17 659/19 682/12 682/21	build [1] 770/18 Building [1] 530/7
beets [6] 536/9 536/10	094/10/094/10/094/20	big[/] 55//5 55///	009/19/002/12/002/21	Building [1] 550/7
		www.dianaburden.com		

CSID ARB 16 8	
bigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

Zbigniew Plotr Grot et al		Revised		Pages 528-781
В	C-144 [4] 535/25	California [1] 530/7	capabilities [3]	721/6 722/5 723/6
	536/8 536/19 537/21	call [2] 720/5 781/2	625/12 686/4 686/7	727/19 729/10 730/5
	C-145 [1] 535/25	called [8] 553/5	capability [3] 624/25	730/6 732/7 733/20
bullet [1] 660/15	C-31 [1] 763/7	561/11 689/24 702/11	683/3 703/23	734/1 734/3 734/19
Bun [1] 531/12	C-33 [1] 766/1	704/23 758/4 779/18	capable [1] 588/21	735/21 736/16 737/20
burden [3] 529/22	C-42 [1] 765/15	779/18	capacity [2] 671/9	738/5 753/4 753/6
579/16 695/10	C-48 [1] 763/7	calling [1] 540/12	761/10	753/7 758/4 769/1
burnt [1] 560/23	C-94 [7] 535/5 535/10	came [8] 545/20 573/2	Capex [12] 607/11	776/18 779/8 781/5
business [131]	535/11 759/9 759/25	589/21 620/16 640/7	609/3 625/15 626/13	781/10 781/10
563/17 565/1 586/2	777/7 777/12	688/8 739/21 770/6	627/4 627/10 652/19	cases [7] 704/1
588/11 589/24 592/24	C-95 [2] 757/22	can [114] 538/5	652/22 652/25 653/21	707/25 708/3 708/17
593/1 593/20 593/21	776/23	539/23 541/13 547/6	653/23 654/4	711/16 749/13 778/11
594/10 597/6 598/7	c.lindinger [1] 531/9	547/24 549/7 549/20	capital [62] 561/16	cash [28] 589/24
599/3 599/6 602/22	c/o [1] 529/14	549/21 550/19 556/17	562/4 572/9 572/23	590/17 598/21 598/22
603/1 603/2 603/6	Cabinet [1] 529/10	557/1 557/3 560/3	572/25 586/17 586/18	599/12 600/9 600/25
603/10 603/14 615/19	cadastral [6] 729/24	561/24 562/12 567/3	588/2 589/19 590/3	627/3 629/1 629/2
626/23 626/25 627/1	732/17 732/22 760/20	567/4 567/16 567/24	591/3 591/10 596/10	642/1 642/2 642/5
627/5 627/18 627/20	760/24 761/7	572/13 573/9 576/2	596/16 600/6 600/7	642/6 644/21 646/7
629/20 630/21 631/3	cadastrals [1] 729/17	576/11 576/22 580/9	601/5 601/12 601/16	646/9 646/10 646/12
631/17 632/3 634/16	calculate [15] 549/5	582/13 583/18 583/25	601/18 601/18 601/21	646/20 646/25 648/4
636/11 636/15 646/8	549/18 549/20 551/22	586/22 589/20 590/19	601/22 602/4 602/19	648/5 648/19 655/8
646/10 646/11 646/19	553/23 578/15 582/24	592/22 594/20 596/6	603/8 603/10 603/11	674/3 674/5 692/12
647/17 647/18 647/21	583/2 586/9 625/17	597/1 597/11 597/16	603/15 603/16 604/15	cash flow [6] 600/9
647/25 648/12 648/13	628/17 630/10 635/22	597/25 599/2 602/14	610/15 611/3 621/11	600/25 644/21 646/7
649/13 649/15 649/21	644/6 708/14	604/25 607/24 611/6	621/21 622/11 622/15	646/20 674/3
649/23 649/24 650/3	calculated [22] 551/6	614/19 616/13 617/13	622/16 623/8 624/21	cashflows [20]
650/5 650/7 650/11	551/21 552/6 552/7	618/8 618/11 620/5	627/15 628/12 628/17	601/22 641/11 641/21
653/15 653/16 655/16	564/4 564/10 566/25	624/11 625/3 628/15	628/18 628/20 629/1	641/23 646/14 648/2
655/19 656/16 656/17	567/13 569/7 569/10	630/13 633/10 633/19	629/3 630/3 630/4	648/11 654/7 655/13
658/9 658/12 658/13	573/18 585/25 590/8	637/15 637/24 638/16	630/25 631/18 632/1	655/16 656/3 658/7
662/24 663/8 664/14	590/15 600/18 601/16	640/1 640/2 641/13	645/3 648/8 649/4	658/21 679/5 684/8
664/25 669/13 669/17	625/19 625/21 626/17	642/24 642/25 649/11	649/6 652/25 653/14	687/8 687/9 692/2
669/19 669/22 669/24	657/8 658/6 658/21	652/12 659/13 661/12	676/17 677/15 700/11	703/24 741/11
670/4 670/8 681/9	calculating [5] 590/5	672/25 673/3 673/23	756/2	catalogue [3] 577/7
681/21 682/19 682/24	595/13 596/10 622/15	675/16 676/1 676/21	captured [1] 551/25	577/11 577/14
682/25 683/1 683/3	708/10	676/25 677/13 677/21	care [11] 586/7 588/6	catalogue-type [2]
683/4 683/8 683/15	calculation [55] 572/1	683/25 684/6 687/6	591/20 593/14 594/1	577/7 577/11
683/17 683/22 684/5	586/21 589/19 596/14	687/6 688/6 688/18	595/18 597/22 600/4	categories [1] 640/20
684/10 685/14 685/18	596/16 596/18 598/17	689/18 691/13 691/19	601/1 602/18 603/20	category [2] 698/7
685/20 686/10 687/4	598/25 599/1 600/5	691/22 691/24 696/1	career [1] 741/9	765/12
687/5 687/8 687/22	600/17 601/3 601/19	698/20 701/21 705/3	careful [2] 608/17	caterpillar [3] 575/15
688/24 689/1 689/5	623/8 626/13 628/25	705/11 716/2 716/19	718/25	576/12 576/19
689/19 691/23 692/2	633/15 634/18 635/9	716/23 742/14 743/9	carefully [2] 694/23	caterpillars [2] 575/22
692/19 692/21 694/8	642/9 642/20 645/4	744/19 745/25 748/21	694/24	700/11
694/10 694/14 696/11	646/25 647/5 648/8	749/14 749/16 750/18	carried [2] 560/10	cattle [1] 560/13
697/3 697/8 697/9	648/9 649/4 652/22	754/1 754/3 754/8	737/8	cause [3] 735/25
697/11 697/18 698/3	655/9 658/19 661/1	757/16 761/23 772/4	carry [6] 659/15	754/13 754/17
698/10 698/11 699/1	661/14 661/16 662/22	774/14 777/8 778/5	687/24 699/15 754/13	causes [2] 639/19
703/22 703/23 706/4	664/4 667/14 669/21	779/4 780/16	754/17 754/24	655/7
709/17 715/2 720/21	675/22 676/18 679/13	can't [7] 643/2 661/7	case [70] 528/5 545/9	cautious [1] 709/25
720/21 720/22 720/24	686/24 687/1 687/14	668/22 702/23 703/5	575/9 587/15 588/5	caveat [1] 700/15
732/10 732/21 738/17	692/5 692/13 692/25	703/15 706/7	589/3 589/6 591/7	caveats [1] 699/5
740/19 742/4	693/24 694/1 702/7	Canada [2] 529/11	593/8 595/25 599/13	CC [2] 528/15 529/9
businesses [7] 621/1	714/9 714/10 719/2	690/1	600/2 600/16 611/7	cel [1] 531/12
623/4 623/19 624/16	719/15 762/17 771/11	candid [1] 732/5	623/18 644/12 652/12	cent [36] 546/11
625/1 625/5 686/5	calculations [22]	Cann [1] 779/18	654/25 657/14 670/20	547/13 547/17 548/10
businessman [1]	586/13 587/12 603/2	cannot [22] 568/9	672/13 686/3 696/1	548/11 550/1 550/7
588/21	623/17 628/13 628/20	575/14 576/20 593/2	696/16 696/21 702/9	550/18 550/20 551/3
С	633/4 633/12 634/7	593/4 597/19 604/19	702/11 702/21 703/2	551/4 551/5 552/1
	643/6 645/20 649/7	611/19 616/18 623/23	703/3 703/10 703/11	557/10 560/17 588/16
C-033 [1] 767/15	651/5 652/5 652/6	637/3 651/3 652/11	705/19 706/23 708/13	588/20 597/18 629/9
C-034 [1] 767/15	652/13 652/16 660/20	661/13 684/22 705/19	708/25 709/10 712/15	644/3 646/14 647/12
C-105 [1] 766/7	665/25 687/17 692/16	712/25 733/13 741/11	713/17 716/24 719/6	647/16 647/21 647/23
C-142 [1] 535/24	771/13	741/13 742/7 762/4	720/17 720/20 720/22	647/24 652/9 652/11
C-143 [1] 535/25			0, 0, _ 0 0, _ 2	
	1	www.dianaburdan.com		
ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
---	--	---	--	---
c	763/3 765/2 765/7	640/16 640/17 640/25	618/22	colleague [6] 548/19
cent [8] 655/23	challenged [2] 740/24	641/1 641/12 660/7	clear [34] 544/2	567/21 728/20 738/10
660/14 662/19 692/19	765/21	661/7 749/14 749/16	559/18 560/2 589/4	747/24 778/20
692/21 693/22 731/16	challenging [1] 735/12	750/6 765/14 768/4 768/20	590/8 599/11 602/1 606/25 609/23 615/25	colleagues [12] 582/15 688/19 690/3
739/5	Chambers [1] 529/5	Claimant [35] 530/12	617/12 636/16 641/9	715/18 743/10 752/9
central [1] 580/23	chance [6] 632/13	532/3 532/5 532/13	647/1 651/14 657/20	772/10 773/22 774/12
centre [16] 528/2	657/1 712/5 744/16	532/17 532/18 533/25	660/10 666/1 670/11	775/24 779/14 781/3
546/7 547/1 547/4 548/1 548/2 548/23	747/14 777/19	534/24 536/19 539/3	719/3 721/12 722/24	collect [1] 548/7
549/6 549/12 549/17	Chancellery [12]	541/1 541/7 541/10	724/1 724/18 728/12	collective [3] 557/21
549/19 550/19 583/8	733/10 734/2 735/10	571/1 577/15 582/17	729/6 731/21 735/16	755/11 758/12
644/2 671/9 770/20	735/11 735/13 735/22	582/20 659/23 670/4	744/13 745/4 757/2	collectivistic [3]
centres [2] 567/10	735/25 736/2 764/20 765/6 765/7 765/14	691/12 697/19 697/21 702/19 703/1 705/23	757/5 763/19 770/9 clearly [13] 535/14	753/19 753/20 758/8 college [1] 554/9
760/16	change [6] 540/15	712/6 712/10 717/8	583/9 587/24 589/12	collegial [1] 779/6
cereals [1] 566/12	589/19 631/18 655/21	719/24 720/7 720/9	612/22 615/18 650/15	collusion [1] 756/5
certain [28] 563/22 569/8 578/5 579/7	655/22 665/21	749/7 752/4 757/22	666/5 714/13 741/2	Colorado [4] 530/7
611/15 613/12 615/14	changes [7] 556/14	778/18	742/6 742/7 757/8	737/14 750/19 772/25
623/13 624/21 627/5	599/25 601/18 629/2	Claimant's [3] 537/20	cliche [1] 753/4	Colorado Springs [1]
631/4 645/21 681/3	640/3 646/6 692/4	607/21 758/24	client [6] 635/24	772/25
682/6 683/6 685/25	chapter [4] 709/7 780/1 780/1 780/3	Claimants [58] 528/9 530/2 532/7 532/9	661/10 670/2 674/19 684/25 746/5	colour [1] 721/12 combine [1] 576/19
699/16 712/24 712/25	chapters [1] 779/25	537/25 539/7 539/11	clients [2] 553/2 691/5	
713/2 713/15 714/16	character [5] 726/16	579/9 581/17 585/16	climatic [4] 565/14	combines [1] 575/15
715/3 723/6 747/1 753/17 768/12 773/1	732/3 739/23 755/19	587/15 608/5 609/3	565/19 568/8 568/21	come [28] 536/17
certainly [13] 544/16	758/9	613/3 632/16 641/3	close [4] 588/15	557/18 605/3 632/13
546/5 647/15 650/14	characterisation [1]	656/22 658/15 659/16	681/25 693/22 769/5	643/9 646/20 680/16
665/12 665/25 679/16	754/20	660/3 679/11 686/20	closed [1] 781/14	681/11 682/8 682/11
688/7 738/22 740/2	characterise [1] 688/4 cheaper [1] 630/23	695/8 696/10 709/3 719/7 724/13 727/24	closely [2] 542/12 684/1	683/20 684/9 684/13 689/9 692/24 694/9
757/15 775/21 777/15	cheated [1] 753/24	731/16 731/17 733/7	closer [3] 555/9 649/7	695/15 695/19 706/16
certainty [7] 593/10	chernozem [1] 557/11	734/20 735/6 735/16	652/10	708/21 710/7 710/13
609/11 609/13 636/14 687/13 738/21 739/7	cherrypick [1] 677/13	737/11 737/19 737/21	closes [1] 781/12	710/19 711/6 712/3
certificates [1] 587/23	cherrypicking [1]	745/7 753/3 754/12	closing [18] 532/18	719/18 726/5 779/23
certification [1]	677/21	756/7 758/17 759/17	532/19 532/20 638/10	comes [11] 557/18
760/11	chicken [1] 666/14	760/22 761/3 762/6	716/1 717/9 719/21	569/19 574/19 605/6 646/15 653/6 655/14
cetera [6] 569/9 569/9	chief [2] 554/8 638/16 chimney [1] 695/19	765/17 766/8 766/19 767/6 767/18 768/19	720/9 743/5 743/7 752/4 752/7 757/23	691/10 749/13 768/20
701/22 727/4 749/2	Chisinau [1] 531/13	770/19 772/21 774/10	758/17 761/3 761/6	776/16
749/3	abaica [2] 547/7 602/0		773/16 774/17	comfortable [1]
CEX [2] 572/24 762/13 CEX 1 [1] 762/13	736/18	Claimants' [10]	closings [2] 638/2	778/18
CEX-2 [1] 572/24	choose [3] 676/25	670/13 682/22 686/16	718/14	coming [11] 559/5
CFO [1] 634/1	682/18 711/3	686/23 690/19 731/13	co [6] 529/8 530/8	566/6 575/20 577/13
CH [10] 533/13 533/13	chose [1] 767/23 chosen [1] 653/19	760/8 762/17 769/12 771/17	555/1 728/25 738/11 769/5	584/18 611/11 646/12 648/2 685/16 739/11
533/18 533/18 533/18	Christmas [1] 779/15	claimed [10] 581/10	Co-Arbitrators [1]	777/24
533/20 585/20 618/25	CHRISTOPH [1] 531/4	609/3 641/13 641/14	529/8	commence [1] 585/14
762/17 769/22	church [2] 728/4	641/18 641/20 642/7	Co-counsel [1]	commencing [1]
CH-2 [1] 762/17 CH-7 [3] 533/13	755/9	661/12 661/13 697/23	738/11	707/7
533/18 533/18	circulated [1] 769/16	claiming [2] 749/8	co-horse [1] 555/1	comment [18] 557/13
CH-8 [3] 533/13	circumstance [1]	749/10	co-operation [1]	586/3 586/7 586/12
533/18 533/20	736/19 circumstances [6]	claims [1] 756/13 clarification [4]	769/5 co-ordination [1]	588/6 595/18 597/22 603/21 607/24 612/12
CH-9 [3] 585/20	678/23 682/18 705/2	551/17 756/19 760/17	728/25	631/24 637/3 647/2
618/25 769/22	705/6 705/13 708/16	775/16	cockups [1] 780/7	668/16 709/8 709/10
chair [4] 585/3 639/4 740/16 740/17	circumvent [1] 658/23	clarified [6] 579/5	collaborate [2] 674/20	
Chairman [5] 552/21	cited [3] 582/5 617/10	606/6 744/14 752/24	675/4	commenting [1]
556/16 696/15 696/23	617/11	761/9 767/25	collaborating [1]	539/11
751/24	city [4] 730/8 730/12	clarify [5] 606/19	603/19	comments [3] 618/19
Chairman said [1]	755/22 762/12 City Hall [1] 755/22	613/15 633/7 682/23 757/19	collaboration [10] 592/21 604/1 604/5	639/25 649/4 commercial [1]
751/24	civil [5] 727/9 749/1	classified [1] 666/17	769/9 769/12 769/18	623/24
chairs [3] 691/8 691/9	755/12 766/22 766/24	classify [1] 588/10	769/24 770/9 770/16	Commissariat [1]
758/5 challenge [4] 736/2	claim [15] 582/3 608/6		771/13	765/9
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
C	757/11	complicated [2]	634/20 662/18 712/25	consultants [1]
Commission [1]	company's [2] 678/19	708/18 720/22	759/3	697/12
566/22	678/20	component [1] 591/5	confirmation [2]	consulted [1] 588/23
commit [1] 649/19	comparable [34]	computer [1] 580/8	760/14 776/24	consulting [1] 647/18
committed [1] 752/17	597/20 621/3 621/5	concede [2] 670/7	confirmed [12] 723/9	contact [2] 634/3
commodities [3]	621/7 621/14 622/10	678/6	723/11 756/10 759/15	728/20
651/18 712/17 713/4	623/14 628/14 629/8 635/2 642/18 642/22	concentrating [1] 773/18	760/8 760/11 762/20 767/1 767/8 768/12	contain [1] 755/23
commodity [2] 709/22	642/25 643/1 643/2		769/8 770/1	contained [2] 558/5 762/14
713/20	653/19 653/20 675/24	concern [6] 582/21 627/1 643/11 653/2	confirming [1] 680/22	contains [2] 669/1
common [9] 546/20	676/8 676/12 676/21	709/18 722/15	confirms [1] 546/18	770/14
546/21 546/22 599/17	676/24 677/1 677/11	concerned [1] 763/22	conflict [1] 543/11	contemporaneous [3]
599/22 599/23 763/14	677/12 677/14 677/16	concerning [23] 536/1		649/13 669/22 699/8
767/9 777/16	677/17 677/19 678/2	546/23 615/9 724/22	conflicts [1] 598/12	content [3] 558/7
commonality [1]	678/3 678/6 682/15	725/7 728/23 729/9	confuse [1] 586/17	726/9 745/10
776/2	689/17	729/14 729/17 731/18	confused [4] 562/14	contents [2] 539/21
commonly [1] 551/6	comparative [1] 667/1	733/1 734/1 735/2	630/8 672/9 672/11	745/22
communicate [2]	comparator [1]	735/8 735/8 736/6	confusion [2] 665/17	context [17] 536/24
534/5 542/2	629/10	737/23 744/18 745/10	777/13	537/24 603/1 697/16
communicated [3] 725/16 726/1 764/16	compare [4] 567/25	748/24 774/20 774/25	conjunction [2]	724/24 729/18 729/18
communication [2]	621/19 642/22 653/18	775/5	641/21 661/13	730/14 731/10 732/1
638/25 639/1	compared [7] 550/1	concerns [7] 536/9	conscience [1] 585/8	732/7 732/19 733/12
communications [1]	566/4 624/15 653/25	625/15 627/15 641/1	consensual [1]	734/8 734/22 735/19
534/8	677/3 704/17 739/3	654/24 722/5 731/7	780/24	746/5
community [5] 546/17	comparing [4] 546/25	conclude [3] 621/13	consensus [1] 539/14	continuation [1]
739/16 755/6 779/21	547/3 696/17 780/4	738/6 771/12	consequence [3]	541/2
780/22	comparison [5]	concluded [3] 590/3	655/14 655/15 700/8	continue [10] 533/8
companies [56] 581/3	596/17 622/2 634/22	702/17 731/15	conservative [6]	556/15 595/10 601/5
581/4 587/25 593/18	034/24 077/22	concludes [1] 773/23	563/25 586/16 636/10	608/16 692/24 738/7
596/5 596/7 596/9	compensate [3] 703/1 706/13 744/6	concluding [2] 715/9 772/10	637/7 656/9 694/12 consider [13] 544/23	755/2 767/24 780/25 continued [5] 532/2
596/14 596/23 596/25	compensated [4]	conclusion [4] 547/23		533/2 692/4 744/6
597/21 597/21 597/23	657/6 662/15 747/18	548/8 625/4 771/15	621/14 621/22 642/25	779/9
598/3 598/5 599/24	747/20	conclusions [1]	654/18 667/18 677/12	continues [2] 693/10
621/10 621/14 621/19	compensation [4]	632/21	678/22 679/4 702/25	747/17
621/22 621/25 622/5	693/12 743/1 748/13	conclusions as [1]	consideration [14]	contract [3] 551/25
622/9 622/19 623/7	749/18	632/21	582/23 583/12 583/17	761/2 761/11
623/14 628/14 629/8	competence [1]	conclusory [1] 632/19		contracted [1] 771/21
634/23 635/2 642/19 642/19 642/22 642/23	755/15	concur [1] 614/20	612/1 612/4 637/7	contracts [6] 552/11
642/25 653/20 653/21	competent [3] 575/10	concurs [1] 761/23	679/2 725/6 733/22	636/18 645/19 684/11
653/25 655/14 675/20	767/7 771/20	conditions [9] 549/25	746/19 747/21	759/16 766/13
675/22 675/25 676/8	competitor [4] 723/9	564/23 565/14 565/19	considerations [1]	contradicted [1]
676/13 676/14 676/20	725/21 726/23 767/20	568/8 581/15 583/12	698/9	695/12
676/23 677/5 677/11	competitors' [1]	584/6 780/14	considered [11]	contradiction [2]
677/12 677/23 678/2	723/25	conduct [7] 722/13	533/19 613/10 627/9	556/22 628/10
678/3 678/7 678/12	complaint [1] 728/24	729/12 734/21 750/17	642/18 656/6 656/7	contradicts [2] 556/4
713/12	complaints [1] 759/10		671/8 676/12 676/13	769/21
company [50] 553/5	complete [6] 544/6	conducted [1] 547/22	678/3 713/10	contrast [1] 593/14
561/6 561/11 561/13	600/23 601/21 713/16 734/21 743/3	conducting [3] 592/24 739/25 779/8	considering [3] 588/9 677/19 726/18	contrasted [1] 696/18 contributed [4]
561/15 561/19 561/20	completed [1] 652/16	confer [7] 538/5	considers [2] 677/10	587/11 610/14 611/2
561/21 561/22 562/8	completely [11] 534/2	577/23 712/8 747/23	703/8	611/17
562/10 581/11 587/11	540/5 556/4 566/15	774/11 774/14 775/23	consistency [1] 594/4	
588/19 594/17 603/12	620/4 624/18 630/20	conferred [3] 538/6	consistent [2] 594/10	611/21 745/21
605/14 610/14 612/10	683/12 684/19 715/15	775/25 779/13	624/13	contributions [1]
613/9 617/21 627/25	716/14	confess [1] 537/14	consistently [1]	768/22
630/2 630/18 630/25	completeness [1]	confident [1] 551/8	736/23	control [10] 607/22
633/25 648/18 648/21	613/6	confirm [23] 541/20	conspiracy [6] 756/5	608/2 615/12 641/3
662/14 668/14 673/18	completes [1] 752/4	542/25 543/10 544/5	756/8 756/9 756/12	641/6 661/10 700/10
673/21 676/23 678/19	complex [1] 763/13	544/21 544/22 545/4	757/16 757/16	743/21 762/21 763/1

544/21 544/22 545/4

584/2 607/20 613/12

627/16 627/21 628/1

628/9 628/15 633/14

546/1 548/9 573/9

757/16 757/16

constantly [1] 570/10

constitute [1] 544/24

constructed [1] 697/8

743/21 762/21 763/1

537/24 715/19 729/16

conversation [4]

763/16

consultancy [1] 555/6 conversations [2]

678/22 678/23 678/24

679/1 683/15 685/19

713/15 743/24 744/6

744/20 744/23 744/25

749/16 749/17 749/20

complex [1] 763/13

complexity [1] 683/24

compliant [1] 762/12

complexities [1]

712/25

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 528-781
С	570/10 570/17 571/15	695/18 696/22 698/17	530/5	CUSNIR [1] 531/10
conversations [2]	572/2 572/4 572/9	703/17 704/20 705/7	create [3] 542/17	custom [1] 587/9
723/11 746/4	573/11 573/22 591/3	707/11 707/19 708/8	704/9 761/20	customary [2] 614/4
converted [4] 569/22	591/9 595/8 596/1	727/13 729/5 737/9	created [3] 674/2	759/14
569/24 571/17 651/9	596/10 596/16 598/6	739/14 739/22 739/25	694/21 769/4	customs [2] 609/9
convince [2] 690/3	599/20 600/1 600/20	742/10 744/14 745/3	creates [2] 598/22	723/21
771/14	602/19 607/10 621/11	746/10 758/20 759/3	711/14	cut [1] 579/7
convinced [4] 555/11	622/11 622/15 623/8	762/6 765/19 768/5	credibility [5] 594/21	cut-off [1] 579/7
690/6 698/8 756/22	630/3 630/24 632/1	770/19 772/14 776/25	675/2 686/6 686/11	CWS [1] 773/1
	654/13 656/15 656/16	777/9	715/3	CWS-11 [1] 773/1
convincing [1] 710/17 copies [4] 533/17	670/15 670/21 670/25	council [1] 759/15	credible [6] 677/24	cynical [1] 680/25
535/18 587/22 727/12	673/2 676/17 684/8	counsel [13] 533/16	678/1 708/24 740/15	
coping [1] 572/17	693/16 701/8 701/9	539/7 637/2 686/16	741/3 741/4	<u>D</u>
copy [9] 570/3 593/3	701/10 701/19 701/22	686/23 691/2 715/20	credit [1] 780/21	damage [8] 662/14
593/4 607/4 618/6	701/23 742/11 774/6	716/6 738/11 762/6	Creek [1] 702/12	681/12 682/11 702/7
618/12 618/13 618/23	778/4	765/1 766/12 769/12	cricketing [1] 704/23	708/21 719/2 768/19
619/6	costly [2] 656/18	counsel's [1] 758/6	criticised [1] 622/24	773/4
COREN [1] 530/4	693/2	count [1] 613/8	criticism [2] 590/2	damages [47] 585/25
	costs [74] 569/3 569/8	counter [1] 748/1	653/19	586/1 587/14 588/4
coren.hinkle [1] 530/10	571/19 572/11 572/21	counting [1] 762/19	criticisms [1] 676/11	589/6 590/16 590/20
CORINA [1] 529/24	573/1 573/21 575/20	countries [7] 558/2	critique [3] 609/22	616/5 635/13 635/22
	578/16 586/6 591/7	558/2 593/19 597/24	614/5 699/14	640/18 640/21 641/12
corn [4] 550/18 550/21 567/9 567/16	592/12 593/25 595/14	634/23 634/23 736/16	Croatia [1] 597/25	642/11 648/23 655/17
corporation [1]	595/16 595/19 595/24	country [16] 564/1	crop [4] 538/9 567/23	658/20 669/21 674/6
661/17	596/20 600/21 602/6	593/3 593/5 634/13	594/6 594/14	682/9 682/14 682/15
correct [42] 542/13	605/12 617/25 618/2	634/15 689/24 690/2	crops [20] 537/17	687/3 692/13 692/14
542/22 549/14 553/14	618/9 619/18 619/21	700/19 704/4 707/15	547/14 549/25 551/1	693/15 694/14 702/18
563/17 565/4 568/5	620/6 620/10 620/23	731/3 739/15 740/1	555/19 555/21 557/7	703/3 708/10 708/14
570/20 570/21 578/10	620/24 629/25 633/5	750/15 758/18 770/5	558/4 558/20 564/3	708/20 708/24 709/7
589/7 590/23 590/24	633/13 633/16 634/8	couple [9] 533/11	564/4 564/10 567/8	709/12 710/8 717/22
602/19 606/23 607/2	639/19 647/22 650/11	535/2 567/21 568/25	567/13 568/12 574/24	749/8 749/9 749/12
610/2 610/3 610/4	651/22 651/25 652/3	602/17 616/15 638/21	646/19 714/14 714/16	749/14 749/23 750/6
613/20 616/8 622/25	654/18 671/19 671/25	688/13 696/25	714/18	772/22 772/23 775/3
628/10 628/25 640/14	673/12 673/15 674/15	course [37] 535/20	cross [18] 532/8	775/5
655/25 660/4 663/11	675/23 676/10 692/6	538/25 542/7 542/11	532/13 533/8 541/3	DAN [1] 530/17
663/12 663/15 664/4	693/6 693/9 694/3	544/11 544/15 545/16	587/9 605/20 637/16	dangers [1] 780/2
665/3 665/5 667/22	695/4 703/20 703/21	549/2 549/21 553/21	638/7 638/19 659/16	DANIELA [1] 529/24
667/23 670/23 672/14	705/16 705/22 706/1	554/2 555/3 570/3	659/23 679/12 686/3	data [38] 546/18 547/8
686/15 692/1 719/9	711/1 741/11 742/9	571/8 576/21 583/13	691/10 691/11 766/19	551/24 552/15 559/4
758/16 762/22	742/12 774/20 775/7	584/7 601/8 609/5	780/2 780/3	559/4 559/16 566/5 566/5 566/6 566/8
corrected [2] 628/7	775/12 775/13 775/17	619/1 645/17 661/9	cross-examination	566/9 566/21 567/6
666/7	775/17 776/5 776/7	672/18 676/17 681/23	[14] 532/8 532/13	
correction [4] 545/6	776/11 776/13 778/21	682/1 682/21 688/15	533/8 541/3 605/20	567/9 581/6 581/7 595/22 600/10 603/24
666/1 666/9 666/10	could [89] 535/9	691/11 704/14 709/13	659/16 659/23 679/12 686/3 691/10 691/11	604/2 622/8 622/17
corrections [2] 628/6	538/4 540/15 542/14	719/19 729/2 730/11		623/22 625/9 628/16
665/24	547/12 548/2 548/6 556/25 561/1 563/1	740/6 748/18 760/17	766/19 780/2 780/3 cross-referenced [1]	628/17 635/4 667/1
correctly [6] 576/22	564/2 564/15 564/18	court [24] 529/21 637/21 638/9 724/22	587/9	668/25 712/18 740/9
590/7 625/17 655/20	565/3 569/1 569/3	727/16 734/6 735/4	crosschecked [1]	740/15 769/25 770/3
758/4 759/6	572/7 573/22 573/22	736/3 736/14 737/16	609/8	770/6 770/7 770/11
Correia [1] 529/14	581/10 585/5 585/18	749/1 754/6 754/9	crystallisation [1]	date [36] 544/13
correlate [1] 671/25	590/12 591/1 595/9	759/24 763/4 765/21	716/22	589/10 589/11 589/25
correlated [1] 595/25	598/24 599/16 601/11	766/7 766/10 766/18	cultivated [1] 685/6	592/3 592/8 592/8
correlation [5] 671/19	607/20 610/25 613/15	766/21 766/24 767/5	cultural [3] 728/6	592/9 592/18 611/24
673/6 673/8 673/11	614/9 614/24 617/15	780/13 781/6	779/21 779/23	612/5 612/22 612/22
674/15	618/23 619/16 624/1	courts [6] 733/9	culture [1] 779/22	616/19 627/24 631/15
corroborate [2]	628/1 636/7 639/9	733/18 767/7 767/10	cured [1] 602/3	646/2 649/16 650/1
675/13 756/18	642/3 651/9 651/10	767/10 768/6	curious [4] 577/8	650/22 651/8 657/2
corroborating [1]	658/5 660/7 660/24	courts' [1] 767/1	708/3 722/24 725/6	657/4 657/5 663/25
758/14	669/2 670/25 673/20	covered [2] 564/9	currency [1] 709/21	664/2 664/3 664/10
Cosernita [9] 578/20	674/14 674/19 679/8	609/2	current [3] 560/25	664/10 664/18 683/18
579/24 589/13 727/1	688/25 691/4 692/5	covers [1] 778/10	589/20 629/20	684/10 723/6 745/17
727/3 727/16 762/11	692/23 694/5 694/20	cows [1] 560/12	currently [4] 556/7	753/10 778/3
765/25 766/9	CONDE COEVE COEVE	CRACIUNEANU [1]	640/23 683/15 693/7	dated [4] 592/16
cost [48] 569/19 570/7				
		www.dianaburden.com	1	l

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

		Revised		1 4965 626 761
D	596/15 603/12 603/16	deliberately [1] 627/7	598/20 625/3	598/18 600/17 605/24
dated [3] 659/8	629/9 629/25 630/2	deliberation [1]	derived [6] 592/12	608/1 609/4 610/5
659/10 709/13	630/11 630/23 631/13	777/18	596/7 597/19 600/10	613/3 614/1 616/20
dates [2] 579/7 657/4	631/15 631/16 655/21	deliberations [1]	651/17 671/23	616/21 620/24 621/19
day [66] 535/20	656/17 677/18 741/21	698/24	deriving [2] 621/21	622/13 623/2 623/3
597/20 622/3 637/1	debt/market [1] 629/9	delivered [2] 697/19	628/22	623/6 624/4 624/6
691/17 726/21 751/22	debt:equity [2] 629/8	715/5	describe [9] 565/2	628/19 628/25 631/10
753/20 753/22 753/23	655/6	Deloitte [51] 530/18	565/2 594/1 598/25	635/8 635/16 648/9
753/24 755/10 755/16	debts [1] 655/10	542/13 542/19 542/20	599/16 600/4 601/1	654/3 656/5 661/22
755/19 755/23 756/20	decades [2] 588/25	543/1 552/15 562/23	603/23 633/10	661/24 664/14 665/19
756/24 757/7 757/13	593/8	596/10 607/15 613/18	described [10] 563/8	669/7 670/23 672/15
	December [5] 528/21	617/16 639/21 641/4	575/21 723/20 726/12	674/11 674/19 674/23
758/19 758/21 758/23	533/1 659/10 730/20	642/12 642/15 642/17	732/3 736/21 736/25	675/11 675/22 676/8
758/25 759/2 759/4 759/8 760/10 760/12	737/2	643/6 645/20 646/1	737/13 740/2 773/1	679/21 682/12 682/18
	decency [1] 534/25	647/3 647/4 647/8	description [2] 559/2	687/22 690/21 694/11
761/1 761/2 761/11 761/13 761/18 761/19	decent [1] 706/24	648/9 648/17 650/13	583/4	699/16 717/24 725/17
	decide [7] 636/5 689/4	650/17 652/21 653/19	Desert [1] 749/25	734/1 735/12 736/20
761/21 761/24 762/1	689/11 710/18 711/3	653/22 654/3 654/10	deserved [1] 771/23	742/16 744/5 751/11
762/2 762/5 762/23	748/18 774/3	655/20 656/1 656/5	desire [2] 716/3 748/6	756/17 757/10 757/12
763/4 763/15 763/18	decided [3] 710/3	656/12 663/7 664/2	desk [1] 619/13	760/7 763/23 767/2
763/21 764/2 764/10	753/7 757/3	669/21 669/23 670/2	desperate [1] 715/24	767/24
764/14 764/17 765/2	decides [1] 673/2	675/20 676/7 677/10	despite [8] 672/22	didn't [20] 534/13
765/11 766/19 767/3	decision [16] 536/18	678/2 692/16 714/9	674/13 737/16 740/17	534/17 536/9 555/3
767/10 767/13 767/25	538/5 538/8 538/14	768/25 769/7 769/12	756/18 762/7 766/17	555/4 559/21 565/15
768/2 768/6 768/9	538/20 655/18 710/7	770/6 770/10	771/12	566/14 620/7 620/8
768/14 769/7 769/10	710/19 711/5 727/17	Deloitte's [10] 595/17	destroyed [1] 721/9	620/11 625/8 648/10
769/14 769/20 770/3	729/9 733/24 736/10	640/4 649/3 655/8	destruction [3] 722/6	648/10 678/16 680/8
770/5 770/7	749/25 766/21 767/2	768/24 769/2 769/22	738/15 741/22	698/13 740/13 750/2
Day 1 [9] 753/23	decisions [1] 755/22	770/12 770/13 771/13	detail [7] 663/5 694/18	
756/20 756/24 757/7	declaration [3] 585/6	Deloittes [1] 646/16	722/4 724/12 725/14	diesel [1] 572/11
757/13 758/19 758/21	639/7 639/10	demand [2] 713/16	729/2 736/21	difference [11] 592/10
759/8 761/1	declaratory [1] 761/17	714/1	detailed [3] 616/10	594/16 594/19 594/21
days [10] 600/19	declare [1] 585/7	demonstrated [1]	616/14 776/6	641/16 646/3 648/24
600/22 628/24 638/21	declared [2] 550/12	723/5	details [4] 575/12	676/16 680/5 687/1
674/23 675/1 688/13	665/4	demonstrative [1]	587/16 678/19 746/23	754/11
716/18 720/19 722/11	declares [1] 665/14	731/15	determine [3] 547/20	differences [5] 553/5
DCF [44] 589/3 589/18	decrease [1] 630/25	Denmark [1] 598/1	703/17 708/24	553/9 605/16 679/13
590/5 601/19 624/14	decreased [2] 560/13	denominated [2]	determined [2] 683/2	725/5
626/12 634/18 635/9	779/17	586/24 651/12	703/23	different [28] 537/18
636/13 642/9 644/18	deduct [1] 598/18	Denver [1] 530/8	determining [4]	555/11 555/14 556/11
645/4 646/6 661/14	deducted [1] 599/4	depend [1] 570/8	642/20 677/14 677/16	570/14 574/16 574/16
664/4 681/13 681/24	deemed [1] 717/19	dependent [1] 661/16	677/17	574/23 576/7 593/19
682/13 682/19 686/17	deems [1] 775/3		developed [1] 623/20	593/20 593/21 598/4
686/21 686/23 686/25	deep [2] 656/4 715/13	depends [4] 570/22	developed [1] 023/20 developing [1] 554/19	
689/17 692/25 693/24	deeply [1] 780/14	593/2 675/11 708/12	deviation [2] 597/15	629/18 646/1 646/2
693/25 694/20 694/21	defect [1] 772/15	deploy [1] 653/5	749/15	679/25 680/2 681/11
701/3 701/5 702/5	defend [2] 602/18	deployment [1] 653/8	devices [2] 653/12	685/10 709/12 709/15
703/5 703/15 705/14	764/14	depreciate [1] 627/4	739/2	725/3 730/5 770/5
706/14 706/20 708/21	defer [3] 754/25	depreciated [1]	DIANA [1] 529/22	differentiation [1]
709/18 710/11 710/22	774/21 775/8	615/16	did [105] 534/5 534/10	760/18
718/21 719/15 768/25	defied [1] 739/18	depreciating [1] 572/9		difficult [5] 634/12
DCF based [1] 694/21	define [1] 694/14	depreciation [16]	542/17 544/12 545/18	644/19 649/18 691/6
de [2] 529/14 713/20	defined [1] 739/16	598/20 625/15 625/18	548/4 549/5 549/18	713/1
de-risked [1] 713/20	definitely [5] 623/18	625/19 625/22 626/2	549/19 550/6 551/4	difficulties [3] 565/18
deadline [1] 765/6	703/3 705/19 708/11	626/3 626/8 626/8	551/22 552/12 552/13	637/15 639/18
deal [4] 571/7 640/6	732/21	626/17 626/18 626/20	554/2 554/7 555/23	difficulty [4] 579/23
707/16 713/25	degree [4] 683/21	627/9 654/10 654/14	562/16 565/18 566/17	642/17 649/12 711/14
dealing [6] 570/11	685/10 685/25 773/6	701/25	566/19 567/15 568/17	digits [1] 775/21
713/24 714/2 714/5	delay [2] 707/7 735/2	depression [2] 750/24		diligence [2] 697/21
747/5 780/5	delayed [1] 701/15	751/3	575/6 575/13 575/23	698/4
dealt [2] 640/5 747/3	delays [1] 736/14	deprive [1] 726/3	575/24 577/5 578/19	diminish [1] 572/21
Dean [1] 555/7	delegation [1] 764/22	depriving [1] 705/23	578/24 579/8 579/14	diminish the [1]
death [1] 773/4	deletion [2] 684/16	deputy [1] 554/12	583/16 586/15 587/1	572/21
debilities [1] 655/9	763/12	derive [3] 594/11	595/7 596/17 598/17	Dimtri [1] 564/13
debt [16] 596/11				
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
D	633/3 675/6	554/3 554/4 556/6	709/14 745/5 745/6	664/22 664/24 669/4
direct [18] 533/9	diseases [1] 550/22	557/14 561/6 561/9	745/7 745/10 745/14	670/1 670/3 671/21
591/12 600/21 614/1	dismissed [1] 740/22	561/17 562/7 568/7	745/25 759/4	673/22 673/24 674/18
620/23 621/22 626/13	displayed [3] 580/5	571/2 571/18 571/20	documentary [1]	675/10 676/20 676/25
637/12 638/6 638/19	611/11 612/12	574/14 574/19 575/6	566/21	677/12 677/20 680/7
659/17 671/18 679/18	disposal [1] 693/13 disposed [1] 693/11	575/18 576/24 577/15 577/17 579/8 580/2	documentation [2] 588/14 633/20	681/4 682/1 689/3 689/12 689/21 689/21
686/3 694/2 753/10	disposition [17]	580/3 580/13 580/14	documented [1]	691/1 692/1 692/9
757/15 766/16	723/24 725/2 725/13	580/15 583/4 583/11	698/11	694/18 694/20 694/25
directed [1] 732/18	734/2 735/12 736/3	584/12 585/23 587/15	documents [14]	696/8 703/19 705/7
direction [5] 565/9	736/4 736/7 763/7	587/18 594/15 597/3	533/14 535/25 587/10	714/2 717/13 718/18
709/9 716/21 716/21	763/8 763/9 764/16	598/5 604/18 604/22	587/22 609/9 609/10	744/17 745/15 746/22
717/1	765/4 766/11 766/15	606/18 608/8 611/1	610/5 619/8 631/4	754/24 774/2 776/14
directly [11] 538/10 595/24 596/2 597/20	766/18 767/2	611/4 613/8 613/8	640/9 725/5 725/8	776/17 776/19 779/20
658/16 658/23 673/3	Disposition 1-A [10]	613/9 614/25 616/20	746/11 757/17	done [42] 544/17
714/16 731/23 732/21	734/2 735/12 736/3	618/4 619/6 619/7	does [59] 537/15	551/12 553/1 554/18
769/21	736/4 736/7 763/7	621/13 621/18 622/4	537/16 537/21 537/21	560/3 563/11 569/6
director [2] 554/12	764/16 765/4 766/18	623/2 623/4 623/14	537/22 538/1 542/1	571/25 597/8 606/5
613/22	767/2	623/24 624/4 624/12	548/11 548/24 549/6	617/15 622/1 622/10
disagree [3] 621/16	Disposition 2 [1]	626/25 629/16 629/16	549/12 549/17 550/22	627/8 631/3 636/9
621/17 621/18	763/8 dispositions [36]	630/12 630/16 631/1 633/6 634/12 637/11	569/18 572/12 576/13 583/20 590/22 594/22	638/16 639/16 648/17 651/4 658/6 658/8
disagreements [1]	720/1 723/16 724/4	637/21 639/6 639/8	583/20 590/22 594/22 596/22 596/22 597/5 601/17	673/9 677/6 678/6
598/13	720/1723/10724/4	639/18 640/7 647/8	605/3 612/17 620/5	679/9 681/17 683/9
disappeared [3]	725/3 725/15 725/18	652/11 652/21 654/23	623/16 624/8 628/6	688/1 694/5 694/7
560/12 700/8 700/22	725/23 725/24 726/2	655/15 658/20 660/10	628/8 630/11 631/14	697/7 698/4 699/3
disappearing [1]	726/3 726/8 726/10	661/18 661/20 663/2	647/3 647/8 656/2	699/10 701/18 715/14
657/1	726/12 726/14 727/13	663/4 663/23 666/21	660/10 673/21 692/21	715/16 726/8 732/19
disappears [1] 708/1 disc [1] 611/15	729/11 734/12 734/25	666/23 668/18 668/24	698/6 699/12 704/22	756/16 778/11
disclosed [1] 654/10	735/3 735/8 761/15	670/6 671/16 671/22	705/13 706/1 707/3	donkey [1] 689/10
discount [7] 601/3	762/8 762/10 763/11	671/24 672/8 674/1	714/21 719/4 737/25	door [1] 555/15
602/20 649/2 651/7	763/13 763/22 764/5	675/1 677/13 678/6	739/5 742/13 756/4	doors [1] 720/13
654/21 655/24 709/21	764/8 764/13 764/19	678/17 681/20 687/7	756/5 760/8 761/20	dosage [1] 533/19
discounted [10]	764/25 765/2 765/19	689/22 690/9 691/21	761/21 761/25 762/16	dossier [1] 716/15
590/17 598/21 600/9	disproportionately [1] 685/13	691/21 695/17 695/18 696/2 698/19 699/8	763/2 764/21 778/8 778/21	doubt [3] 615/7 621/2 771/22
642/2 642/6 646/25	disputable [1] 632/6	702/23 702/25 703/4	doesn't [7] 608/21	dovetailed [1] 777/23
651/7 655/8 674/3	dispute [10] 660/6	703/5 703/21 704/8	631/13 654/8 710/20	down [6] 572/12
674/5	668/8 668/12 668/19	704/9 704/12 704/16	716/20 747/6 759/22	616/7 633/18 647/23
discounting [3] 646/1	668/21 669/8 669/10	705/7 706/12 707/4	doing [10] 555/13	695/18 749/13
646/6 648/17	693/9 745/9 752/20	708/11 708/17 711/21	623/12 632/3 639/17	downside [1] 704/14
discover [1] 538/17 discovered [1] 601/2	disputed [3] 641/7	711/22 712/4 713/4	687/2 702/4 703/25	downward [1] 600/24
discs [1] 575/17	745/8 745/23	715/12 715/14 716/15	711/16 757/6 779/22	Dr [7] 528/16 529/13
discuss [13] 591/16	disputes [3] 528/3	717/8 718/10 718/10	dollar [3] 691/14	605/21 750/19 769/3
592/20 615/1 675/19	553/10 767/8	719/20 720/5 720/17	691/19 691/22	769/4 772/25
701/21 721/18 721/19	district [9] 566/2	723/5 727/8 728/5	domain [2] 582/9	Dr Gumovschi [1]
721/23 737/4 751/24	567/11 593/4 607/16	728/8 728/9 729/7	760/19	769/4
773/12 773/24 774/4	723/12 728/14 739/20	730/6 732/12 743/23	don't [91] 534/15	Dr Rurac [1] 769/3
discussed [18] 534/7	758/16 766/7	747/9 747/13 749/3 751/10 753/1 753/3	551/18 561/15 561/25	Dr Wiechen [1] 605/21
535/23 536/4 538/19	districts [2] 566/11 566/23	754/10 754/10 759/20	562/3 562/11 563/2 563/3 573/13 573/16	Dr Zbylski [1] 750/19
539/7 593/9 593/9	ditches [1] 560/14	759/20 771/13 773/13	574/18 575/3 575/15	Dr Zyblski [1] 772/25
617/18 620/14 647/7	divide [1] 772/19	773/15 774/8 775/14	576/12 577/21 578/17	draft [1] 709/4
654/21 681/7 722/10	divided [1] 557/22	776/5 776/5 776/20	580/7 581/7 582/14	drafted [1] 759/2
725/11 725/14 727/25	dividends [1] 648/19	778/6 781/8	590/1 599/9 601/4	dramatic [1] 717/21
729/1 750/9 discussing [4] 536/21	divisions [4] 647/19	document [33] 538/13		draw [1] 548/8
596/23 614/22 660/2	658/9 662/24 720/21	538/25 539/19 539/25	609/25 610/20 611/9	dream [13] 682/1
discussion [12]	do [183] 534/20	540/22 540/23 569/23	613/16 615/16 618/13	682/1 688/4 688/5
631/25 632/2 642/14	537/15 540/19 541/15	570/25 571/4 571/9	621/16 622/6 622/21	688/12 691/14 691/15
652/18 658/2 709/11	541/15 541/18 541/22	571/10 610/19 610/21	629/21 632/24 642/23	740/2 740/3 740/5
712/14 721/8 741/6	542/24 543/13 543/15	610/23 611/6 611/20	644/13 644/19 647/2	740/6 742/14 742/15
741/10 741/14 775/2	543/23 544/9 545/1 545/10 545/22 548/18	611/25 612/16 659/6 659/10 661/17 661/19	647/23 648/16 652/14 652/15 652/20 652/22	drinkable [1] 560/18
discussions [5]	545/10 545/22 548/18 550/5 552/5 553/13	709/2 709/3 709/6	657/24 658/18 660/22	driven [1] 714/1 dropped [1] 640/25
540/17 588/24 607/18	0000 00210 000/10	10312 10313 10310	001/24 000/10 000/22	
L		www.dianaburdon.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
D	economists [1] 689/8	engage [4] 574/3	582/1 582/4 582/11	618/20 620/20 620/24
drops [1] 647/23	economy [1] 739/17	574/23 700/9 749/6	587/4 587/10 587/20	623/19 623/20 681/9
drought [20] 565/10	educated [2] 600/14	engaged [1] 603/6	587/25 588/1 604/17	esteemed [1] 752/9
565/12 565/17 565/22	682/3	engagement [1] 702/7	607/17 607/25 613/7	estimate [8] 626/2
566/2 566/4 566/11	effect [4] 568/8	English [19] 537/2	613/13 613/18 614/8	643/16 645/15 667/17
566/18 568/11 568/19	761/15 765/20 773/8	542/1 542/2 542/6	626/16 627/6 633/5	667/20 676/21 682/9
582/23 583/12 583/15	effective [4] 649/24 725/25 726/7 735/5	542/10 543/5 543/8 544/20 545/20 545/24	634/8 653/7 660/2	684/9 estimated [2] 617/25
583/17 583/20 583/23	effectively [4] 606/1	546/9 546/16 547/7	660/6 660/8 660/23 673/19 700/11 701/23	677/4
584/6 584/9 584/10	650/5 718/21 771/25	562/15 562/16 562/18	705/16 707/18 707/22	estimates [2] 651/21
584/12	effects [2] 568/11	562/24 567/7 704/23	707/25 708/1 708/2	697/17
droughty [2] 568/21	750/15	enhanced [1] 675/3	708/4 714/15 723/23	estimation [2] 629/7
583/15	efficiency [3] 659/4	enjoy [3] 533/5 584/19		733/20
dry [1] 566/13	752/6 775/7	755/8	743/15 743/22 744/4	et [6] 569/9 569/9
Du [1] 779/18	efficient [3] 637/18	enough [7] 547/24	744/11 744/23 744/25	701/22 727/4 749/2
Du Cann [1] 779/18 due [13] 538/25 558/4	637/23 773/18	547/25 573/10 573/11	745/23 746/16 746/22	749/3
570/3 571/8 588/11	efficiently [1] 767/16	735/20 747/23 776/22	746/25 747/18 748/8	et cetera [6] 569/9
618/15 622/13 681/7	efforts [3] 742/5	ensure [1] 587/10	748/25 771/7 775/1	569/9 701/22 727/4
683/13 697/21 698/4	748/15 749/6	entered [2] 533/23	equipments [1] 573/8	749/2 749/3
719/18 748/18	egg [1] 666/14	764/16	equity [29] 596/11	eternity [1] 627/2
duly [1] 765/2	eight [1] 768/16	enterprise [3] 564/19	596/15 603/11 603/17	Europe [2] 558/1
duration [2] 636/5	either [12] 547/6	599/18 611/18	627/18 627/21 627/22	565/23
751/19	559/1 587/24 642/24	entertaining [1] 780/9		Europlant [1] 553/6
during [11] 560/9	676/20 677/10 689/22	entire [7] 601/23 628/3 651/3 683/14	629/20 629/23 629/25	evaluate [3] 611/19
564/4 579/11 621/22	710/22 743/9 745/23 747/17 749/19	732/15 758/18 766/21	630/10 630/11 630/17 630/20 630/24 631/12	655/15 678/20
632/20 671/9 729/18	elderly [1] 753/22	entirely [12] 628/4	631/13 632/1 655/2	evaluated [1] 548/6 evaluation [15] 635/8
729/20 730/13 732/20	element [4] 591/6	630/20 657/1 683/17	655/4 655/12 655/19	636/19 682/13 682/15
769/16	646/12 647/2 647/17	699/13 730/5 740/22	655/21 655/21 656/18	682/16 685/4 685/7
duties [3] 555/8	elemental [1] 602/21	744/13 744/19 748/7	677/18	685/11 685/13 685/20
735/20 780/2	elements [2] 564/17	763/19 769/2	equity-financed [1]	708/20 708/21 709/7
duty [3] 543/19	709/19	entirety [2] 743/21	631/12	709/12 719/13
543/21 763/1	else [11] 612/8 622/1	779/6	equivalent [1] 779/15	evaluations [1] 694/9
E	622/7 631/10 631/11	entities [6] 593/18	erasures [1] 762/14	evaluator [1] 683/22
each [16] 590/16	659/14 703/20 723/17	621/3 621/12 623/10	errata [7] 602/1 640/5	evaporated [1] 688/12
590/18 590/20 594/6	724/2 737/10 760/14	648/25 658/17	640/7 659/8 659/9	even [35] 549/24
671/12 687/7 712/4	elsewhere [1] 678/15	entitled [2] 611/10	659/11 693/20	550/23 555/9 558/2
712/23 716/4 716/17	email [2] 534/8 777/9	720/2	erratum [2] 639/15	558/11 574/21 578/11
719/25 724/15 764/7	eminent [1] 779/17	entitlement [1] 608/10		579/14 583/19 583/22
773/19 776/10 776/12	emphasis [1] 596/4	entity [5] 588/2 658/17 658/23 658/25	erroneous [2] 737/23 763/3	588/15 588/16 588/19 593/4 593/20 601/23
earlier [9] 621/20	emphasise [3] 631/2 634/11 634/12	659/1	erroneously [1]	613/7 623/23 623/25
622/25 625/16 626/6	employed [1] 593/15	entrepreneur [1]	758/25	624/13 624/21 629/24
660/2 670/18 713/19	employees [1] 727/4	689/24	error [9] 598/17	636/8 645/21 678/12
744/22 778/6	empty [4] 691/9	entries [3] 587/7	598/17 600/17 601/15	685/8 725/24 727/14
early [1] 769/23	740/16 740/17 758/4	587/9 609/8	640/4 640/7 650/23	728/8 734/21 741/14
earned [1] 663/8 earning [1] 705/23	enabled [1] 547/12	envelope [3] 572/3	654/3 654/5	756/1 757/11 765/9
earnings [8] 599/13	encourage [2] 742/1	698/15 760/1	errors [5] 602/12	779/13
599/14 599/19 599/25	752/10	environment [3]	640/12 640/13 755/23	evening [1] 533/4
683/2 741/15 741/17	encouraged [1]	624/18 684/6 706/25	762/23	event [3] 762/2 764/15
742/5	540/16	envisage [1] 704/3	especially [7] 591/7	772/23
easier [3] 712/19	end [18] 544/18	equal [5] 549/6 549/20		events [4] 683/24
713/1 713/4	584/17 597/20 622/3	567/17 592/9 665/20	717/23 726/17 749/13	723/15 753/17 773/2
easily [4] 570/15	637/1 638/8 642/4	equates [1] 656/12	essence [1] 683/7	ever [8] 553/1 554/22
614/9 617/15 746/10	642/6 643/25 648/15		essential [3] 716/22	575/23 575/24 579/25
Eastern [1] 565/22	648/20 679/11 696/19 741/6 751/22 773/10	573/1 573/4 573/7 573/10 573/22 574/2	733/14 752/19	725/12 725/15 735/18
EBIT [2] 652/8 652/10	777/10 778/5	573/10 573/22 574/2	essentially [2] 700/20 751/2	every [8] 552/7 557/8 702/9 713/2 722/11
EBITDA [2] 597/15	ended [2] 540/5 700/8	574/13 574/22 575/18	essentials [1] 780/1	741/16 779/21 780/25
598/19	ends [2] 534/11 659/2	575/23 575/23 575/24	establish [3] 576/14	everybody [9] 533/3
economic [2] 598/22	energy [2] 701/14	577/6 578/12 578/14	683/3 768/19	557/9 557/9 718/24
767/10	707/18	578/15 580/2 580/23	established [12]	719/3 720/11 720/18
economically [1] 706/2	enforce [1] 762/7	580/24 581/4 581/5	588/10 608/7 608/10	722/21 728/18
economics [1] 673/7	enforced [1] 771/24	581/14 581/20 581/22	608/24 608/25 610/17	everyone [3] 533/4
·				

ICSID ARB 16 8	Wor
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Re

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 528-781
E	639/12 659/16 659/23	620/25 621/3 623/4	531/15 538/22 542/19	extent [7] 566/3
everyone [2] 687/20	679/12 679/19 686/3	626/16 759/16	553/22 581/19 582/8	617/17 624/21 661/12
754/5	691/10 691/11 712/10	expand [1] 557/15	588/5 588/24 588/25	685/25 704/22 717/3
everything [18]	766/19 780/2 780/3	expect [10] 545/19	589/5 592/22 592/24	extinguishes [1]
539/16 541/22 541/24	examine [1] 733/4	612/8 626/10 637/11	593/6 593/10 593/13	748/19
554/15 565/3 567/25	examined [1] 751/8	637/15 673/3 673/5	593/25 594/25 595/4	extra [4] 539/14
575/14 583/16 630/18	example [17] 557/20	673/20 697/6 706/7	595/7 595/20 603/20	541/17 639/18 644/22
637/17 682/1 682/2	558/15 561/3 569/20	expectation [3]	604/1 617/5 618/1	extract [1] 623/23
730/16 730/17 778/10	580/1 580/24 592/14 623/6 684/1 685/16	643/25 651/16 671/12	618/9 619/17 620/2 620/16 643/15 644/13	extracted [1] 563/21 extrapolated [1] 568/9
780/24 781/7 781/11	713/6 723/10 727/10	expectations [3] 650/1 650/3 739/18	645/8 645/15 649/18	extreme [2] 568/8
evidence [37] 570/13	750/10 750/16 761/14	expected [4] 545/21	650/6 650/12 650/16	682/18
572/22 572/25 573/3	769/19	645/18 731/3 742/22	651/21 652/3 667/11	extremely [4] 579/10
577/16 579/7 579/11	exceed [1] 644/2	expecting [1] 705/21	670/24 671/7 672/7	681/24 715/21 773/21
579/13 581/3 581/13	exceeded [1] 741/23	expects [1] 705/25	672/23 680/5 684/2	eye [1] 600/13
610/5 613/11 624/25	exceedingly [1]	expeditious [1]	684/15 688/17 689/8	eyes [1] 768/10
635/12 657/17 678/10 690/17 691/12 693/15	572/14	700/18	689/12 693/25 695/8	<u> </u>
722/10 725/12 725/14	excellent [3] 535/17	expended [1] 701/14	697/18 712/5 715/16	<u>F</u>
750/3 750/5 750/8	541/1 777/11	expending [1] 653/22	721/1 729/22 730/3	F2 [1] 600/11
750/9 750/12 751/5	except [4] 568/5	expenditure [4]	733/2 757/8 761/8	face [2] 713/15 744/7
751/21 751/25 752/14	648/19 661/12 681/15	586/18 604/15 627/10	770/9	faced [2] 565/22
753/10 757/15 759/17	exception [1] 536/8	697/25	experts' [8] 642/13	743/24
768/18 772/6 775/21	exceptional [3]	expenditures [3]	643/12 643/25 644/11	facilitating [1] 732/16
evidenced [2] 587/24	565/10 565/12 565/17 exceptionally [1]	569/8 586/18 653/15 expenses [8] 586/14	654/11 656/8 694/19 768/21	fact [37] 571/1 571/23 576/12 583/23 588/11
732/6	653/25	586/17 586/20 598/20	expiration [1] 736/11	595/23 597/7 606/2
evident [1] 579/9	excess [1] 649/20	601/20 604/20 605/5	explain [20] 542/10	612/14 622/12 624/3
evidential [1] 622/7	exchange [7] 650/18	625/18	549/7 549/20 550/19	643/19 644/5 644/15
evidentiary [1] 707/14	650/21 650/23 651/1	expensive [2] 603/11	553/13 556/25 567/4	647/4 667/8 668/9
evidently [1] 615/15 ex [17] 589/6 592/5	651/9 716/8 717/22	689/8	570/6 571/12 589/20	668/24 678/11 680/12
597/8 597/12 612/3	exchanges [1] 716/10	experience [11] 553/2	591/1 592/22 594/20	683/13 687/23 691/2
649/10 649/12 651/2	excise [1] 632/6	589/1 593/8 599/17	595/12 596/6 608/4	699/10 714/13 721/2
664/19 680/23 724/17	excluded [3] 586/13	599/23 603/19 603/21	633/19 634/17 758/8	722/9 722/19 722/21
724/20 725/19 727/10	586/20 604/19	694/8 711/15 738/25	758/20	725/24 734/1 734/3
727/15 766/2 767/12	exclusion [1] 605/5	773/7	explained [11] 541/25	744/13 746/1 746/9 750/22 771/17
ex ante [8] 589/6	exclusive [1] 586/19 excuse [3] 640/10	experienced [1] 690/9 experimental [1]	549/25 574/10 574/12 609/5 612/2 755/21	factor [4] 596/11
592/5 597/8 612/3	680/4 695/21	567/10	757/4 763/25 768/7	600/8 656/6 713/9
649/10 649/12 651/2	executing [1] 761/11	expert [64] 530/17	770/24	factors [4] 596/1
680/23	execution [8] 721/20	530/18 531/16 544/23	explaining [2] 585/19	642/20 646/2 679/3
ex parte [7] 724/17	729/15 729/19 729/21	546/10 553/7 553/17	698/11	facts [11] 544/2
724/20 725/19 727/10 727/15 766/2 767/12	730/1 730/11 730/23	553/19 553/22 554/1	explains [1] 755/8	631/14 681/7 703/12
ex post [1] 664/19	732/16	581/19 589/17 589/22	explore [3] 610/1	706/23 749/22 750/1
exacerbated [1]	exercise [14] 623/5	591/17 594/8 594/16	706/15 715/25	751/15 752/14 766/9
734/24	624/15 693/2 697/8	594/17 594/23 598/13	exponentially [1]	772/6
exact [1] 746/22	697/21 699/3 699/15	604/4 604/4 607/22	637/16	factual [5] 690/22 737/23 746/14 753/14
exactly [13] 570/5	699/20 700/6 704/16 724/8 735/1 761/12	608/18 609/24 610/6 616/24 617/9 617/24	express [7] 534/23 575/7 699/14 710/21	758/10
578/24 579/4 632/8	724/8735/1761/12	618/4 620/21 638/19	711/9 715/13 773/15	factually [1] 683/18
653/12 665/17 670/2	exhibit [14] 582/5	639/6 659/7 659/8	expressed [2] 544/6	faculty [1] 555/7
676/1 678/5 686/22	611/7 611/8 633/11	672/18 672/20 673/25	574/1	failed [4] 727/16 756/7
748/2 748/10 763/20	744/22 746/13 748/1	674/13 674/17 674/21	expresses [1] 615/18	767/18 768/19
exaggerate [1] 694/11	751/11 753/11 759/9	675/4 675/7 679/9	expressing [1] 615/21	failure [3] 728/23
exaggerated [1] 572/15	766/1 766/7 767/15	679/15 680/21 682/22	expression [1] 609/16	
exam [1] 638/16	772/18	684/3 686/7 694/6	expressly [1] 763/23	fair [17] 548/13
exam-in-chief [1]	exhibit 1 [1] 633/11	694/12 695/6 696/3	expropriated [2]	553/15 602/24 603/3
638/16	exhibits [6] 535/21	699/9 710/9 710/10	627/17 689/7	630/5 631/6 652/19
examination [30]	581/13 614/8 633/6 633/11 765/24	711/4 711/13 725/1 741/19 742/21 755/14	expropriation [1] 684/18	684/20 698/25 703/17 708/21 712/2 747/23
532/3 532/5 532/7	exist [1] 701/3	760/8 768/18 770/11	extend [1] 779/3	748/24 772/20 776/21
532/8 532/9 532/12	existence [5] 587/3	expertise [7] 543/21	extended [1] 636/25	778/14
532/13 532/14 532/17	609/11 613/12 682/6	553/13 609/20 714/17	extension [1] 606/3	fairly [5] 558/20 671/6
533/8 541/3 541/10	697/3		extensive [2] 593/17	705/8 742/14 778/19
582/20 585/16 605/20 618/16 632/16 632/21	existing [6] 555/17	experts [62] 530/15	621/12	fairness [1] 670/1
010/10/032/10/032/21				
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
F	feet [1] 639/23	finally [3] 544/1 770/8		formal [2] 620/13
faith [3] 762/5 767/20	FELIX [1] 531/5	771/6	770/25 774/14	773/23 formalised [1] 715/2
771/21	fell [1] 579/23 felt [3] 589/1 656/9	finance [2] 655/18 706/20	fix [1] 540/20 fixed [14] 586/19	formally [4] 535/22
fall [2] 698/6 729/21	670/18	financed [7] 627/18	587/5 587/7 605/14	535/23 535/24 698/10
fallow [1] 739/13	fertile [3] 555/17	629/15 629/20 630/10	609/7 609/8 610/10	formatting [1] 725/2
familiar [3] 618/3 749/24 757/9	555/21 557/12	630/20 631/12 631/13	616/6 625/18 625/20	former [4] 536/22
famous [1] 564/13	fertility [1] 557/6	financial [28] 587/6	625/22 625/23 625/24	739/10 758/15 767/10
fantastic [1] 680/25	fertilizers [23] 533/19	587/9 587/18 588/17	626/7	formulas [1] 628/22
far [11] 536/8 582/12	547/25 555/18 557/23	610/9 613/7 613/8	flee [1] 748/23	formulated [1] 562/24
645/6 671/18 689/20	558/3 558/8 558/19 560/4 560/7 560/14	623/13 623/23 647/14 649/22 660/21 663/5	flexibility [1] 534/25 flexible [2] 540/10	forth [4] 611/16 695/4 700/12 742/21
693/14 700/14 719/5	560/21 560/24 563/23	663/9 663/13 665/5	579/10	forthright [1] 673/15
725/25 727/6 781/9	564/16 564/18 564/22	665/13 665/22 666/4	Floresti [22] 533/20	forthwith [1] 545/9
farm [10] 536/10	644/22 645/22 652/8	666/6 666/17 682/17	533/22 547/9 561/11	Fortier [16] 528/15
536/13 554/3 554/4 554/10 572/18 572/20	653/8 672/9 673/19	685/19 686/1 693/21	566/3 566/6 566/24	529/9 529/10 556/23
573/5 627/11 700/22	694/4	741/18 742/2 748/7	567/11 568/12 578/25	570/24 585/3 638/14
farmed [4] 554/22	few [13] 533/10	financials [2] 664/6	583/7 584/9 607/16	639/5 699/16 700/4
570/9 699/23 737/9	535/21 541/8 545/22	664/12	723/12 728/13 730/22	708/2 710/6 740/2
farmer [9] 547/18	632/14 644/14 644/20 659/25 689/22 720/19	financials so [1] 664/6	732/9 735/9 739/4 758/23 765/9 766/7	758/4 772/11 773/9 Fortier's [1] 699/12
553/8 570/6 574/10	752/21 752/23 768/23		flow [13] 590/18 600/9	
653/10 673/2 687/25	field [3] 582/8 587/2	629/24 629/25 630/1	600/25 642/2 642/6	583/3 588/4 588/7
720/23 720/23	680/21	630/17 630/23 630/24	644/21 646/7 646/20	589/2 631/12 635/13
farmers [19] 547/10 547/10 547/15 547/17	fields [11] 547/13	649/22 655/2 655/4	646/25 655/8 674/3	635/17 678/10
547/17 547/20 548/14	547/14 553/11 554/16	655/22 656/15 656/17	674/5 692/12	forward-looking [6]
553/6 555/9 555/12	555/1 557/24 644/23	find [13] 565/15 570/2		582/25 588/4 588/7
555/16 557/7 558/4	679/23 694/4 727/3	571/11 580/22 643/3	fluctuations [1]	589/2 635/13 635/17
558/16 561/3 569/6	771/4 fifth [1] 627/14	649/18 695/22 703/2 710/12 724/13 747/7	709/21 flushed [1] 738/13	found [11] 534/11 596/7 600/5 609/20
583/22 653/5 658/1	figure [9] 550/7 552/6	748/4 749/5	focus [3] 543/9 596/4	619/20 623/11 667/21
farmers' [3] 546/12	568/14 569/19 584/13	fine [7] 533/4 541/24	642/11	715/21 737/15 765/15
546/13 546/19 farming [26] 545/21	651/11 666/12 666/14		focused [1] 777/21	773/20
555/23 570/8 570/10	710/25	773/16 778/6	follow [6] 561/4	founded [1] 612/10
570/17 570/19 575/9	figures [44] 565/15	finish [2] 637/19	582/16 582/18 634/10	fountain [1] 560/17
586/15 588/13 625/1	566/22 566/24 567/8	664/9	699/11 719/25	fountains [1] 560/17
649/20 681/10 681/21	567/8 567/11 567/12 567/13 567/17 567/17	firm [4] 674/5 685/5 696/6 713/17	followed [2] 558/9 577/13	four [19] 607/12 626/23 636/9 636/10
700/9 701/4 714/19	567/20 567/25 568/2	firms [2] 553/10	following [5] 560/4	636/18 636/20 636/22
723/23 730/17 733/14	568/3 568/4 568/9	560/12	601/20 606/2 766/12	637/6 637/8 642/4
733/15 734/4 734/9		first [56] 534/1 545/24		699/23 700/1 700/23
734/17 734/18 739/2 741/9	569/10 571/21 578/18	557/2 560/4 562/13	footnote [1] 754/4	701/4 721/14 721/17
farmlands [3] 579/1	582/22 583/6 583/14	563/24 564/5 586/11	forbidden [1] 766/16	736/11 772/18 772/19
579/2 700/13	584/8 584/11 584/12		force [2] 705/17	four-page [1] 772/18
farms [6] 557/21	604/18 616/24 644/10 652/9 652/17 653/17	596/6 605/4 605/8 607/11 607/14 609/4	764/17	four-year [1] 736/11
570/11 657/21 657/22	671/22 671/22 671/25	611/14 613/25 616/7	forecast [7] 564/6 564/8 564/9 564/17	fourth [1] 625/14 Frame [1] 610/24
657/23 657/24	672/3 672/6 682/4	618/1 618/2 619/2	683/5 713/4 713/5	France [1] 529/15
fashion [1] 747/9	686/9 692/8 692/15	629/14 630/16 640/21	forecasted [1] 589/6	frankly [3] 711/12
fashions [1] 749/2 fault [1] 568/10	709/22	641/2 644/14 644/20	forecasts [2] 770/22	726/14 778/4
favour [2] 766/8	Filat [1] 536/22	645/2 655/1 660/1	770/24	FRAUKE [3] 529/18
766/18	file [3] 623/25 717/20	660/18 684/2 686/15	foregone [2] 591/11	780/15 780/20
February [4] 589/12	718/4	689/18 697/1 712/6	655/4	Frauke Nitschke [1]
646/3 664/11 757/21	filed [14] 586/3 587/15 605/25 606/21 610/9	714/20 717/8 718/22 720/10 721/25 722/16	foreign [7] 561/15 562/4 611/17 650/18	780/15 free [7] 538/23 657/7
fee [7] 731/8 731/20	610/10 613/5 718/20	730/7 738/15 741/8	650/21 650/23 650/25	657/9 706/16 711/20
731/22 760/25 760/25	718/23 719/10 725/20		foremost [1] 534/1	715/24 729/24
761/5 761/5 feed [1] 560/22	762/11 765/14 778/7	759/16 760/23 766/1	forget [2] 672/25	frequent [1] 602/25
feel [8] 656/2 671/16	filing [4] 605/13	767/4 770/17 770/23	733/13	friend [2] 739/20
687/15 706/16 711/20	622/13 717/18 727/9		forgive [1] 626/5	758/18
717/8 720/3 778/13	final [10] 539/8 548/8	fiscal [3] 586/23	forgiveness [1] 673/1	friends [1] 781/2
feeling [2] 538/8	635/5 712/5 716/11 722/1 734/7 736/9	604/17 761/18 fit [1] 652/14	form [6] 538/14 560/5 581/13 641/12 680/19	front [7] 585/6 608/21 618/4 639/7 729/8
773/13	737/21 769/19	five [7] 564/9 568/19	693/6	732/5 741/2
fees [1] 731/9				
		www.dianaburden.com	1	

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			-
F	generating [2] 644/25	762/23 762/25 763/4	got [7] 533/4 534/25	728/16 730/7 730/16
fruitful [8] 604/5 769/9	703/24	764/9 764/10 764/14	550/19 616/4 629/13	730/21 730/25 731/8
769/11 769/17 769/24	generation [1] 683/2	764/17 764/24 765/2	632/23 780/8	731/9 731/19 733/6
770/8 770/16 771/12	genial [1] 779/7	766/19 766/25 767/3	govern [1] 658/25	734/10 734/14 734/20
full [5] 570/4 655/21	gentlemen [5] 552/22	767/8 767/10 767/13	government [4]	735/6 735/13 735/23
680/22 681/1 700/10	582/8 584/1 584/16	Gladei's [3] 724/10	668/14 732/8 756/13	736/20 737/2 737/5
fully [6] 534/6 629/14	752/9	733/16 733/20	757/2	737/9 737/18 738/4
630/10 649/10 649/11	geographical [1]	GLEASON [7] 530/3	gradient [1] 571/23	738/15 738/16 739/18
721/9	566/7	530/6 552/18 720/8	graduated [1] 554/7	739/22 741/8 742/23
function [2] 704/24	geographically [1]	738/8 774/9 774/18	graduates [2] 552/22	743/15 743/20 744/17
704/25	597/23	gleasonwells.com [3]	554/18	744/20 746/1 746/4
fundamental [3]	German [2] 553/5 710/12	530/9 530/9 530/10	grain [1] 714/1	746/17 748/23 749/8
591/23 650/23 670/13		gmail.com [1] 529/16	grains [3] 566/13 567/19 572/20	749/10 749/20 750/2 750/11 750/16 750/23
fundamentally [1]	Germany [3] 553/9 597/25 689/25	GMBH [1] 531/6 go [35] 537/22 574/6	granted [1] 766/5	752/13 753/2 753/21
719/13	get [43] 534/9 539/16	582/13 604/14 611/13	granular [1] 695/2	753/23 756/11 756/25
further [27] 539/10	539/16 540/17 550/22	631/13 635/24 636/12	granularity [2] 643/13	757/4 757/7 758/18
541/5 552/16 566/25	551/4 552/13 557/7	639/13 643/3 649/9	645/6	761/1 761/2 761/7
577/24 581/12 586/2	558/4 559/19 559/25	652/1 657/12 663/22	grasp [1] 649/11	765/1 767/23 767/25
601/13 604/8 635/19	564/2 576/9 581/18	689/20 690/4 699/19	grateful [5] 533/7	767/25 768/2 768/3
652/13 652/16 658/5	582/10 586/4 591/19	702/4 703/7 703/20	581/23 582/14 584/17	768/5 768/6 768/9
687/9 700/12 700/15	605/22 606/17 606/18	704/7 704/8 704/10	780/14	768/10 768/14 771/19
705/10 729/7 756/25	637/14 638/15 640/19	709/1 711/12 716/2	gratitude [2] 534/23	771/22 773/1
759/20 764/15 764/24	644/19 645/12 649/21	729/5 729/7 734/6	773/16	Grot's [32] 564/18
774/5 776/14 777/19	656/11 657/12 683/25	736/20 736/23 737/13	Gray [1] 529/5	578/5 580/5 624/15
777/25 781/10	684/12 687/22 691/4	742/1 742/23 775/6	great [6] 572/19 690/1	624/24 624/25 625/11
Furthermore [1]	697/18 701/18 724/19	goes [6] 537/5 565/8	713/24 714/25 724/12	630/19 643/7 643/17
767/12	734/12 735/13 735/15	638/12 704/19 709/9	729/2	644/1 644/7 655/18
future [29] 532/20	747/14 749/4 753/12	721/19	Great Britain [1]	667/21 668/14 689/18
564/7 629/21 631/17 636/12 651/16 651/17	768/6 778/8	going [56] 570/18	690/1	707/14 728/19 728/24
680/24 681/2 683/2	gets [2] 772/23 780/20		greater [8] 645/6	732/2 740/11 744/3
683/5 683/5 683/7	getting [2] 701/19	627/1 629/21 635/23	672/8 673/20 687/13	746/12 750/19 757/5
683/24 684/7 684/8	719/4	637/14 638/7 638/12	704/19 722/4 725/14	757/11 760/23 761/4
684/8 685/8 685/23	GIEDRE [1] 530/5	640/1 648/5 648/12	736/21	767/7 768/8 772/2
686/12 687/8 703/24	girls [1] 689/12	648/13 648/14 652/7	gross [6] 597/15	773/12
709/24 712/19 738/22	give [15] 563/1 575/3	653/4 653/5 655/10	597/17 647/12 647/15	ground [3] 681/9
739/8 741/11 748/9	632/13 689/9 692/11	656/21 657/2 659/5	647/21 647/24	687/22 688/5
774/17	703/16 705/3 710/18	665/6 673/6 683/6	GROT [147] 528/8	grow [1] 637/16
futures [2] 714/5	712/3 712/5 727/12	687/11 687/24 688/9	530/12 530/14 536/9	growing [2] 647/20
714/5	747/6 754/6 777/21	692/3 692/20 697/21	536/13 537/18 555/22	658/12
	779/25	698/19 704/19 705/21	557/18 558/9 558/13	grown [1] 754/22
G	given [34] 537/23	709/18 714/3 721/14	558/15 560/19 563/9	grown-up [1] 754/22
gained [1] 593/10	538/24 539/12 566/5	721/18 722/11 723/17	572/23 581/11 585/25	growth [1] 667/5
GALIS [1] 529/25	571/4 571/5 571/22	729/5 730/16 730/17	586/7 587/24 588/12	guarantee [2] 704/24
game [2] 690/25	573/25 574/24 581/19	733/10 735/15 736/14	588/21 608/1 613/14	705/1
710/11	618/12 624/4 653/15 654/1 657/2 659/7	736/17 736/23 748/4 749/9 753/5 754/13	614/10 627/20 627/25	guess [1] 750/1
gather [1] 716/7	675/12 684/25 692/8	749/9753/5754/13	629/20 630/17 631/8 631/10 645/10 645/23	guidance [1] 626/18 guida [1] 779/20
gathering [1] 617/2	697/15 703/13 707/5	754/16 756/16 773/10	631/10/645/10/645/23 647/11 648/25 649/13	guide [1] 779/20 guideline [11] 569/5
gave [2] 686/11	707/7 712/16 714/3	gone [5] 565/3 703/14		578/18 593/18 596/5
710/21	717/17 719/9 719/17	708/2 708/4 737/9	655/13 658/16 661/22	596/7 596/9 596/23
general [9] 536/24	720/12 734/8 736/13	good [33] 533/3	662/9 662/14 662/19	621/10 622/9 675/20
539/14 563/18 565/21	769/14 776/18 781/7	534/25 539/2 539/15	667/18 672/24 673/1	675/22
579/3 602/22 634/15	gives [4] 685/20 686/6	541/11 541/12 554/21	674/6 683/17 686/3	guidelines [3] 571/21
703/11 708/13	753/2 773/5	555/19 555/19 555/21	686/7 687/21 688/22	572/14 575/20
generalise [1] 668/22	giving [3] 707/9 711/8	555/22 556/23 558/12	689/23 690/17 690/21	GUMOVSCHI [23]
generally [7] 582/3	750/3	558/15 561/2 576/22	691/18 691/23 692/3	530/18 532/2 533/2
591/20 598/14 603/22	GLADEI [34] 530/16	576/24 603/25 605/21	693/9 693/12 694/10	541/25 542/9 543/15
662/6 668/18 671/24	530/16 530/17 722/19	606/11 618/24 625/5	694/15 696/8 696/10	548/17 550/4 552/4
generate [6] 641/11	723/3 724/13 727/5	715/12 721/4 737/6	697/12 697/13 698/8	553/3 554/4 557/14
641/22 652/4 652/10 680/10 692/9	729/23 753/18 753/20	752/3 768/1 771/19	699/7 703/16 705/8	559/15 561/23 562/7
generated [7] 588/15	760/8 760/10 761/11	771/21 771/24 779/7	706/6 706/14 714/12	563/7 578/22 593/7
652/8 658/11 663/18	761/13 761/22 761/24	780/20 780/23	714/21 714/24 715/5	603/22 769/4 769/13
685/12 692/16 739/4	762/1 762/2 762/20	goods [1] 600/21	721/4 723/11 723/20	770/2 770/5
000/12 032/10 103/4				
		www.dianaburden.com	1	

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 528-787
G	750/23 750/24 750/25	669/6	563/12 564/7 564/14	751/9 753/9 753/15
guys [2] 551/12	750/25 757/3 757/8	harvesters [1] 611/15	564/23 578/9 588/15	755/10 777/14
689/11	762/6 762/22 763/16	harvesting [9] 554/16	592/1 594/1 594/6	hearing [37] 528/19
GUZUN [1] 531/11	764/13 765/1 765/4	573/23 574/3 574/13	594/8 594/22 596/25	538/22 539/8 541/21
	765/15 766/13 766/16	574/17 576/19 576/21	598/18 598/19 600/17	571/5 571/6 579/6
H	768/5 768/13 770/2	579/25 580/1	600/20 601/17 601/19	579/12 579/14 616/16
H3B [1] 529/11	771/10 771/19 771/21	has [110] 548/19	607/6 610/22 611/10	698/21 717/12 717/14
ha [22] 554/12 557/25	771/23 773/7 778/14	561/15 561/19 562/4	618/11 624/16 625/6	717/20 718/15 727/23
560/11 561/20 570/12	778/15	571/9 571/17 579/4	631/12 645/12 649/21	729/2 744/16 750/9
570/18 570/19 570/22	half [7] 573/12 573/14	587/11 588/1 590/7	653/4 653/5 662/14	751/23 752/23 752/25
571/19 571/20 572/1	573/16 580/17 580/19	590/8 591/11 592/16	662/15 670/10 670/11	753/15 756/7 756/18
572/2 574/4 574/9	629/13 714/20	592/17 601/16 608/14 608/22 609/17 609/19	673/3 687/23 687/25 688/1 688/3 688/5	757/4 757/19 760/17 769/16 773/13 775/19
645/11 645/13 645/14	hall [2] 730/13 755/22 halls [2] 730/8 762/12	614/11 618/19 625/6	688/5 688/22 688/22	777/16 778/14 778/24
667/16 699/23 700/22	hand [12] 591/8 596/1	629/12 630/6 638/20	689/2 689/6 691/3	779/9 781/12 781/14
714/13 739/3	603/9 604/25 613/25	640/4 645/2 645/3	691/23 692/4 694/1	hearings [1] 751/20
had [171] 533/4 534/3	618/23 679/17 704/16	645/23 646/24 647/21	695/17 698/9 699/10	heart [1] 721/15
535/5 540/1 547/8	722/1 759/9 764/2	648/17 649/24 650/4	700/9 700/10 701/9	hectare [6] 560/8
547/11 552/15 554/12	767/23	650/9 652/18 652/21	701/9 701/14 701/18	569/20 570/17 570/19
555/10 556/10 557/22	handed [7] 533/16	654/16 655/20 655/23	701/22 701/24 702/1	594/5 617/25
558/9 558/16 558/17 558/18 558/19 558/20	604/25 607/7 618/7	656/1 656/4 658/2	707/15 711/11 712/16	hello [1] 632/17
560/14 564/7 564/9	618/24 619/8 619/15	660/22 662/3 662/14	723/2 723/20 730/7	help [20] 573/15
564/20 565/3 566/1	hands [4] 554/14	666/16 670/10 676/6	730/8 730/8 730/8	601/14 623/15 624/8
570/13 571/8 571/10	638/3 638/8 638/13	678/2 678/9 681/14	730/18 730/25 731/19	684/9 688/16 688/18
572/17 572/18 572/20	handwritten [1]	685/21 685/22 693/3	731/19 731/20 731/22	689/15 690/8 691/13
572/22 572/25 573/5	618/13	693/12 694/15 695/6	732/4 732/7 732/11	691/19 691/22 696/22
573/7 575/4 575/10	hang [1] 778/22	698/6 700/20 700/22	732/12 732/13 734/11	702/8 710/6 711/4
575/10 576/4 576/8	happen [8] 534/10	701/9 701/10 701/14	736/22 737/6 737/7	711/5 711/13 718/11
576/14 576/15 576/16	580/1 619/6 631/21	701/18 701/24 703/14	737/8 737/12 737/13	735/18
577/8 578/4 578/9	683/7 714/3 768/13	703/14 705/4 705/8	737/13 739/21 740/13	helped [3] 698/20
580/8 580/12 582/11	774/2	706/6 706/9 706/14	740/18 741/20 741/21	698/21 698/23
587/2 588/11 588/19	happened [26] 565/3	707/25 708/2 708/4	743/21 747/17 747/21	helpful [10] 570/2
598/7 598/14 599/12	580/23 581/22 582/12 609/17 609/19 609/25	709/24 710/2 711/2 712/24 713/2 713/7	750/2 750/3 750/4 750/12 750/15 750/24	571/12 711/11 711/24 715/21 754/15 754/23
603/25 606/19 607/18	611/23 614/6 616/14	714/9 714/15 715/2	750/25 756/13 757/13	768/21 773/18 774/7
608/25 609/14 613/21	641/24 648/4 684/20	716/18 717/21 718/19	758/18 758/19 758/20	helpfully [1] 574/12
615/5 615/5 615/20	685/21 685/22 700/17	719/12 719/17 719/18	758/23 758/25 759/3	helping [1] 761/1
617/12 623/9 624/16	703/14 707/14 716/18	720/18 721/7 726/16	761/19 767/24 768/5	helps [1] 708/7
625/16 626/6 626/22	721/5 744/11 745/11	729/7 729/24 740/22	768/7 768/11 768/11	Hence [1] 710/1
628/24 635/4 637/17	746/5 748/25 752/12	743/15 747/2 747/2	768/12 768/12 768/12	her [1] 759/16
640/11 642/14 647/12 649/5 649/5 650/15	780/8	755/18 760/11 772/1	768/14 769/8 771/21	here [81] 533/15
650/17 651/22 651/24	happening [4] 638/20	773/1 775/1 777/2	771/23 778/22 779/17	541/17 566/15 568/3
656/25 668/5 670/24	646/7 692/18 723/19	778/20 779/8 779/22	he didn't [1] 740/13	570/11 571/14 573/19
671/7 671/8 671/8	happens [2] 568/20	780/6	he would [1] 560/24	579/15 581/19 584/11
671/13 671/14 675/3	773/25		head [2] 745/4 745/16	584/19 585/18 586/23
675/3 676/9 679/5	happy [8] 533/15	have [556]	heading [1] 554/13	590/19 600/17 601/15
681/19 681/20 682/25	618/5 749/6 750/4	haven't [10] 534/15	headline [1] 533/18	603/4 604/7 604/23
685/6 685/11 685/14	774/23 781/10 781/11	537/14 562/10 562/11	hear [9] 556/21	611/14 615/3 615/11
686/9 686/20 687/23	781/11	665/9 677/5 681/15	559/21 584/22 715/24	619/12 619/19 626/2
687/25 688/1 688/3	hard [4] 540/18	721/15 751/9 779/13	716/15 750/2 772/15	626/12 629/16 631/3
688/5 688/5 688/22	691/15 740/17 772/6	having [15] 562/18	773/25 774/7	633/19 634/19 635/14
689/2 689/5 689/19	hardly [1] 768/22 hardware [1] 699/21	580/22 612/21 623/19 638/8 639/15 669/25	heard [42] 562/6 562/9 606/13 618/3	638/11 640/21 641/10 642/17 645/17 645/25
691/18 694/1 696/9	harrows [1] 611/15	685/23 689/22 697/5	641/4 643/19 643/24	642/17 645/17 645/25 646/7 646/23 648/3
696/11 697/2 697/4	harvest [19] 546/10	698/4 701/15 706/19	645/5 655/3 656/19	648/20 651/14 652/18
697/11 698/9 703/8	546/12 567/13 567/23	716/9 747/5	657/22 667/4 684/14	653/2 653/3 655/15
709/3 714/13 714/14	568/1 574/18 574/18	he [149] 534/4 534/5	684/17 690/16 695/14	657/14 659/15 660/14
716/7 722/24 723/2	574/19 576/22 576/24	534/13 540/18 540/19	696/4 696/14 709/10	661/7 662/13 667/4
723/11 723/20 723/22	576/25 583/17 583/19	540/20 542/1 548/20	711/18 716/16 717/11	676/5 681/7 687/2
725/4 726/18 728/14	583/22 589/25 628/4	555/23 557/16 557/19	720/2 720/25 721/2	687/10 689/13 690/10
732/12 734/14 734/17	645/11 646/17 648/7	558/15 558/16 558/17	727/5 727/23 728/15	690/10 690/13 691/18
735/23 737/6 737/7 740/7 741/21 742/5	harvestable [1]	558/18 558/20 559/16	728/19 728/22 730/7	695/5 710/6 713/24
740/7 741/21 742/5	570/15	559/21 560/23 560/24	730/25 731/19 732/2	714/4 718/25 720/14
748/15 748/23 750/23	harvested [2] 646/17	562/3 563/10 563/11	732/11 737/12 739/19	723/17 727/18 730/6
1-10/10/1-10/20/20				
	1	www.dianaburden.com	1	

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Re	public of Moldova

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

Zbigniew Plotr Grot et al		Revised		Pages 520-701
н	721/8 723/3 724/14	594/20 603/23 605/3	560/1 563/6 570/6	607/24 614/19 628/15
here [11] 736/5	729/24 732/5 732/9	609/1 612/25 613/3	570/7 571/10 571/12	640/1 640/2 649/11
747/8 752/11 753/2	732/10 735/1 735/9	621/24 628/19 630/11	571/13 574/10 575/2	673/23 676/1 691/24
754/15 757/8 759/10	737/14 738/5 738/18	630/13 633/4 637/11	576/9 577/2 577/8	696/1 744/19 745/25
772/3 772/4 774/3	738/19 738/23 739/2	638/12 642/24 652/12	582/14 601/12 604/2	780/16
780/8	739/20 739/22 740/18	652/14 653/21 654/18	604/3 604/4 607/24	I can't [1] 668/22
heroic [1] 780/14	740/21 741/9 741/19	654/21 670/24 671/7	612/23 612/24 614/6	I cannot [6] 575/14
hesitant [1] 775/6	741/22 742/17 743/20	671/22 671/24 672/9	614/12 614/13 615/4	616/18 637/3 652/11
hesitate [1] 746/3	743/20 743/22 743/22	672/11 672/25 678/5	615/11 615/13 618/5	684/22 712/25
hesitating [1] 540/4	750/10 756/11 757/1	687/13 689/11 689/19	620/4 621/8 623/21	I compare [1] 653/18
high [10] 558/10	760/23 767/25 768/3	691/13 691/19 691/22	629/9 630/8 632/3	I conclude [1] 621/13
558/20 572/14 575/5	768/9 768/10 768/11 768/13 771/24 773/3	697/24 699/19 701/5 702/3 703/4 703/7	637/5 639/4 640/1 641/7 641/8 650/9	l confer [1] 747/23
576/4 602/7 640/15		703/15 707/3 716/6	653/10 653/12 653/17	l confirm [6] 543/10 544/5 544/22 545/4
685/13 755/16 757/2	773/4 773/7 773/8 historical [6] 597/11	703/15/707/3/10/0	659/5 662/4 662/16	633/14 634/20
higher [23] 546/12	647/24 650/21 685/18	726/25 727/1 727/3	668/10 672/2 672/5	l consider [2] 544/23
546/19 547/14 548/10	685/24 705/15	727/23 727/25 732/7	672/9 672/20 673/12	545/5
548/11 549/4 549/14	historically [2] 599/17	737/13 745/2 748/18	674/25 678/13 680/22	I considered [1]
549/19 549/25 558/11	599/24	750/12 764/16 772/15	680/25 681/1 681/3	613/10
558/18 564/9 564/11	history [5] 683/1	779/11	684/3 688/9 688/14	I continue [1] 755/2
568/15 596/1 596/2	685/17 687/25 740/11	however [11] 579/9	688/17 688/20 688/21	I could [10] 624/1
644/8 654/1 657/23	740/25	596/22 686/2 688/3	689/14 691/21 692/10	670/25 679/8 691/4
728/11 731/1 732/18	hold [2] 628/6 628/8	697/15 712/16 713/3	693/14 694/12 696/9	692/5 694/20 694/25
771/2	holding [2] 650/2	730/3 761/3 766/17	698/1 698/8 698/20	703/17 729/5 745/3
highest [3] 617/19 730/21 756/13	749/20	770/13	700/15 702/10 706/11	I did [13] 554/2 554/7
highlight [3] 592/4	holiday [1] 781/11	huge [3] 594/19 717/2	706/19 706/22 707/3	578/24 586/15 616/21
634/22 722/13	holistic [1] 735/9	777/21	707/9 707/13 707/16	648/9 661/24 670/23
highlighted [2]	home [1] 737/14	humidity [1] 568/14	710/11 710/12 713/23	672/15 674/11 674/23
590/14 768/23	homework [2] 679/10	humus [2] 558/4	715/4 718/10 722/11	675/11 694/11
highlights [1] 646/5	757/6	560/6	724/11 729/5 736/23	l didn't [6] 565/15
highly [3] 575/10	Hon [2] 528/15 529/9	hundred [6] 560/1	739/24 744/19 746/7	566/14 648/10 648/10
575/17 576/21	honest [3] 554/6	595/4 630/4 662/9	746/13 747/5 749/24	680/8 698/13
him [32] 534/5 534/11	581/23 732/5	662/19 711/16	750/1 756/21 772/24	I discussed [1] 593/9
534/16 536/5 542/10	honestly [4] 554/6	hundreds [6] 726/10	773/10	l do [28] 537/15
564/21 610/19 610/21	601/14 694/7 771/9	726/17 726/17 726/19	l apologise [4] 604/6	541/15 541/15 550/5
610/23 618/5 699/13	honour [2] 585/8	762/13 763/22	608/23 711/23 753/25	552/5 568/7 579/8
700/17 701/12 706/7	727/16	hybrid [1] 547/23	I appreciate [7]	604/22 611/4 621/13
719/4 725/19 730/17	honourable [2] 704/12 771/22	hybrids [1] 547/21	570/12 581/16 581/21 611/12 611/19 660/21	639/8 639/18 640/7
730/18 732/11 737/8	hope [8] 533/4 533/4	hyperlink [1] 535/19 hypotheses [1]	688/14	652/11 654/23 661/20 663/4 666/23 670/6
737/11 737/12 738/17	534/25 541/15 659/14	564/25	l ask [8] 557/1 611/6	671/22 674/1 677/13
738/24 743/21 746/19	696/24 758/5 780/24	hypothesise [1]	624/11 682/21 708/8	690/9 702/25 708/17
747/18 747/19 756/14	hopeless [1] 695/17	573/17	738/18 743/9 772/10	747/9 773/13 773/15
757/5 768/1 768/8	horse [1] 555/1	hypothetical [6]	l asked [2] 551/3	I don't [46] 534/15
himself [4] 630/19	hotel [1] 534/3	563/10 566/16 566/18	744/9	551/18 561/15 561/25
728/16 739/20 756/15	hour [4] 638/18	568/3 603/7 703/12	l assume [2] 570/7	562/3 562/11 573/13
hindsight [2] 591/25	717/22 720/1 776/10		669/23	575/15 576/12 577/21
612/20	hours [7] 606/14	l	I assumed [1] 627/19	582/14 608/9 621/16
HINKLE [1] 530/4	616/4 629/13 689/23	l accept [1] 687/23	I believe [31] 560/19	622/21 647/2 647/23
hints [1] 779/11 hired [3] 714/17 737/8	730/13 732/21 776/9	I acknowledged [1]	560/23 564/16 591/8	652/14 652/20 652/22
750/11	housekeeping [1]	620/13	592/25 601/6 602/16	657/24 658/18 660/22
his [80] 535/4 539/12	533/12	I acted [3] 553/4 553/6	602/24 604/8 608/11	664/22 664/24 669/4
540/19 558/10 558/17	how [93] 547/11 550/6	553/21	619/20 631/25 644/4	671/21 673/22 676/20
564/20 587/24 588/14	550/19 551/22 552/6	l add [1] 561/24	645/5 646/13 647/13	676/25 677/20 689/3
598/18 601/19 618/12	552/12 553/22 554/16	l agree [8] 548/20	648/3 649/7 650/22	689/21 689/21 692/1
618/13 618/18 621/12	558/22 558/24 559/19	557/16 647/3 683/21	651/4 652/21 656/14	694/18 694/20 694/25
627/20 633/9 637/17	559/23 559/25 566/17	703/18 708/13 752/20	657/8 671/13 678/9	696/8 718/18 744/17
648/22 648/25 655/13	566/19 571/18 571/20	760/4	678/14 679/10 683/11	745/15 746/22 776/14
655/19 673/2 686/4	572/7 572/8 572/10	l also [5] 612/1 648/15		776/17 776/19 779/20
687/22 687/24 688/4	572/11 574/2 574/11	650/13 669/24 695/9	I calculated [1]	l encourage [1] 742/1
688/6 688/8 688/11	574/13 575/6 575/7 576/9 576/24 576/24	l am [110] 533/15 540/4 545/18 545/20	585/25	l excluded [1] 586/13
689/5 693/25 698/9	576/9 576/24 576/24 580/6 582/2 582/9	554/6 554/17 555/8	l can [20] 549/21 557/3 562/12 572/13	l explained [1] 609/5
701/11 701/20 708/7	586/24 589/21 594/1	555/9 555/11 555/25	573/9 576/2 576/11	I express [1] 534/23 I felt [1] 589/1
712/12 714/22 718/22	000127 003121 034/1	000/0000/11/000/20	51013 51012 510/11	i leit [1] 308/1
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
	576/1 576/1 579/3	I regret [1] 590/5	712/23 713/11 713/19	I wonder [3] 621/24
I find [1] 649/18	580/4 580/6 600/3	I relied [1] 678/4	713/21 714/23 714/24	629/13 708/6
I fully [1] 649/11	619/3 650/11 669/5	I remember [1] 554/25		I worked [3] 542/19
I get [2] 605/22 684/12	688/19 690/8 699/12	I repeat [1] 583/25	742/14 758/21 776/3	554/9 604/13
l go [1] 649/9	715/18	I respond [1] 694/17	776/21 777/3 777/8	I would [82] 538/16
I graduated [1] 554/7	l leave [3] 678/15 687/14 688/15	I revert [1] 661/6 I right [2] 570/16	778/10 778/23 779/17 I thought [1] 610/16	543/3 543/8 543/9 543/18 544/18 545/22
I had [7] 556/10	l left [1] 555/7	746/15	I took [1] 589/23	546/6 548/15 548/17
603/25 640/11 649/5	l limit [1] 752/23	I said [8] 560/22	I tried [1] 639/23	548/22 551/13 553/13
651/24 671/13 681/19 I have [112] 533/13	I listen [1] 680/23	578/16 583/25 648/2	I understand [27]	557/17 557/19 564/12
533/14 536/4 537/13	I literally [1] 616/4	686/2 687/14 696/20	543/19 574/21 576/18	570/2 575/12 579/12
537/14 539/18 541/5	l look [3] 609/20	728/10	577/1 603/18 605/23	582/23 586/2 586/11
543/11 544/2 544/5	653/14 692/17	I sat [1] 702/12	606/3 612/23 616/2	588/10 590/11 592/4
552/16 553/23 554/17	I looked [4] 565/15	I saw [1] 576/20	621/6 624/3 624/9	592/20 596/3 597/13
555/4 555/15 556/3	575/9 643/5 694/24 I made [3] 586/12	I say [5] 541/22 654/12 689/3 701/17	643/14 646/11 653/3 653/6 653/11 653/24	598/11 601/4 605/22 606/4 606/12 607/8
558/6 558/21 560/7	629/19 671/1	779/4	654/14 658/14 662/5	607/10 608/4 612/8
561/22 562/9 571/25	I maintain [1] 695/1	I see [4] 569/18	667/5 669/10 695/9	615/14 617/6 622/12
574/10 574/10 582/10	I make [1] 616/3	611/24 619/2 653/24	705/9 706/20 773/14	627/15 630/21 631/24
585/2 585/23 591/24 594/4 594/12 594/24	I may [8] 543/10	I selected [1] 652/4	l understood [3]	632/2 632/18 635/2
604/12 606/16 608/20	556/16 582/18 601/8	I sell [1] 615/13	536/9 566/16 671/10	637/17 640/12 647/16
609/18 609/20 611/25	607/13 629/5 744/9	I share [1] 686/24	l use [1] 700/21	673/5 679/12 682/9
612/18 613/5 613/11	773/17	I should [1] 780/8	l used [3] 651/23 653/9 655/24	685/8 685/8 691/8 607/16 600/1 701/7
615/12 617/3 619/14	I mean [1] 618/18 I mentioned [1]	I shouldn't [1] 657/19 I show [1] 610/23	l visited [1] 561/21	697/16 699/1 701/7 701/10 702/6 708/15
631/4 638/14 639/16	550/25	l simply [2] 566/19	I walked [1] 766/20	710/11 712/12 713/9
639/20 641/1 641/10	I might [3] 713/18	605/1	I want [24] 534/1	714/11 718/25 719/7
642/17 645/5 646/24 647/1 647/4 647/5	714/5 735/24	I sit [1] 585/3	542/24 544/20 549/9	722/3 722/16 724/3
649/3 649/6 649/9	I misinterpreting [1]	I solemnly [1] 585/7	552/11 581/21 593/24	725/9 726/9 732/24
652/2 652/9 652/12	677/8	I speak [2] 688/18	601/14 609/23 610/22	737/3 741/6 746/21
652/15 653/2 653/20	I need [3] 540/19	691/7	631/2 633/18 634/11	749/18 765/22 773/10
653/21 653/22 654/22	558/21 758/5 I note [3] 652/6 656/1	I started [1] 555/1 I stated [1] 752/19	642/11 645/25 646/23 651/14 675/19 699/11	773/12 773/25 779/13
658/3 658/4 658/6		I stick [1] 711/24	705/9 715/22 729/9	l written [1] 555/10 l'm [2] 698/19 726/8
658/6 658/7 658/8	l now [6] 588/3 589/15		735/16 738/13	ICS [2] 575/4 722/7
660/11 660/20 664/5	591/12 591/16 633/5	I stop [1] 632/11	I want to [1] 709/1	ICSID [9] 528/5
664/11 664/15 667/3 667/18 668/16 671/21	670/12	I strongly [1] 594/25	I wanted [3] 587/16	529/17 703/25 704/9
673/15 674/6 677/6	I object [1] 754/19	I struggle [2] 654/2	611/20 628/9	704/21 704/25 749/13
679/9 681/1 683/9	l only [2] 617/10	654/15	I was [28] 553/18	768/11 778/11
686/17 686/17 686/23	690/18	I suppose [2] 698/1	554/7 554/8 554/12	idea [6] 555/22 574/11
009/13/009/13/090/14	I pass [1] 732/25 I performed [2] 612/2	706/11 I take [2] 569/1 743/6	554/13 554/25 555/2 555/6 556/1 562/14	582/10 665/6 721/4 768/13
692/8 694/7 695/1	642/16	I taught [1] 553/22	578/23 581/18 582/10	idealism [1] 707/19
696/7 699/3 703/13	I personally [1]	I thank [4] 780/11	614/3 614/3 619/5	ideally [1] 774/1
703/25 704/1 708/1 708/19 708/22 709/17	773/20	780/12 780/15 781/1	640/13 651/20 673/10	identical [2] 568/4
712/2 714/23 715/4	I pointed [1] 651/23	I think [73] 539/19	675/12 680/11 681/25	624/22
753/12 773/6 779/5	I posed [1] 772/21	541/18 552/19 561/1	690/2 690/7 690/13	identified [10] 580/12
I haven't [6] 534/15	I prepared [1] 674/4	565/10 571/11 573/15	694/12 754/14 777/6	605/14 612/22 613/23
537/14 562/10 562/11	I presented [1] 648/7 I presume [1] 613/1	579/5 582/12 584/16 585/11 588/19 593/5	l wasn't [2] 652/1 673/14	623/7 642/18 726/13 733/8 746/16 750/16
681/15 779/13	I produced [1] 674/22	595/9 595/10 597/5	l welcome [1] 639/4	identify [3] 590/12
I heard [2] 562/6	I project [1] 679/22		I went [1] 578/25	590/13 763/23
695/14	I projected [1] 680/10	615/17 618/19 618/22	I will [24] 535/3 545/7	identifying [1] 587/3
I hesitate [1] 746/3 I hope [4] 533/4 533/4	l put [1] 715/3	631/22 632/13 634/25	546/15 556/15 610/19	idle [3] 701/11 701/24
696/24 758/5	I rather [1] 621/2	637/22 638/1 645/9	639/24 640/6 640/19	702/1
l insist [1] 710/5	l read [2] 556/2	652/19 654/16 659/4	642/8 643/9 646/20	ie [3] 607/17 644/8
l just [11] 541/20	689/21	670/10 675/5 675/13 681/6 685/10 687/1	664/13 665/24 680/19	671/11
545/25 551/11 568/25	I realise [1] 580/14 I really [4] 642/23	687/20 688/6 688/13	686/15 687/17 696/19 709/8 721/25 722/1	ignorance [1] 630/12 ignored [1] 736/23
579/2 615/11 693/19	706/18 715/12 771/16	688/18 688/19 689/23	709/0721/25722/1	ill [2] 771/18 771/18
698/14 727/21 741/1	I recall [2] 581/8 660/5		754/6	ill-managed [1]
743/12 I know [20] 561/7	I received [2] 604/3	693/2 696/8 698/19	I wish [6] 691/17	771/18
561/10 561/14 561/19	650/14	699/6 702/24 704/13	696/21 771/18 771/20	ill-set [1] 771/18
561/20 563/3 565/13	I recognise [1] 612/16	705/5 707/20 712/2	771/23 780/11	illegal [3] 726/19

64/8 68/12 728/2 738/3 1odividually [1] 728/20 Inn [1] 529/5 space Inn [1] 529/5 space Inn [1] 529/5 space Innerestro [4] 563/6 57/12 750/17 788/14 Illiquity [1] 657/15 simagination [2] 704/20 563/2 682/6 892/15 802/6 802/6 802/1 Innorme [1] 659/16 802/6 802/6 802/1 Innorme [1] 659/16 802/6 802/6 802/1 Innorme [1] 659/16 802/6 722/0 7122/1 712/2 Innorme [1] 659/16 802/6 802/6 802/1 Innorme [1] 659/16 802/6 802/6 802/1 Innorme [1] 659/16 802/6 802/6 802/1 Innorme [1] 659/16 802/6 722/0 712/2 71/2 Innorme [1] 659/16 802/6 802/6 802/1 Innorme [1] 659/16 802/2 672/2 724/1 Innorme [1] 659/16 802/2 672/2 724/1 Innorme [1] 659/16 802/2 672/2 724/1 Innorme [1] 771/2 Innorme [1] 559/16 802/2 666/6 802/13 802/1 750/17 Innorme [1] 771/2 Innorme [1] 757/1 Innorme [1] 771/2 Innorme [1] 752/2 Innorme [1] 727/2 Innorme [1] 727/2 Innorme [1]	ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
Integrat Parket Parke	Г	634/8 681/2 728/2			interested [4] 563/6
T73:3 17425 7/86 2017 10425 7/86 2017 10425 7/86 2017 104216 3692 5042 5007 60212 104216 3692 5042 5007 60212 104216 3692 5042 5007 60212 104216 3692 5042 5007 60216 104216 3692 5042 5007 60216 104216 3692 5042 5007 60216 104216 3692 5042 5007 60216 104216 3692 5042 5007 60216 104216 3692 104216 3692 5042 5007 60216 104216 3692 5042 5007 60216 104216 3692 5042 5007 60216 104216 3692	illegal [2] 759/1				
imagination (1) 65/2 65/2 65/2 65/2 73/3 65/2 73/3 73/3 73/3 73/3 65/2 65/3 73/3	773/3				
Image and off (1) G8/1/2 E8/1/5 68/1/2 industry (13) 53/1 740/20 723/20 Image (2) 704/20 68/2/5 68/2/6 88/2/6 68/1/1 68/2/2 68/2/1 68/2/2 68/2/1 68/2/2 68/2/1 68/2/2 68/2/1 68/2/2 68/2/1 68/2/2 68/2/1 68/2/2 68/2/1 68/2/1 68/2/1 68/2/1 68/2/1 68/2/1 68/2/2 68/2/1 68/2/					
7.39.79 682/5 682/5 682/6 682/3 694/7 728/3 655/6 inputs [7] 653/4 interfered [1] 700/7 734/13 710/1 712/3 72/12 655/6 77/26 727/4 747/4 556/6 73/2 672/4 interfered [1] 700/7 539/5 724/1 income-based [6] 661/7 685/17 600/7 740/21 inserted [1] 569/26 558/2 709/6 728/2 intertered [1] 559/7 539/5 61/36 62/76 662/76 682/16 682/17 inconsistent [1] inflate [1] 727/2 inserted [1] 559/7 inserted [1] 559/7 61/2 667/22 67/8 652/7 inflate [1] 620/1 inflate [1] 620/1 inserted [1] 757/6 669/26 678/2 678/6 660/72 666/72 666/7 inflate [1] 620/1 inflate [1] 620/1 inserted [1] 757/6 679/4 709/20 740/3 incorsett [4] 660/1 inflate [1] 630/1 inserted [3] 660/1 interpreter [2] 679/4 709/20 incorset [4] 660/1 inflate [1] 620/1 inserted [3] 560/13 interpreter [2] 539/2 680/26 666/66/61/1 incorses [2] 652/7 inflate [1] 620/14 interpreter [2] 559/2 interpreter [2] 559/2 690/26 66/66/61/3 incorses [2] 652/2 inflate [1] 620/17 instences [1] 757/7 intererererererererererererererere					
Imagine [2] (0.4/20) (0.4/20) 685/11 085/11 085/11 085/11 594/25 74/4/4 594/25 594/25 602/7 (0.4/20) Interving [1] 767/12 (0.4/20) Interving [1] 767/12 (0.4/20) Say 25 74/4/ Say 25 74/4/1 685/15 08/12 08/201 1/13/7 713/20 74/021 Insegned [1] 509/12 (0.4/20)					
immadiately [2] 7101 7101 71017 71220 7132 6359 6732 674914 international [5] immense [1] 597/16 681/12 681/12 681/12 681/12 681/12 686/1 infected [15 557/1 insertion [1] 689/20 558/2 679/14 international [6] 558/2 679/14 international [6] 558/2 709/5 728/2 558/2 679/14 international [7] 578/17 717/20 770/21 internationally [1]	• • •				
589/25 724/1 Intermes [1] 597/1 Solution 5.500/5 Solution 5.500/5 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
Immense [1] 597/16 587/12 587/13 587/14 587/15 58					
impact [13] 550/25 65					
363/3 510/3 620/14 inflate [1] 727/2 insiste [1] 768/2 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
bib/sig bib/sib/sig bib/sig bib/sig					
600/2013/22 0740/3 impacted [1 629/2 622/19 inflated [1] 650/19 587/19 564/22 717/23 interpretation [1] finpacted [1] 629/2 incorrect [4] 662/3 66/23 660/6 incorrect [4] 662/1 incorrect [4] 662/1 65/23 660/6 66/23 660/2 66/23 660/2 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
06/94 / 109/20 (20)2 incorporating [1] inflating [1] iss0/ent [1] 744/2 inso/ent [1] 744/2 imperded [1] 726/6 iss0/ent [1] 766/7 inso/ent [1] 744/2 inso/ent [1] 744/2 imperded [1] 726/6 increase [2] 645/2 650/17 65/15 709/22 651/4 641/6 inso/ent [1] 744/2 implies [2] 599/6 increase [2] 645/2 influence [1] 623/17 inso/ent [1] 744/2 intervni [1] 584/1 implies [2] 599/6 increase [2] 645/2 influence [1] 624/1 instance [3] 666/13 intervni [1] 584/1 important [1] 533/6 increase [2] 630/2 550/1 540/18 570/5 573/4 57/3 instance [1] 767/5 instance [1] 767/5 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
Impared [3] 668/3 669/3		incorporating [1]			
660/3 660/5 10007ect [4] 662/1 552/1 660/5 660/5 660/5 660/5 660/5 660/5 660/5 660/5 660/5 660/7 660/5 660/7				insolvent [1] 744/2	
impeded [1] 726/6 b5b/23 666/6 666/17 b5b/23 666/6 666/17 information (2) 58/22 inspected [3] 607/17 inspected [3] 607/17 implications [1] 76077 increase [2] 645/2 information [6] 560/13 inspected [3] 607/17 inspected [3] 607/17 instruct [3] 58/24 58/27 instruct [3] 58/24 58/27 instruct [3] 58/24 58/27 instruct [3] 58/24 58/21					
impercet [1] 755/2 685/25 68					
implications [1] 7607 increased [2] 64/2 64/26 64/26 64/26 intervention [1] 7407 f03/3 implice [2] 659/6 increased [2] 751/2 influence [1] 646/10 instance [6] 566/17 intervention [1] 740/7 f03/3 implice [1] 741/1 increases [2] 630/25 654/7 538/14 54/18 54/23 instance [6] 567/17 538/24 539/23 557/22 558/15 57/24 558/15 57/24 558/15 57/24 558/15 57/24 558/15 59/16 538/24 539/23 557/22 558/15 59/16 538/24 539/23 557/22 558/15 59/16 538/24 539/23 557/22 558/15 59/16 538/14 539/23 557/22 558/15 560/15 59/16 564/18 701/10 701/17 16 17/16 17/16 220/1 569/15 560/15 59/16 564/18 701/10 701/17 16 17/16 220/1 569/15 560/16 57/16 746/23 introducting [1] 537/1 564/18 709/3 744/22 564/18 709/3 744/22 564/18 709/3 744/22 564/18 709/3 744/22 564/18 709/3 744/22 564/18 709/3 744/22 564/18 509/17 566/18 709/3 744/22 564/18 509/17 566/18 709/3 744/22 564/18 509/17 566/18 709/3 744/22 564/18 509/17 566/18 709/3 744/22 569/17 566/18 709/3 744/22 566/18 709/2 73/16 73/6 1000014					
Introduces [2] Signal Introduces [2] Signal Introduces [2] Signal imply [1] 751/3 increases [2] 630/2 650/2 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
000000000000000000000000000000000000					
Imply [1] 741/1 increases [2] 630/25 553/11 546/16 546/23 instances [1] 767/5 introduced [10] important [4] 533/6 f54/7 550/1 550/4 557/3 f57/3 573/4 57/3 instances [1] 777/4 f58/2 560/2 563/2 550/2 558/2 550/2 568					
importance [1] 593/6 054/7 050/3 for 3/4 5/33 050/3 for 3/4 5/33 050/3 for 3/4 5/33 050/2 for 3/2 for 3/3 for 3/3 050/2 for 3/2 for 3/3 <t< td=""><td></td><td>increases [2] 630/25</td><td></td><td></td><td>introduced [10]</td></t<>		increases [2] 630/25			introduced [10]
important [14] f33/6 incur [5] 59/7 56/7 59/7 56/7 59/7 56/7 59/7 56/7 59/7 56/7 59/7 56/7 59/7 56/7<		654/7			538/24 539/23 557/22
5657 590/2 691/4 incurred [5] 599/18 592/15 691/1 592/1 592/1 593/11 institute [5] 559/16 600/8 601/6 678/19 701/20 719/16 753/16 incurred [5] 559/17 institute [5] 559/16 707/20 719/16 753/16 incurred [5] 558/17 introducing [1] 537/7 701/27 719/16 753/16 indeed [14] 588/17 569/16 670/15 569/16 670/15 70197 748/12 739/23 indeed [14] 538/17 569/16 670/15 570/16 675/19 585/12 684/24 686/12 707/20 717/20 717/20 590/4 632/10 633/22 670/16 675/12 678/18 instruction [1] 730/4 invalidating [1] 736/3 778/20 570/7 580/5 657/17 569/16 675/19 685/24 686/16 694/1 instruction [1] invalidating [1] 736/3 767/6 770/14 774/24 774/25 771/20 777/25 insufficient [3] 686/25 inventoris [2] 590/16 759/12 0 697/17 699/2 715/15 indeexed [1] 651/15 indeexed [2] 557/18 investigate [1] 729/4 investigate [1] 729/5<					
500/8 00/16 / 75/3/6 701/10 612/4 612/20 615/6 559/17 566/9 567/18 introducing [1] 537/7 707/20 719/16 753/6 7019/16 753/6 7019/16 753/6 559/17 566/9 567/18 introduction [1] 770/20 719/16 753/76 7019/16 753/6 658/12 664/16 559/17 566/9 567/18 introduction [1] 770/20 776/11 indeed [14] 538/17 664/20 669/1 670/15 728/7 730/9 556/12 556/17 779/20 678/21 682/25 685/18 687/24 686/1 694/1 instruction [1] rotauid [1] 761/25 779/20 759/4 759/23 765/18 697/13 756/6 757/19 685/24 686/1 694/1 728/7 730/9 instructions [1] rotauid [1] 682/16 766/7 759/4 759/23 765/18 697/13 699/2 rotauid [1] 733/15 instructions [1] rotauid [1] 682/16 628/24 686/1 694/1 rotauid [1] 682/16 600/18 600/18 600/22 628/23 investice [2] 550/17 investice [2] 500/1 investice [2] 50/17 investice [2] 552/3 investice [2] 552/3 investice [2] 552/3 investice [2] 552/3 rod4/11 investice [2] 552/3					
10/12/07/19/16/15/30/16 incurred [5] 585/25 61/1 61/1 62/2 60/18 60/18 60/18 60/18 60/18 60/18 62/2	600/8 601/6 678/19				
1730/17 70/17 70/17 70/17 70/17 70/17 50/18 76/19 56/16 56/16 56/16 56/16 56/16 56/16 56/16 56/16 56/16 56/17 50/16 56/16 56/16 56/16 56/17 50/16 56/12 57/13 50/16 56/12 57/13 50/16 56/12 57/13 50/16 56/16 56/16 56/16 56/16 56/16 56/12 56/12 56/16 56/17 56/17 56/16 56/16 56/17 56/17 56/17 56/17 56/17 56/17 56/17 56/16 56/17 56/17 56/16 56/17 56/17 56/16 56/16 56/16 56/17 56/17 56/16 56/17 56/17 56/16					
71/01/1 776/11 658/19 664/18 664/19 instruct [3] 692/23 introductory [1] 738/21 739/23 importad [1] 723/23 indiced [14] 538/17 664/20 669/1 670/15 instruct [3] 692/23 invalid [1] 761/25 imported [1] 723/23 imposed [1] 658/3 678/1 658/24 684/12 678/2 678/16 683/25 684/24 685/23 invalid [1] 736/3 invalid					
Iniportality [2] imported [1] 723/21 indeed [14] 538/17 590/4 632/10 633/22 670/16 675/12 678/18 637/25 68/26 68/26 637/25 68/26 68/26 68/26 68/26 68/26 68/26 637/25 68/26 68/26 68/26 68/26 68/26 637/25 68/26 68/26 68/26 68/26 68/26 637/25 68/26 68/26 68/26 69/21 invalidating [1] 736/25 invasion [1] invalidating [1] 736/2 invasion [1] 698/16 invasion [1] invasion [1] 698/16 invasion [1] invasion [1] 698/16 invasion [1] invasion [1] invasion [1] invasion [1] 698/16 invasion [1] invasion [
imported [1] 723/23 590/4 632/10 633/22 670/16 675/12 678/18 instruction [1] 730/4 invalid [1] 761/25 779/20 678/21 682/25 685/18 683/25 684/24 682/31 685/24 686/1 694/1 758/17 instruction [1] 728/15 invalid [1] 761/2		indeed [14] 538/17	664/20 669/1 670/15		
impose [2] 638/13 67/1 65/2 63/2 668/2 78/2 78/2					
779/20 b3/13 / 36/6 / 57/19 b3/24 / 63/1 (94/1) 728/15 b3/24 / 63/1 (94/1) imposed [1] 65/3/3 759/47 / 59/23 765/18 759/47 / 59/23 765/18 69/22 (97/13 699/2) insufficient [3] 68/25 insufficient [1] 68/26 impression [3] 556/3 76/6 777/2 777/25 755/13 69/14 73/24 60/12 65/18 60/22 69/7/3 69/2 insufficient [1] 65/18 60/12 60/14 impression [3] 556/3 56/3 69/17 69/2 715/15 independent[6] 777/2 777/25 755/13 60/12 60/14 60/12 60/14 591/20 697/17 69/2 715/15 independently [1] independently [1] integrate [1] 65/18 integrate [1] 565/18 60/12 66/22 591/20 69/17 61/24 60/14 60/13 63/14 integrate [1] 56/18 integrate [1] 56/18 60/12 66/2 60/20 invested [6] 611/18 565/14 60/11 63/12 60/14 60/13 63/2 intelligence [1] intelligence [1] investigate [1] 72/4 investigate [1] 72/4 60/14 60/2 60/21 60/21 60/21 60/21 60/21 60/21 60/21 60/21 60/21 60/21 60/21 60/21 60/21 60/21 60/21 60/21 60/21 <					
Thypesed [1] 630/3 impressed [1] 674/25 impression [3] 556/3 768/6 768/7 impression [3] 556/3 591/20 767/6 independent [6] 546/3 585/24 694/12 697/17 699/2 715/15 independently [1] 699/2 715/15 independently [1] 591/20 712/18 729/8 747/10 777/25 693/14 734/24 755/13 628/23 inventory [5] 600/14 600/18 600/19 600/22 600/23 697/17 699/2 715/15 impressively [1] 553/1 findependently [1] 563/8 independently [1] 642/7 611/18 informative [1] 709/19 indicate [6] 587/18 608/8 669/1 714/21 formative [1] 709/19 indicate [6] 587/18 608/8 669/1 714/21 formative [1] 709/19 indicate [6] 587/18 608/8 669/1 714/21 formative [1] 709/19 intial [20] 586/6 formative [1] 709/19 intellectually [1] 605/11 605/13 633/4 formative [1] 709/19 intellectually [1] 605/13 633/4 formative [1] 709/19 intellectually [1] 703/20 704/6 705/25 586/5 597/18 indicate [1] 723/5 formative [1] 708/19 intellect [1] 689/3 intend [1] 689/11 607/11 612/10 609/14 670/15 interaction [1] 680/12 586/6 586/19 588/9 586/6 586/19 588/9 586/6 586/19 588/9 586/15 631/8 633/16 63/16 590/23 591/1 individual [5] 654/24 726/17 749/14 726/17 66/2 766/4 726/17 647/7 749/14 726/20 724/22 727/11 656/13 657/13 701/25 709/22 576/14 injury [1] 592/9 formative [1] 708/19 interaction [1] 680/12 568/6 580/19 588/9 568/6 580/23 591/1 614/22 615/18 616/5 631/8 633/16 63/10 651/10 651/11 640/22 661/14 640/12 2 615/8 616/5 631/8 633/16 63/10 651/10					
Impression [1] 50/4/25 768/5 768/7 556/3 768/5 768/7 597/17 699/2 715/15 impressions [1] 597/17 699/2 715/15 jop/17 699/2 715/15 independently [1] impressive [1] 553/1 642/7 impressive [1] 553/1 642/7 impressive [1] 563/12 642/7 indeced [1] 651/15 indeced [1] 651/15 indicate [6] 587/18 indicates [3] 576/6 733/1 566/14 include [6] 550/17 586/2 597/18 588/12 600/19 583/20 584/5 586/5 597/18 indicates [3] 576/6 710/25 741/11 742/8 733/14 712/2 704/2 indicates [3] 576/6 710/25 741/11 742/8 738/12 610/19 583/20 584/5 586/5 597/18 indicates [3] 576/6 710/25 741/11 742/8 738/12 610/19 583/20 584/5 619/21 620/6 620/10 618/2 618/9 619/18 619/21 620/6 620/10 619/21 620/6 620/10 619/21 620/6 620/10 620/24 647/22 694/2 727/17 766/2 766/4 726/16 749/7 749/14 724/72 776/62 766/4 726/16 749/7 749/14 724/72 776/62 766/4 636/17 617/24					
111 pression [1] 536/3 585/24 694/12 777/20 777/25 755/13 600/18 600/19 600/22 1591/20 independently [1] independently [1] independently [1] 73/15 100/18 600/19 600/22 591/20 independently [1] 64/3 585/24 694/12 informative [1] 709/2 integrate [1] 565/18 100/18 600/19 600/22 563/8 independently [1] 653/12 indexed [1] 651/15 indicate [6] 587/18 100/18 604/13 604/14 100/19 563/8 608/8 669/1 714/21 723/16 739/6 interently [1] 709/19 intellectually [1] 603/16 702/19 100/18 60/19 600/22 656/14 723/16 739/6 608/8 669/1 714/21 586/13 604/13 604/13 604/14 699/19 100/19 100/21 100/2					
1763/760/7 697/17 699/2 715/15 informative [1] 709/2 integrate [1] 565/18 600/23 impressions [1] 591/20 642/7 independently [1] independently [1] indexed [1] 651/15 ingredient [1] 733/15 integrate [1] 565/18 600/23 563/8 indexed [1] 651/15 indexed [1] 651/15 indexed [1] 651/15 indexed [1] 651/15 integrate [1] 541/14 investe [2] 552/23 impressively [1] indicate [6] 587/18 indexed [1] 503/12 indexed [1] 563/12 indexed [1] 563/12 608/13 604/14 699/19 693/16 702/19 inaccurate [1] 667/19 indicate [5] 572/14 605/11 605/13 603/4 680/20 investigate [1] 729/4 investigate [1] 729/4 inclination [2] 538/15 538/19 indicate [3] 576/6 703/20 704/6 705/25 intend [1] 689/3 investing [3] 649/19 include [6] 550/17 586/15 597/18 indirect [1] 706/13 initiate [1] 768/2 intent [1] 723/5 558/12 558/15 586/1 individual [5] 654/24 findividual [5] 654/24 727/17 766/2 766/4 563/6 590/23 591/1 614/22 615/2 615/8 584/12 610/5 individual [5] 654/24 726/16 749/7 749/14 726/17 766/2 766/24 563/6 590/12 561/1 605/11 607/10 612	impression [3] 550/5				
591/20 independentiy [1] independentiy [1] ingredient [1] 73/15 integrated [2] 562/17 invest [2] 553/23 563/8 indexed [1] 651/15 indexed [1] 563/12 indexed [1] 651/15 inteligente [1] 709/19 integrated [2] 582/20 704/11 integrated [2] 582/17 704/11 656/14 inclicated [5] 572/14 633/13 633/15 634/8 609/19 intelligence [1] investigate [1] 729/4 inclination [2] 538/15 indicates [3] 576/6 701/25 741/11 742/8 704/9 intended [2] 560/19 investing [3] 649/19 580/19 583/20 584/5 indicates [3] 576/6 701/25 741/11 742/8 704/9 intendig [1] 699/8 intent [1] 723/5 interaction [1] 689/3 investing [3] 649/19 583/19 indicates [3] 576/6 766/5 766/8 766/24 704/9 interaction [1] 689/3 investing [3] 649/19 558/12 558/15 586/15 586/15 investing [3] 649/19 558/12 558/15 586/15 586/15 interaction [1] 680/22 568/14 588/9 interaction [1]		697/17 699/2 715/15	informative [1] 709/2	integrate [1] 565/18	
impressive [1] 553/1 642/7 indexed [1] 651/15 658/12 658/12 658/12 699/19 interdilegence [1] investigate [1] 729/4 investigate [2] 587/5 609/18 699/19 investigate [2] 587/5 609/18 investigate [2] 587/5 656/16 706/5 666/16 706/5 <td></td> <td>independently [1]</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>invest [2] 555/23</td>		independently [1]			invest [2] 555/23
impressively [1] indexed [1] 651/15 indexed [1] 651/15 indexed [1] 709/19 integrity [1] 709/19 integrity [1] 541/14 invested [0] 611/18 563/8 improved [1] 563/12 indicate [6] 587/18 initial [20] 586/6 intellectually [1] 69/19 69/19 69/19 69/16 702/19 69/17 702/19 investigate [1] 709/19					
563/8 indicate [6] 58/18 initial [20] 586/6 initial [20] 586/6 60/225 693/25 693/6 improved [1] 563/12 608/8 669/1 714/21 723/16 739/6 605/11 605/13 603/14 689/19 699/19 693/16 702/19 inappropriate [1] 607/11 632/21 654/16 733/3 633/13 633/15 634/8 680/20 699/19 investigate [1] 729/4 656/14 incleate [5] 572/14 605/11 605/13 633/4 680/20 investigate [1] 729/4 607/11 632/21 654/16 723/3 703/20 704/6 705/25 intende [1] 689/3 investigate [1] 528/3 538/19 indicate [1] 617/24 618/2 618/9 619/18 710/25 741/11 742/8 intending [1] 699/8 interest [21] 543/11 605/11 586/1 558/15 586/1 560/19 583/20 584/5 586/12 620/10 injunction [7] 725/19 interest [21] 543/11 563/6 590/23 591/1 586/6 588/19 588/9 608/3 610/7 617/24 618/2 618/9 619/18 injunction [7] 725/19 interest [21] 543/11 563/15 631/18 633/16 636/13 604/14 726/16 749/7 749/14 726/16 749/7 749/14 727/17 766/2 766/4 591/16 501/15 612/15 616/5 631/8 633/16 636/13 604/14 640/17 651/10 651/11 640/17 651/10 651/11 640/12 2 656/13 645/1					
Improved [1] 563/12 723/16 739/6 605/11 605/13 633/4 intelligence [1] investigate [1] 729/4 inaccurate [1] 667/19 indicated [5] 572/14 633/13 633/15 634/8 680/20 investigate [1] 729/4 656/14 607/11 632/21 654/16 640/22 645/1 683/20 703/20 704/6 705/25 intendig [1] 689/3 609/18 inclination [2] 538/15 indicates [3] 576/6 710/25 741/11 742/8 704/9 intendig [1] 699/8 investigate [1] 729/4 include [6] 550/17 indirect [10] 617/24 indirect [10] 617/24 initiative [1] 768/2 intendig [1] 699/8 interest [21] 543/1 558/12 558/15 586/1 560/19 583/20 584/5 619/21 620/6 620/10 injunction [7] 725/19 interest [21] 543/11 605/11 607/10 612/10 633/3 610/7 617/24 618/2 618/9 619/18 injunctions [8] 724/17 563/6 590/12 558/15 586/1 586/6 586/19 588/9 includes [2] 618/13 619/21 620/6 620/10 injunctions [8] 724/17 640/17 651/10 651/11 640/22 641/17 641/25 654/13 individual [5] 654/24 726/16 749/7 749/14 724/20 724/22 727/11 640/17 651/10 651/11 640/22 65/12 656/13 645/1 645/22 656/24 654/13 618/12 618/9 749/17 749/14 724/20 72/					
inaccurate [1] 667/19 indicated [5] 572/14 633/13 633/15 634/8 680/20 investigated [2] 587/5 656/14 607/11 632/21 654/16 640/22 645/1 680/20 intende [1] 689/3 609/18 606/16 706/5 608/20 606/12 668/20 668/20 668/20 668/20 668/12 658/19 619/21 605/11 612/10 616/5 633/16 640/22 640/22 641/22 618/2 616/5 633/16 640/22 640/12 640/12 640/12 640/22 616/5 633/16 640/22 640/12 640/22 616/5 633/16 640/22 616/5 633/16 640/22 <					
614 607/11 632/21 654/16 640/22 645/1 683/20 intend [1] 689/3 609/18 656/14 723/3 703/20 704/6 705/25 intended [2] 560/19 566/16 706/5 inclination [2] 538/15 586/5 597/18 710/25 741/11 742/8 704/9 656/16 706/5 indicates [3] 576/6 742/12 intitate [1] 768/2 intending [1] 699/8 intending [1] 699/8 include [6] 550/17 568/5 597/18 intitative [1] 706/13 intitative [1] 706/13 interaction [1] 680/12 586/6 586/19 588/9 584/12 610/5 618/2 618/9 619/18 619/21 620/6 620/10 620/24 647/22 694/2 intitative [1] 706/13 interest [21] 543/11 605/11 607/10 612/10 638/3 610/7 617/24 618/2 618/9 619/18 619/21 620/6 620/10 727/17 766/2 766/4 563/6 590/23 591/1 614/22 615/2 615/8 638/3 642/5 individual [5] 654/24 724/20 724/22 727/11 766/5 766/8 766/24 591/6 591/15 612/15 616/5 631/8 633/16 654/13 individualising [1] 727/15 765/23 765/25 741/20 742/20 742/20 683/14 684/19 688/8 654/13 individualising [1] 761/4 721/15 765/23 765/25 741/20 742/20 742/20 688/10 688/22 694/11 697/4 697/22 701/11 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
050714 723/3 703/20 704/6 705/25 intended [2] 560/19 investing [3] 649/19 inclination [2] 538/15 indicates [3] 576/6 710/25 741/11 742/8 704/9 intending [1] 699/8 investing [3] 649/19 538/19 indicates [3] 576/6 586/5 597/18 indirect [10] 617/24 initiate [1] 768/2 initiate [1] 723/5 intending [1] 699/8 interaction [1] 680/12 586/6 586/19 588/9 560/19 583/20 584/5 618/2 618/9 619/18 619/21 620/6 620/10 initiative [1] 706/13 interaction [1] 680/12 586/6 586/19 588/9 605/11 607/10 612/10 608/3 610/7 617/24 618/2 618/9 619/18 619/21 620/6 620/10 620/24 647/22 694/2 727/17 766/2 766/4 563/6 590/23 591/1 586/6 586/19 588/9 605/11 607/10 612/10 614/22 615/2 615/8 616/5 631/8 633/16 640/22 641/17 641/25 640/12 641/17 641/25 640/12 656/13 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1 645/22 656/24 645/1					
inclination [2] 538/15 indicates [3] 576/6 710/25 741/11 742/8 704/9 656/16 706/5 538/19 include [6] 550/17 586/5 597/18 742/12 intending [1] 699/8 intending [1] 723/5 intending [1] 723/5 560/19 583/20 584/5 618/2 618/9 619/18 initiative [1] 706/13 initiative [1] 706/13 interaction [1] 680/12 586/6 586/19 588/9 584/12 610/5 619/21 620/6 620/10 injunction [7] 725/19 interest [21] 543/11 563/6 590/23 591/1 586/6 586/19 588/9 608/3 610/7 617/24 618/2 618/9 619/18 injunction [8] 724/17 766/5 766/8 766/24 591/6 591/15 612/15 616/5 631/8 633/16 608/3 610/7 617/24 individual [5] 654/24 726/16 749/7 749/14 724/20 724/22 727/11 564/0 556/12 656/13 640/17 651/10 651/11 640/22 641/17 641/25 654/13 individual [5] 654/24 727/15 765/23 765/25 657/13 701/25 709/22 643/14 684/19 688/8 654/13 individualising [1] 767/14 727/15 765/23 765/25 657/13 701/25 709/22 683/14 684/19 688/8 670/9 581/20 620/22 764/7 764/7 injury [1] 592/9 748/19 751/25 697/4 697/22 701/11		723/3		intended [2] 560/19	
538/19 586/5 59/1/8 742/12 intending [1] 699/8 investment [61] 528/3 include [6] 550/17 indirect [10] 617/24 initiate [1] 768/2 intending [1] 723/5 558/12 558/15 586/1 586/19 583/20 584/5 618/2 618/9 619/18 initiative [1] 706/13 interaction [1] 680/12 586/6 586/19 588/9 584/12 610/5 619/21 620/6 620/10 injunction [7] 725/19 interest [21] 543/11 563/6 590/23 591/1 605/11 607/10 612/10 608/3 610/7 617/24 618/2 618/9 619/18 injunction [8] 724/17 766/5 766/8 766/24 591/6 591/15 612/15 616/5 631/8 633/16 608/3 610/7 617/24 individual [5] 654/24 766/5 766/8 766/24 591/6 591/10 651/11 640/22 641/17 641/25 654/13 726/16 749/7 749/14 724/20 724/22 727/11 654/20 656/12 656/13 645/1 645/22 656/24 654/13 individualising [1] 767/14 727/15 765/23 765/25 657/13 701/25 709/22 688/10 688/22 694/11 697/4 697/22 701/11 r64/7 r64/7 r1] 592/9 748/19 751/25 697/4 697/22 701/11					
include [6] 550/17 indirect [10] 61//24 initiate [1] 768/2 intent [1] 723/5 558/12 558/15 586/1 560/19 583/20 584/5 618/2 618/9 619/18 initiative [1] 706/13 interaction [1] 680/12 586/6 586/19 588/9 584/12 610/5 619/21 620/6 620/10 injunction [7] 725/19 interest [21] 543/11 605/11 607/10 612/10 608/3 610/7 617/24 618/2 618/9 619/18 injunction [7] 725/19 interest [21] 543/11 605/11 607/10 612/10 608/3 610/7 617/24 indisputably [1] 631/7 766/5 766/8 766/24 591/6 591/15 612/15 616/5 631/8 633/16 includes [2] 618/13 726/16 749/7 749/14 724/20 724/22 727/11 654/20 656/12 656/13 645/1 645/22 656/24 570/9 581/20 620/22 individualising [1] 764/7 764/7 767/14 748/19 751/25 688/10 688/22 694/11 697/4 697/22 701/11 injury [1] 592/9 748/19 751/25 697/4 697/22 701/11 697/4 697/22 701/11					
560/19 583/20 584/5 618/2 618/9 619/18 initiative [1] 706/13 interaction [1] 680/12 586/6 586/19 588/9 584/12 610/5 619/21 620/6 620/10 injunction [7] 725/19 interest [21] 543/11 605/11 607/10 612/10 608/3 610/7 617/24 620/24 647/22 694/2 766/5 766/8 766/24 injunctions [8] 724/17 563/6 590/23 591/1 616/5 631/8 633/16 640/12 618/13 individual [5] 654/24 766/5 766/8 766/24 640/17 651/10 651/11 640/22 641/17 641/25 654/13 726/16 749/7 749/14 724/20 724/22 727/11 765/23 765/25 657/13 701/25 709/22 683/14 684/19 688/8 767/14 764/7 764/7 764/7 763/29 748/19 751/25 697/4 697/22 701/11					
364/12 010/3 620/24 647/22 694/2 727/17 766/2 766/4 563/6 590/23 591/1 614/22 615/2 615/8 included [6] 587/12 indisputably [1] 631/7 766/5 766/8 766/24 591/6 591/15 612/15 616/5 631/8 633/16 608/3 610/7 617/24 individual [5] 654/24 ripunctions [8] 724/17 563/6 590/23 591/1 614/22 615/2 615/8 includes [2] 618/13 726/16 749/7 749/14 724/20 724/22 727/11 654/20 656/12 656/13 645/1 645/22 656/24 including [12] 569/12 570/9 581/20 620/22 764/7 764/7 761/14 727/14 651/12 51/2 615/8 injury [1] 592/9 767/14 r27/15 765/23 765/25 767/14 657/13 701/25 709/22 688/10 688/22 694/11	560/19 583/20 584/5				
Included [6] 58/712 indisputably [1] 631/7 766/5 766/8 766/24 591/6 591/15 612/15 616/5 631/8 633/16 608/3 610/7 617/24 individual [5] 654/24 individual [5] 654/24 591/6 591/15 612/15 640/17 651/10 651/11 640/22 641/17 641/25 635/3 642/5 individual [5] 654/24 726/16 749/7 749/14 724/20 724/22 727/11 654/20 656/12 656/13 645/1 645/22 656/24 654/13 654/13 657/13 701/25 709/22 683/14 684/19 688/8 individualising [1] 764/7 764/7 761/14 748/19 751/25 697/4 697/22 701/11					
606/3 610/7 617/24 individual [5] 654/24 injunctions [8] 724/17 640/17 651/10 651/11 640/22 641/17 641/25 635/3 642/5 includes [2] 618/13 729/16 724/20 724/22 727/11 654/20 656/12 656/13 645/1 645/22 656/24 654/13 individualising [1] 727/15 765/23 765/25 657/13 701/25 709/22 688/10 688/22 694/11 570/9 581/20 620/22 764/7 injury [1] 592/9 748/19 751/25 697/4 697/22 701/11					
633/3 642/3 726/16 749/7 749/14 724/20 724/22 727/11 654/20 656/12 656/13 645/1 645/22 656/24 654/13 749/16 727/15 765/23 765/25 657/13 701/25 709/22 683/14 684/19 688/8 including [12] 569/12 570/9 581/20 620/22 764/7 749/16 721/15 765/23 765/25 657/13 701/25 709/22 688/10 688/22 694/11					640/22 641/17 641/25
654/13 749/16 727/15 765/23 765/25 657/13 701/25 709/22 683/14 684/19 688/8 including [12] 569/12 570/9 581/20 620/22 764/7 764/7 741/20 742/20 742/20 688/10 688/22 694/11 697/4 697/22 701/11 697/4 697/22 701/11 697/4 697/22 701/11				654/20 656/12 656/13	
including [12] 569/12 individualising [1] 767/14 741/20 742/20 688/10 688/22 694/11 570/9 581/20 620/22 764/7 injury [1] 592/9 748/19 751/25 697/4 697/22 701/11					
570/9 581/20 620/22 764/7 Injury [1] 592/9 748/19 751/25 697/4 697/22 701/11					
www.dianaburden.com		/ 04/ /	injury [1] 592/9	148/19/01/25	09774 097722 701/11
www.dianaburdan.com					
			www.dianaburdan.acm		

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

Zbigniew Plotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 528-781
I	772/3 772/4 775/3	539/6 539/7 539/9	529/13 556/19 556/24	L
investment [30]	775/9	539/15 539/18 540/13	585/4 639/6 683/8	I.kopecky [1] 531/8
702/1 704/6 705/16	issued [4] 723/24	541/14 541/20 543/3	696/15 700/4 719/17	la [1] 529/14
705/20 705/24 706/1	724/7 765/5 767/16	545/22 545/25 547/19	772/12	labour [1] 705/17
706/8 707/6 707/10	issues [30] 535/3	548/9 548/18 548/19	Knieper's [1] 635/6	lack [4] 562/3 642/15
707/13 707/21 711/1	536/1 540/25 553/12	551/11 553/15 556/19	know [91] 539/20	713/16 726/5
733/14 735/9 735/21	579/16 600/5 601/2	556/21 556/22 559/3	547/10 552/11 561/6	lacked [1] 669/13
737/19 738/5 738/23	602/3 602/4 616/23	560/23 561/8 563/8	561/7 561/9 561/10	ladies [1] 752/9
740/3 740/4 741/22	620/19 625/15 654/22	567/21 568/25 570/7	561/14 561/17 561/19	Laguardia [107]
742/8 742/18 743/20	654/24 679/8 696/16	571/11 571/25 574/2	561/20 562/7 562/11	543/22 548/7 548/25
744/3 768/2 768/11	702/14 716/22 721/25	576/13 576/19 577/8	563/3 563/3 563/19	549/3 549/5 549/11
768/13 771/18 772/3	725/7 726/10 738/12	579/2 579/3 579/4	565/13 571/18 571/20	549/16 551/22 563/9
investments [10]	749/4 750/21 751/1	580/3 580/3 582/18	575/6 576/1 576/1	565/1 565/17 567/14
563/9 563/10 572/24	752/20 752/24 758/12	584/3 585/22 590/8	577/8 578/14 578/24	568/4 572/23 573/5
572/25 587/8 640/24	767/8 779/12	590/12 592/22 597/14	579/3 580/4 580/6	573/7 574/8 575/4
703/21 705/17 707/11	issuing [1] 726/18	600/12 602/11 603/22	580/7 580/10 580/13	576/4 583/2 587/6
743/22	it [584]	606/10 606/17 608/7	581/20 581/22 582/9	588/2 588/17 598/7
investor [16] 591/7	it true [1] 595/6	610/6 610/17 610/18	582/14 587/16 600/3	599/12 607/19 607/21
591/8 625/2 629/22	items [1] 698/12	613/15 614/18 615/11	605/1 609/25 610/22	609/7 610/10 610/13
630/1 631/1 698/2	its [32] 534/24 539/21	619/15 620/19 621/22	611/1 615/16 619/3	610/14 611/2 611/3
698/3 698/6 704/4	543/22 599/20 599/25	626/21 627/24 630/12	624/12 629/22 635/22	611/18 611/18 612/9
704/6 706/13 706/24	642/20 647/8 654/17	630/24 631/24 634/10	638/6 644/13 644/16	612/10 612/14 621/4
714/25 749/12 749/16	656/4 656/5 660/6	635/12 641/4 646/4	650/11 652/11 660/23	621/15 625/19 625/20
investors [2] 698/7	669/13 675/22 676/9	657/16 659/5 659/7	664/20 664/24 669/4	628/13 633/25 649/14
755/25	679/5 702/13 703/23 725/4 726/3 727/14	662/17 670/3 670/8 674/14 676/3 677/7	669/5 670/2 670/3	658/10 658/16 661/18
invests [3] 705/20			670/23 671/22 671/24	661/23 662/7 662/10
705/24 706/3	735/14 737/24 737/25	679/20 686/9 693/19	673/22 673/24 675/10 680/7 681/4 688/19	662/17 662/20 665/7
invite [2] 637/18	738/14 739/8 739/16 747/18 748/16 764/14	698/14 698/17 698/18 699/18 700/15 702/21	690/8 690/9 699/12	665/10 669/13 670/16
699/15	765/14 766/21 779/22	703/18 705/21 709/10	711/15 714/2 715/18	670/17 673/25 674/1
invited [1] 612/12	itself [11] 617/14	710/21 714/20 715/18	718/18 721/3 725/17	674/3 674/7 674/9
invites [1] 637/23	642/9 657/20 679/24	719/4 719/11 721/16	727/8 727/11 727/14	677/4 677/23 681/8
inviting [1] 707/3	707/22 713/11 739/1	723/19 726/14 727/19	728/24 729/3 735/11	681/17 681/20 685/6
invoiced [1] 731/22	740/6 746/1 749/17	727/20 727/21 728/9	739/21 751/8 756/14	686/9 686/13 693/21
invoices [2] 587/23	778/13	737/9 737/13 737/17	759/20 759/22 768/14	722/7 723/8 724/20
776/9	Ivanes [3] 723/10	741/1 742/25 743/12	774/8 776/12 778/12	725/4 725/8 725/16
invoked [1] 762/4	728/16 728/17	744/10 752/21 753/9	knowing [2] 576/7	725/17 725/22 726/3
involved [5] 650/6		754/19 754/20 759/1	673/23	727/2 727/13 729/25
722/25 727/18 728/11	J	762/16 775/15 775/20	knowledge [10] 544/3	730/1 730/10 738/14
758/24	January [8] 592/16	776/4 776/9 776/25	544/5 614/1 614/10	738/16 744/2 744/21
IONESCU [1] 529/24	607/1 607/2 633/9	779/19 780/4	614/11 664/16 681/8	745/12 745/21 745/24
Iraq [1] 698/16	736/10 775/14 778/5	justice [3] 707/4	755/18 757/5 764/9	746/2 746/17 746/18
irregularities [1]	778/7	755/15 768/6	knowledgeable [6]	746/20 748/15 749/20
724/8	January 2017 [1]	justified [2] 586/25	592/2 592/8 603/5	757/25 758/3 760/2
irrespective [1] 762/3	633/9	588/7	612/5 625/3 696/13	762/11 763/12 764/12
irrigated [1] 548/1	January 31 [1] 778/7		known [6] 589/19	765/20 771/8
isn't [5] 595/6 624/16 646/19 676/8 695/1	join [1] 680/16	K	592/2 592/7 612/4	Laguardia's [19] 546/3 549/18 563/13
	joint [1] 546/2	keep [4] 626/21 734/5	651/9 696/6	563/13 563/14 563/14
issue [53] 533/12 534/6 535/4 535/8	joke [2] 710/13 775/15		knows [6] 559/1	563/17 595/14 624/15
538/10 577/25 579/16	judging [1] 573/20	kept [1] 533/6	610/22 684/4 684/5	667/1 670/21 676/10
582/1 582/5 589/16	judgment [5] 590/25	key [1] 623/13	706/4 780/25	712/15 726/6 727/4
601/2 608/12 615/11	591/15 636/17 734/7	kg [1] 560/11	KOPECKY [14] 531/3	739/25 742/4 764/9
636/4 636/17 639/15	742/20	kilograms [4] 557/23	535/3 536/4 536/6	766/3
641/7 641/10 645/17	judgments [1] 736/3	557/24 558/1 694/3	604/10 632/12 632/20	laid [1] 722/4
654/21 661/7 662/13	July [3] 612/15 646/13		639/11 661/17 679/18	land [26] 549/23 554/3
670/13 714/18 714/19	756/15	711/20	699/12 715/9 772/20	554/4 554/23 555/3
722/2 725/10 727/12	July 2011 [1] 756/15	kind [8] 586/18 624/17		555/4 556/14 556/23
737/22 740/21 744/15	June [2] 646/13 668/3	682/4 682/9 684/19	KOZAK [1] 531/17	556/24 557/9 557/9
744/15 744/17 744/18	June/July [1] 646/13	705/19 708/19 745/21	KPMG [8] 531/17	557/19 560/9 560/11
746/4 746/24 747/5	jurisdictions [1]	kinds [2] 556/9 697/5	531/17 586/3 596/4	563/20 569/9 569/14
748/8 749/11 752/11	755/25	Kingdom [1] 529/6	596/7 600/11 628/16	576/16 578/25 644/24
756/9 757/18 760/16	just [129] 533/11	KLINGST [1] 529/20	696/6	645/24 668/13 681/10
760/20 761/14 762/10	534/9 535/11 535/12	knew [1] 636/6	KPMG's [1] 590/3	714/14 739/13 770/19
763/6 765/22 767/21	537/2 537/10 538/7	Knieper [11] 528/16		landowner [1] 761/1
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

	learn [3] 570/10 595/3	569/24 571/16 650/17	592/20 596/3 597/13	550/15 682/3
L landowsore [0]	665/15	651/6 691/14	592/20 596/3 597/13	little [16] 556/1 561/8
landowners [8] 725/12 725/23 726/20	learned [8] 662/8	LELIA [1] 529/25	606/4 606/12 607/8	562/14 639/22 640/19
728/8 757/21 762/15	671/17 696/5 709/17	length [1] 603/5	607/10 608/4 609/9	684/13 705/10 708/18
766/14 767/19	723/21 770/17 771/1	lengthy [1] 709/11	617/6 618/14 622/12	716/9 717/5 717/6
lands [18] 546/12	771/6	LEON [1] 531/3	626/21 627/15 631/24	724/4 726/25 750/5
546/13 555/18 555/20	learns [1] 704/3 learnt [4] 580/19	less [16] 542/15 555/18 566/12 570/18	632/2 632/9 632/18 641/20 651/18 653/9	776/24 781/10 live [1] 682/10
557/22 575/4 578/24	753/21 762/9 770/17	570/18 603/11 638/4	659/18 659/24 670/3	lived [1] 739/1
668/8 668/15 669/2	lease [32] 551/22	655/23 656/18 706/8	681/13 681/24 682/5	living [2] 740/6 760/4
669/9 669/11 726/11 726/11 726/13 757/3	552/1 552/10 592/18	713/7 713/12 716/13	685/5 688/25 689/15	LLOYD [1] 529/22
759/11 771/9	612/6 636/5 636/8	717/6 731/5 756/5	698/15 699/3 699/13	local [36] 536/23
language [1] 545/20	636/18 636/21 645/19	lessee [5] 757/25	700/3 705/3 706/13	569/14 569/16 589/5
large [7] 570/11	683/19 721/20 722/16	759/5 764/2 764/3 764/6	706/23 709/21 714/11	592/21 592/24 593/6
571/20 571/24 633/20	722/22 723/7 726/19 729/14 729/19 729/20	lesser [1] 566/3	716/6 718/3 719/7 720/10 721/17 722/3	593/25 594/22 595/7 595/20 603/20 607/19
657/22 657/24 720/21	730/1 730/10 730/23	lessor [1] 764/7	722/16 723/3 724/3	617/18 674/20 675/4
large-sized [1] 571/24	732/16 736/12 739/4	lessors [1] 759/5	725/9 726/9 726/22	675/6 721/10 721/22
largely [1] 661/16	761/22 761/23 761/25	let [19] 535/3 538/15	728/10 729/13 731/3	723/8 723/21 725/20
larger [1] 771/2 LARS [9] 530/18	764/4 764/5 764/21	539/15 546/7 570/6	731/18 732/24 737/3	726/7 726/23 729/17
532/6 532/15 572/24	766/13	571/12 639/14 640/15	737/21 742/22 747/20	730/22 732/19 733/1
584/25 648/21 680/15	leased [5] 574/9 575/4		748/11 749/22 753/7	737/15 737/24 738/1
680/17 708/7	578/9 681/10 714/14 leases [34] 635/25	685/5 702/8 702/20 738/7 739/9 740/8	753/8 765/22 773/10 773/12 773/23 773/25	738/3 740/20 757/8 759/15 771/20
LARS WIECHEN [5]	636/24 684/14 684/15	753/1 775/23	774/2 774/11 774/19	locally [2] 566/9
532/6 532/15 572/24	688/3 691/16 699/22	let's [18] 573/24	776/6 779/3	740/15
584/25 680/17 last [21] 533/5 534/2	700/2 700/7 701/8	584/21 606/9 636/2	likelihood [2] 738/22	located [2] 566/7
540/15 551/11 555/6	701/12 701/19 707/21	686/11 701/4 707/17	739/7	597/23
560/9 565/8 567/24	708/1 708/4 723/25	712/21 713/1 713/10	likely [5] 536/17	location [6] 589/13
622/6 638/21 639/17	724/6 727/12 727/12	724/10 729/22 734/13	660/25 670/8 742/24	590/16 590/18 590/20
654/9 658/14 683/9	729/20 731/14 731/17 743/20 758/2 759/13	735/10 754/17 762/9 774/13 778/6	773/7 limit [1] 752/23	593/2 625/6 locations [3] 589/14
702/25 711/18 717/22	762/11 762/14 762/22	level [14] 564/11	limited [10] 561/15	592/19 625/5
720/19 722/10 737/3	763/4 763/13 766/3	617/19 640/15 658/22	562/4 596/14 604/6	logic [1] 571/14
773/13 late [4] 622/13 639/21	766/23 772/15 772/18	687/13 695/12 726/15	616/5 626/22 626/23	logical [1] 630/24
717/18 746/25	least [13] 573/11	728/7 728/11 730/22	717/3 755/7 759/7	London [1] 529/6
later [10] 564/2	584/5 594/23 623/25	731/2 732/18 755/15	limits [1] 637/21	long [16] 539/15
579/11 605/6 610/19	647/15 683/9 686/5	757/2	LINDINGER [1] 531/4	541/9 571/9 584/4
612/11 640/20 643/22	727/15 737/18 739/7 744/4 754/9 779/24	levels [2] 714/17 756/13	line [11] 600/13 604/20 605/8 607/5	637/11 676/4 693/2 704/24 716/2 716/6
734/2 742/12 751/24	leave [9] 580/9 642/8	liabilities [2] 741/22	614/14 696/19 698/12	716/20 717/8 717/15
law [18] 632/9 722/24	678/15 687/14 687/17	743/24	749/25 760/5 776/24	718/5 722/12 776/5
728/1 733/17 742/25 749/24 755/6 756/2	688/15 700/18 707/15	liability [1] 703/2	777/5	long-stop [1] 704/24
763/18 763/20 764/5	737/2	liberal [1] 579/10	lined [1] 535/16	longer [9] 613/2 638/4
764/21 765/11 766/4	leaving [1] 557/8	life [3] 638/6 723/3	lines [2] 608/11	638/6 638/7 661/10
766/23 766/25 767/9	led [5] 600/22 709/24	773/8	757/10	717/5 719/5 744/20 746/18
767/13	722/6 733/5 736/3 left [8] 550/1 555/7	lifetime [2] 626/22 626/23	linked [1] 651/12 list [17] 529/1 530/1	look [44] 543/3 543/18
lawsuit [1] 734/11	639/5 739/2 743/20	lift [1] 611/16	531/1 573/6 573/25	548/22 568/13 573/24
lawsuits [1] 727/9	752/24 768/10 768/12	lifted [3] 727/15	574/25 574/25 577/12	597/14 600/12 604/21
lawyer [3] 570/7 637/4 768/1	legal [25] 531/16	727/17 766/6	577/13 577/17 577/19	605/25 609/20 622/14
lawyers [9] 690/24	543/22 607/25 611/20	light [2] 691/17	578/13 580/7 611/13	623/9 625/25 626/3
696/15 701/22 755/25	612/13 615/11 636/4	748/14	625/16 765/11 772/14	626/6 626/12 627/18
756/1 768/8 768/9	637/3 658/24 659/1	like [108] 535/22	listed [4] 593/18	631/12 636/21 640/20
771/20 771/23	684/15 684/22 700/21 725/1 728/1 728/5	535/23 539/24 543/3 543/8 543/9 543/18	597/21 615/3 623/10 listen [4] 538/25	645/9 647/20 653/14 665/8 683/4 686/9
lay [1] 740/1	733/2 760/7 761/8	544/18 545/22 546/6	680/23 717/16 779/10	692/17 693/21 701/8
LEA [2] 529/20 780/12	761/15 762/6 765/1	548/15 548/17 548/22	listened [2] 689/13	701/10 703/18 722/16
lead [4] 549/13 596/2 689/16 705/12	767/24 779/21 780/5	551/13 554/11 557/13	690/18	733/11 738/18 740/9
lead-up [1] 689/16	legality [1] 764/21	557/15 557/17 557/19	lists [2] 580/13 581/5	740/9 740/13 741/17
leading [3] 542/15	legally [1] 738/1	564/12 575/12 582/23	literally [2] 616/4	742/1 750/13 750/18
554/8 595/11	legislation [2] 555/17	586/2 586/11 587/22	618/10	755/24 756/17 779/16
leads [1] 601/21	658/24 lei [7] 569/21 569/22	589/15 590/11 591/8 591/16 591/21 592/4	literate [1] 755/13 literature [3] 547/12	looked [14] 535/7 563/16 565/15 575/8
lean [1] 717/1		551/10 031/21 032/ 1		
L	L	www.dianaburdan.com	l	l

ICSID ARB 16 8	Word Index
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Revised

				-
L	581/9 610/13 611/2	617/4 617/8 617/11	maximise [1] 603/10	695/21 696/12 698/23
	611/17 613/6 613/13	617/11 617/21 625/12	maximises [2] 603/13	702/8 702/22 708/9
looked [10] 575/9	687/23 688/5	649/14 686/6	655/13	710/10 716/12 748/5
587/7 620/12 623/12	machines [12] 573/8	manager [1] 613/22	maximum [1] 548/2	753/1 753/2 756/9
643/5 653/20 653/22	573/8 575/16 575/22	managing [1] 554/13	may [49] 533/9 538/9	767/21 771/15 775/23
681/19 694/23 694/24	576/21 577/3 577/3			
looking [18] 582/25		mandate [1] 610/1	543/10 552/19 556/16	me, [1] 736/8
583/3 588/4 588/7	580/6 580/9 607/18	manner [6] 668/23	567/15 571/13 577/23	me, May of [1] 736/8
589/2 623/8 635/13	612/25 627/10	698/5 699/9 700/18	581/5 582/18 601/8	me.com [1] 529/7
635/17 663/18 679/6	mad [1] 778/4	703/1 758/3	607/13 615/3 617/22	mean [8] 618/18 626/7
688/17 689/14 711/13	made [42] 544/2 548/1	many [27] 580/6 592/1	621/6 629/5 638/8	633/11 647/3 661/3
714/19 740/23 753/2	562/24 564/23 572/23	606/14 622/5 622/5	638/25 659/16 659/18	695/12 760/9 776/8
772/24 779/14	577/20 586/12 587/21	631/4 631/4 648/21	661/5 678/14 688/23	meaning [3] 607/21
loss [20] 557/5 566/1	588/20 602/12 609/1	674/23 681/6 690/23	694/17 695/13 698/3	675/24 728/5
586/1 586/2 586/6	615/6 629/19 632/20	732/4 735/18 735/24	700/13 707/1 710/22	meaningful [2] 733/6
599/3 603/1 615/2	633/13 636/17 640/11	736/15 736/20 755/4	712/7 713/10 713/16	735/7
615/15 636/15 640/22	640/24 646/16 647/1	758/1 762/13 762/14	717/12 717/13 717/14	means [23] 549/24
	661/21 662/18 669/25	767/4 771/23 772/15	718/5 719/5 736/8	550/24 569/12 572/17
641/15 658/3 658/8	671/1 677/22 688/22	772/16 772/16 780/17	744/9 747/23 755/24	573/16 585/23 592/1
660/7 694/14 701/3	692/4 697/5 698/9	780/17	761/9 763/3 773/17	594/5 595/25 599/5
701/6 705/8 747/18	702/18 705/18 707/11	maps [1] 569/7	774/2 777/17 777/23	602/23 603/12 603/15
loss-making [3] 599/3	721/5 724/24 724/25	March [3] 589/13	779/16 780/22	612/3 614/19 644/12
658/3 658/8	731/24 731/25 731/25	646/3 664/11	maybe [15] 536/12	672/17 682/13 701/3
losses [4] 565/24	735/22 749/18 774/22	margin [11] 588/19	542/14 549/7 549/10	703/6 706/9 734/9
658/11 744/6 748/15	778/20	597/17 647/13 647/15	580/18 581/6 618/11	754/9
lost [33] 588/7 614/22	main [4] 529/20	647/21 647/25 652/8	619/1 630/12 682/23	meant [2] 665/10
615/8 615/22 635/17	591/21 636/13 685/19	652/10 672/8 693/22	695/15 711/23 718/12	665/17
641/8 641/14 641/21		739/5	747/25 756/1	meantime [1] 638/24
641/22 661/8 661/11	MAIN-KLINGST [1] 529/20			
683/14 683/17 684/20		marginally [1] 692/19	mayor [20] 726/18	measure [2] 702/17
691/23 691/23 693/8	maintain [1] 695/1	margins [7] 588/15	726/25 727/1 727/3	762/22
694/11 694/15 696/11	maintains [1] 700/10	597/10 597/15 597/16	727/16 727/25 728/17	measures [1] 558/20
703/15 705/4 707/6	maintenance [6]	597/17 620/19 621/23	755/5 755/14 757/24	mechanical [2]
707/10 707/22 707/23	626/20 627/9 627/13	Marie [1] 529/10	758/10 758/11 759/14	573/21 654/18
708/2 734/10 734/18	652/19 652/23 653/23	Marius [4] 542/20	759/23 759/23 760/9	mechanicalised [1]
734/18 741/8 743/21	maize [1] 568/5	542/20 542/21 770/4	760/14 762/20 763/1	654/13
744/4	major [1] 780/7	marked [1] 535/14	776/25	mechanisation [1]
lot [18] 545/21 546/17	make [43] 535/23	market [13] 602/24	mayor's [8] 731/23	578/16
546/18 554/7 568/14	538/23 555/12 565/16	603/3 603/7 623/20	731/23 732/19 760/6	mechanised [4]
573/19 573/19 603/19	586/12 587/17 597/1	623/21 629/9 630/6	763/1 766/14 766/15	561/21 571/16 572/4
611/17 652/18 658/2	597/13 607/24 616/3	631/6 631/6 651/16	777/4	575/18
696/9 704/1 712/13	631/24 638/11 645/25	713/11 713/13 713/14	mayoral [1] 726/15	media [1] 562/10
	651/14 667/13 673/10	MARTIN [1] 531/17	mayors [23] 722/18	median [1] 550/13
721/5 722/18 750/8	683/6 685/7 686/25	match [4] 604/18	722/24 726/23 727/2	medication [1] 773/6
754/5	692/9 693/20 693/24	629/16 630/12 678/18	727/6 727/8 727/8	medium [3] 560/15
lots [1] 578/9	697/16 697/24 704/5	material [3] 634/7	727/11 727/15 727/19	560/16 571/24
love [1] 691/8	705/14 706/1 710/20	769/13 769/14	727/22 728/1 728/4	medium-sized [1]
lovely [1] 688/25	721/17 729/8 731/18	materially [1] 697/2	728/7 728/11 730/9	571/24
low [4] 558/7 626/3	735/16 737/21 740/3	math [1] 626/5	730/15 730/23 733/25	meeting [3] 536/23
653/17 653/25	740/3 742/18 748/12	mathematical [1]	755/7 755/11 755/12	728/21 732/12
lower [8] 605/17	754/1 760/2 767/18	654/5	763/6	member [1] 564/13
605/18 629/25 643/22	774/19 777/18 778/17	Matrix [1] 529/5	me [59] 541/22 546/7	members [7] 607/15
667/7 667/10 692/7	makes [5] 570/24	matrixlaw.co.uk [1]	565/7 567/3 567/4	613/18 738/11 747/12
728/7	599/6 626/19 657/20	529/7	570/6 571/12 574/2	752/8 771/16 772/7
Ltd [1] 611/18	754/10	matter [16] 538/11	574/24 576/18 588/20	memorial [2] 736/22
Ltd's [2] 610/15 611/3		543/12 588/8 591/19	606/17 608/9 608/21	
LUCIA [1] 530/5	making [15] 584/18			750/22
lunch [4] 637/11	599/3 599/19 608/19	595/23 602/20 608/19	612/5 616/3 616/13	memorised [1] 537/15
638/16 638/18 659/5	619/5 632/18 658/3	717/7 720/12 723/1	617/6 624/24 625/10	memory [2] 736/8
luncheon [2] 659/13	658/8 669/14 684/7	744/14 746/10 746/14	626/20 636/23 637/4	768/21
659/21	690/7 697/22 700/4	756/17 759/22 762/18	639/14 640/15 640/20	mention [8] 618/9
lunchtime [2] 540/18	715/20 776/12	matters [5] 533/12	642/21 643/6 652/1	619/17 620/6 662/24
715/18	man [4] 720/23 732/5	543/20 544/2 544/7	652/15 663/6 663/22	717/17 746/21 766/11
	742/16 771/22	707/14	664/9 664/14 674/18	767/2
Μ	managed [2] 555/21	mature [2] 681/10	675/18 678/16 680/4	mentioned [12]
machinery [12] 574/1	771/18	685/14	683/8 686/6 686/11	542/22 550/25 559/16
578/2 578/12 580/12	management [8]	maturity [1] 682/19	692/9 692/10 692/22	560/7 564/3 567/1
51 51 E 51 5, 12 000/12				
		www.dianaburdan.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	1

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

-	•	[-
Μ	minded [1] 777/15	623/23 629/24 634/13	712/21 713/1 713/8	552/18 720/8 738/8
mentioned [6]	minds [2] 582/5	647/11 649/21 657/18	714/6 715/24 716/14	774/9 774/18
567/22 610/6 621/10	773/19	658/1 678/12 681/10	724/4 729/10 741/3	Mr Grot [134] 536/9
670/18 688/2 717/19	mine [1] 682/5	681/17 685/7 689/24	741/3 748/21 749/23	536/13 537/18 555/22
mentioning [1]	mineral [2] 560/7	690/1 690/4 690/24	770/14 780/19	557/18 558/9 558/13
739/12	560/24	691/2 691/5 691/9	moreover [2] 739/3	558/15 560/19 563/9
mentions [1] 611/14	minimise [1] 630/2	695/6 705/25 706/4	770/21	572/23 581/11 585/25
merchandise [6]	minimum [10] 591/9	715/1 731/3 735/18	morning [21] 533/3	586/7 587/24 588/12
663/19 663/20 663/23	603/13 721/11 722/23	735/19 736/15 736/17	536/17 539/10 541/11	588/21 608/1 613/14
663/24 665/2 744/5	724/21 727/1 733/19	737/3 738/20 739/11	541/12 605/21 606/11	614/10 627/20 627/25
mere [1] 747/12	741/12 741/25 742/8	740/1 743/16 748/23	616/11 643/15 643/19	629/20 630/17 631/8
merely [3] 621/11	Minister [5] 536/22	750/5 752/17 753/19	657/22 688/23 690/10	631/10 645/10 645/23
652/23 756/21	538/3 756/15 756/22 756/24	763/14 767/8 767/24	690/11 690/13 690/15	647/11 648/25 649/13
method [17] 590/18	minus [4] 550/1	768/6 773/2 773/7	696/4 721/1 721/4 769/23 769/23	649/19 650/4 653/3 655/13 658/16 661/22
600/10 622/6 622/8	597/18 599/5 599/6	Moldovan [31] 536/1 538/2 547/1 547/18	most [17] 556/7	662/9 662/14 662/19
624/14 681/12 681/13	minute [6] 540/7	547/19 548/12 555/11	557/11 602/12 602/25	667/18 672/24 673/1
682/20 686/21 702/16	540/15 543/6 546/7	555/16 555/20 561/13	615/15 617/16 625/4	674/6 683/17 686/3
702/25 708/11 709/18	584/21 727/20	569/22 588/2 595/2	634/18 653/10 670/13	686/7 687/21 688/22
710/1 710/4 710/7	minutes [10] 539/14	619/25 620/3 650/16	683/25 707/25 708/23	689/23 690/17 690/21
719/2	540/6 545/23 567/21	651/6 658/21 658/25	738/21 739/23 742/24	691/18 691/23 692/3
methodical [1] 598/17	602/17 619/20 637/13	678/7 684/5 721/3	752/21	693/9 693/12 694/10
methodologies [1]	659/5 716/5 774/14	727/22 727/25 733/17	mother [1] 714/2	694/15 696/8 696/10
701/2	misinterpreting [1]	737/16 756/1 758/9	motivata [1] 763/16	697/12 697/13 698/8
methodology [13]	677/8	758/13 767/13 773/3	motivation [1] 572/21	699/7 703/16 705/8
549/8 586/8 592/11	missed [1] 765/7	Moldovans [1] 757/8	mouth [3] 608/18	706/6 706/14 714/12
593/15 595/1 595/13	missing [1] 619/12	moment [13] 538/4	614/18 664/23	714/21 714/24 715/5
634/19 643/4 647/5	mistake [2] 601/23	611/4 643/9 645/4	move [8] 548/16	721/4 723/11 723/20
650/23 654/23 707/3	616/3	646/21 672/3 691/7	614/19 637/9 670/12	728/16 730/7 730/16
719/13	mistakes [1] 564/14	716/9 716/13 718/12	716/1 724/3 729/13	730/21 730/25 731/8
methods [8] 622/14	misunderstanding [2]	740/7 747/24 748/12	732/24	731/9 731/19 733/6
681/11 708/10 708/14	591/24 626/12	Monday [4] 690/10	moved [1] 681/18	734/10 734/14 734/20
709/12 709/15 710/1	mitigation [2] 742/5	690/11 690/13 691/3	movement [3] 660/22	735/6 735/13 735/23
710/16	748/14	money [16] 555/12	660/24 660/25	736/20 737/2 737/5
metres [1] 549/24	mix [1] 585/13	599/7 641/19 648/14	movements [1] 661/2	737/9 737/18 738/4
MICHAEL [8] 531/17 532/11 532/15 536/2	model [5] 598/7	648/24 656/25 657/2	Moving [3] 650/9	738/15 739/18 739/22
591/18 639/2 659/7	626/19 647/9 649/2	657/7 658/22 673/18	666/19 741/10	741/8 742/23 743/15
680/17	742/4	687/3 687/11 688/7	Mr [394]	743/20 744/17 744/20
MICHAEL PEER [5]	modelled [1] 648/11	721/5 741/8 771/24	Mr Astuno [8] 585/13	746/1 746/4 746/17
532/11 532/15 639/2	models [3] 593/20	monies [1] 697/25	608/16 632/15 659/22	748/23 749/8 749/10
659/7 680/17	593/21 717/24	monitoring [1] 554/13	722/1 732/25 738/7	749/20 750/2 750/11
Michael Peer's [1]	modern [5] 575/17	monogram [1] 559/7	738/9	750/16 750/23 752/13
536/2	673/19 678/25 679/4	month [1] 646/4	Mr Beril [9] 690/21	753/2 753/21 756/11
middle [1] 668/2	723/23	monthly [2] 646/6	732/3 739/10 756/14	756/25 757/4 758/18
midnight [2] 539/9	modest [2] 739/3	646/9	756/17 756/21 757/12	761/7 765/1 767/23
639/22	741/23	months [1] 748/1	758/15 758/22	767/25 768/3 768/5
midsummer [1]	modification [1]	Montréal [1] 529/11	Mr Beril's [1] 759/6	768/10 771/19 771/22
646/12	545/6	moral [7] 749/8 749/9	Mr Chairman [3]	773/1
midyear [1] 648/16	modifications [1]	749/12 749/23 750/6	552/21 556/16 696/23	Mr Grot's [32] 564/18
might [13] 581/17	671/1	772/22 775/2	Mr Fortier [11] 556/23	
581/24 602/16 665/16	modified [1] 719/15	morass [1] 747/13	570/24 585/3 638/14	624/24 624/25 625/11
668/15 668/19 679/10	modify [2] 652/1	more [51] 535/21	639/5 700/4 708/2	630/19 643/7 643/17
706/6 713/18 714/5	670/25	537/22 539/24 540/1	710/6 740/2 758/4	644/1 644/7 655/18
718/1 728/9 735/24	MOLDOVA [72]	540/3 555/12 557/9	772/11	667/21 668/14 689/18
MIHAIL [3] 530/17	528/11 531/12 531/13	586/16 592/23 596/1	Mr Fortier's [1]	707/14 728/19 728/24
532/2 533/2	546/24 550/21 552/23	603/12 616/17 622/7	699/12 Mr Gladoi [11] 723/3	732/2 740/11 744/3 746/12 750/19 757/5
MIHAIL RURAC [2]	554/5 554/20 554/23 555/18 555/23 557/8	623/20 626/4 636/12 636/12 653/4 661/7	Mr Gladei [11] 723/3 727/5 753/18 761/22	757/11 760/23 761/4
532/2 533/2	557/17 559/6 565/11	671/10 671/13 671/18	762/20 762/25 764/9	767/7 768/8 772/2
million [5] 590/21	565/12 565/23 566/1	675/9 675/11 675/15	764/14 764/24 766/25	773/12
649/5 649/8 649/20	568/18 572/15 578/6	675/17 678/25 683/15	767/8	Mr Gumovschi [16]
694/16	580/22 582/9 587/2	688/4 691/15 695/1	Mr Gladei's [2] 733/16	
mind [7] 601/4 670/13	589/1 607/16 613/17	696/22 699/17 704/18	733/20	548/17 550/4 552/4
674/18 682/5 688/6	613/23 614/3 614/4	706/4 712/2 712/18	Mr Gleason [5]	553/3 554/4 557/14
734/5 737/5	010/20017/0014/4	1001711212112/10		000/0 007/7 007/14
				1

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	
	_

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

м	629/7 632/11 632/17	604/22 606/14 607/25	nearby [1] 737/10	540/11 551/15 551/18
	633/1 633/3 637/24	609/5 609/19 612/1	nearly [2] 570/17	551/19 581/5 604/18
Mr Gumovschi [7]	638/24 659/13 675/21	613/5 613/22 613/22	571/20	606/1 606/8 606/13
559/15 561/23 562/7	695/14 702/3 708/9	614/18 614/19 616/22	necessarily [1]	616/2 627/10 627/11
563/7 578/22 593/7	712/11 717/24 719/12	616/23 618/16 619/4	570/14	628/10 628/19 672/3
603/22	769/8	619/9 619/13 620/19	necessary [8] 571/13	672/6 707/11 718/21
Mr Kopecky [13]	Mr Wiechen's [2]	625/14 626/5 626/9	573/2 586/14 610/11	719/13 759/13 775/21
535/3 536/4 536/6	696/18 746/12	627/14 630/12 630/24	717/19 719/6 749/5	781/11
604/10 632/12 632/20	Mr Zbigniew Grot [1]	630/25 631/9 635/3	775/4	
639/11 661/17 679/18		639/5 639/5 639/16		newly [3] 538/24
699/12 715/9 772/20	738/16		need [56] 536/17	588/10 612/10
775/11	Mr Zelenenco [3]	639/23 640/4 640/5	539/16 539/16 540/19	newly-established [1]
Mr Lars Wiechen [1]	728/12 730/9 730/15	640/7 647/1 647/5	558/8 558/21 571/2	588/10
680/15	MS [14] 529/18 529/20		573/15 574/3 574/11	newly-founded [1]
Mr Michael Peer [1]	529/22 529/22 529/24	649/6 649/12 651/24	574/12 574/13 574/14	612/10
591/18	529/25 529/25 541/2	652/5 654/3 654/4	574/23 587/15 599/10	next [15] 538/21
Mr Nagacevschi [1]	541/6 543/7 552/10	656/20 657/10 659/2	615/4 617/7 618/10	548/16 548/23 557/25
768/1	601/9 723/10 777/10	660/19 661/6 661/10	619/14 622/8 623/25	565/8 587/13 591/10
Mr Peer [49] 536/14	Ms Ivanes [1] 723/10	662/6 662/21 664/9	632/24 644/20 645/5	598/12 614/19 619/20
539/12 586/3 591/25	Ms Nitschke [2] 601/9	664/23 665/25 666/23	649/2 652/21 655/10	709/2 734/19 760/16
	777/10	668/1 669/16 670/2	655/17 655/25 656/2	773/25 774/2
593/15 593/16 594/13 595/7 595/13 595/15	Ms Pernt [4] 541/2	672/25 673/16 674/22	656/9 657/6 678/22	NICOARA [1] 530/17
	541/6 543/7 552/10	676/11 680/20 681/2	688/16 711/4 716/15	night [4] 533/5 534/2
596/22 598/17 599/4	much [52] 533/23	681/5 681/7 681/14	716/20 717/9 720/3	690/3 718/24
600/17 601/16 601/24	535/18 536/18 541/16	682/12 684/21 687/12	733/4 733/11 733/22	night's [1] 535/1
602/2 602/12 621/12	541/18 545/19 552/17	687/14 688/19 690/3	747/15 758/5 758/11	nil [3] 689/21 696/7
635/16 637/10 638/4	561/5 562/12 565/6	691/3 691/5 692/5	762/18 763/24 768/22	696/18
638/24 639/3 639/13	568/24 570/23 572/8	692/15 694/7 694/8	774/3 774/5 775/19	Nina [2] 728/16
659/3 659/12 664/7	572/10 574/2 574/11	694/13 695/25 696/19	776/4 776/5 776/14	728/17
678/17 679/12 680/16	574/13 582/2 584/15	697/10 697/16 698/24	781/7	Nina Ivanes [1]
686/14 688/14 689/20	593/2 600/15 600/15	700/16 701/7 702/9		728/16
693/17 693/20 693/23		702/10 710/21 711/24	needed [6] 547/11 548/7 562/25 563/22	
695/14 695/21 699/4	629/25 630/22 630/23			nitrogen [1] 557/23
706/15 706/17 711/18	640/2 653/21 659/4	715/18 717/4 729/13	656/6 707/15	NITSCHKE [4] 529/18
712/11 715/10 718/22	679/17 680/14 689/11	732/24 736/8 738/6	needing [1] 644/22	601/9 777/10 780/15
718/24 719/4 740/18	689/19 703/16 712/1	738/10 743/10 745/4	needs [6] 560/6	no [152] 528/5 534/4
Mr Peer's [24] 536/3	712/21 715/8 715/15	745/16 746/3 747/8	563/23 563/24 579/5	534/19 534/22 538/18
537/14 538/12 591/24	715/19 721/8 728/16	747/24 748/19 752/10	638/9 687/12	539/4 541/1 541/5
593/24 594/3 594/21	741/3 745/2 752/4	752/19 753/12 757/18	negative [13] 599/3	542/16 543/11 547/2
598/25 599/11 600/5	756/5 765/19 772/9	758/12 761/14 762/10	599/9 599/12 599/13	547/19 550/11 550/23
601/3 606/2 621/6	773/20 775/2 776/1	768/16 771/15 772/10	599/14 599/19 599/25	550/25 552/16 553/25
621/25 622/13 622/17	778/25 781/8 781/13	773/21 774/12 775/23	692/3 692/5 741/15	557/8 569/21 572/17
622/24 623/17 628/16	multinational [1]	778/20 779/14 780/12	741/17 742/4 742/5	572/21 574/11 577/10
628/24 634/22 703/7	753/4	myself [6] 551/6	negativity [1] 654/7	577/17 578/21 581/2
705/11 717/18	multiple [5] 569/11	585/22 688/18 691/7	neglect [1] 705/19	582/10 596/19 596/21
	662/24 720/21 723/14	714/24 752/23	negotiate [1] 687/6	598/9 598/22 602/5
Mr President [10]	758/13		neighbour [1] 711/20	602/9 604/16 604/16
571/3 574/15 585/15	multiplied [2] 600/20	N	neither [2] 672/17	609/16 613/2 613/25
606/6 633/2 679/7	600/21	Nagacevschi [1]	757/16	614/11 615/7 616/18
712/7 715/7 743/18	multiplying [1] 600/19	• .	net [6] 588/15 600/6	622/21 623/9 624/23
748/5	must [7] 607/6 687/11	name [3] 585/2 744/1	693/22 709/16 710/23	625/10 625/21 626/11
Mr Rurac [9] 534/3	703/5 711/6 738/15	753/10	710/24	627/10 627/10 627/11
542/1 553/20 554/22	742/10 753/7	namely [7] 557/5	neutral [1] 617/20	627/12 627/13 629/18
557/14 561/18 593/7	my [160] 534/23	598/19 626/6 627/17	neutrally [1] 610/25	629/18 631/15 631/16
603/22 771/9	543/19 543/21 544/3	628/3 633/5 756/9	never [19] 552/11	631/22 632/4 632/6
Mr Rusu [3] 728/12	544/4 544/6 544/24	narrowly [2] 777/20	553/23 563/16 571/4	635/11 636/23 638/10
730/9 730/15		777/22		
Mr Tcaci [1] 634/1	550/8 550/11 551/19	national [7] 594/6	577/2 614/4 615/23	638/18 638/25 639/1
Mr Ursu [1] 750/10	555/2 556/16 559/23		626/4 681/8 708/19	648/3 648/18 649/12
Mr Veaceslav [1]	561/21 562/15 563/5	594/7 595/21 619/25	708/22 723/2 725/24	649/21 651/24 654/22
750/14	564/16 565/8 567/21	620/3 728/21 732/8	726/1 735/17 740/12	655/7 656/9 656/22
Mr Wiechen [31]	568/10 571/14 574/9	naturally [1] 721/23	749/1 771/7 771/8	660/11 661/9 664/16
539/8 540/14 540/16	574/22 575/5 575/9	nature [7] 668/12	nevertheless [4]	665/1 666/12 667/18
584/23 585/1 585/17	576/11 582/7 582/15	712/14 712/22 714/2	660/13 672/12 673/25	668/16 669/16 669/19
591/16 598/15 601/25	585/1 585/7 585/8	748/22 774/22 776/18	742/24	670/6 672/17 673/8
602/17 604/12 606/11	585/9 586/12 586/20	natured [1] 779/7	new [26] 533/13	674/4 676/9 677/10
	587/13 589/22 601/9	near [1] 748/9	533/18 539/19 539/24	679/22 681/21 682/8
607/4 610/12 614/11				
607/4 610/12 614/11				
607/4 610/12 614/11				

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
N	640/6 648/8 724/12	646/24 661/3 661/4	officials [5] 728/8	ongoing [1] 626/21
no [60] 683/14	759/6	661/6 662/11 666/3	728/11 730/22 735/19	only [75] 533/12
684/18 685/11 690/12	notes [4] 618/13	666/10 666/15 679/8	773/4	537/21 540/4 543/5
690/18 700/4 700/17	619/2 619/5 780/4	691/13 691/14 691/14	offset [3] 741/13	547/24 557/24 560/11
702/24 706/15 706/19	nothing [9] 612/8	696/18 731/16 751/6	741/23 742/8	564/25 572/13 574/18
707/24 708/17 711/10	627/12 635/19 658/5	772/19	often [4] 689/9 753/24	576/14 577/4 579/20
711/21 712/2 713/14	681/20 699/17 718/19	numbers [19] 551/9	755/22 758/11	581/3 582/7 587/10
715/11 718/9 722/25	742/17 756/16	551/23 552/12 552/14	okay [5] 541/21	592/6 592/16 606/1
724/5 724/7 725/12	notice [4] 567/15	559/9 559/10 560/13	606/24 607/3 616/1	606/6 606/19 612/4
725/14 726/18 731/24	734/24 759/5 764/24	582/25 586/24 591/14	682/10	617/10 618/25 626/20
732/22 735/17 737/10	noticed [2] 566/10	594/8 605/16 676/22	old [2] 551/15 551/16	626/23 627/9 627/22
737/15 738/1 738/3	780/22	688/24 696/16 696/17 705/18 740/10 770/2	omission [2] 590/5 620/16	629/2 640/11 641/16 644/16 646/15 647/21
744/20 745/9 746/17	notices [8] 757/18 757/20 757/23 758/22		omissions [5] 721/10	648/6 648/14 655/2
753/2 756/9 757/8	759/1 760/13 763/9	nutrients [1] 563/20	722/6 722/7 722/12	655/12 657/5 660/7
757/15 758/21 760/11	763/10	0	722/14	666/8 667/9 667/13
760/20 761/5 761/12	notification [6]	o'clock [1] 719/21	omitting [1] 631/4	667/15 671/9 678/1
763/24 764/18 767/21	724/19 725/7 725/10	object [3] 536/15	once [2] 740/12	690/18 690/22 708/11
768/13 769/14 771/4	725/11 726/6 735/2	579/12 754/19	764/12	708/20 709/8 711/14
771/10 771/16 771/22	notifications [6]	objection [2] 608/16	one [123] 535/4 539/6	721/1 725/22 728/4
772/2 772/7 772/11	722/17 722/22 723/4	747/9	551/3 551/11 553/2	728/5 728/10 729/11
775/19 775/21 776/15	726/19 760/1 760/7	objective [3] 585/24	557/8 558/21 559/1	731/13 731/20 735/7
777/6 778/4	notified [2] 734/12	695/22 695/25	559/1 559/25 567/3	736/15 742/17 755/9
No 1 [2] 604/16	734/14	objectivity [1] 617/20	568/19 576/12 580/17	755/18 758/20 759/3
604/16	notify [1] 545/7	obligated [1] 764/3	580/19 584/5 584/14	761/4 765/20 766/22
No 4 [1] 760/20	notion [1] 660/2	obligation [2] 543/22	587/24 589/18 591/4	766/24 767/4 768/22
No 8 [1] 767/21	Notwithstanding [1]	764/19	591/23 593/3 593/4	771/4 772/15
No.1 [1] 734/17	678/5	obligations [3] 728/2	593/15 594/7 594/9	opaque [1] 744/9
No.2 [1] 734/18 nobody [4] 691/2	nought [1] 688/8	728/3 741/21	595/4 598/5 600/13	open [7] 540/5 581/25
705/20 705/24 735/17	November [6] 611/22	obliged [1] 765/8	602/12 602/21 604/12	582/3 582/5 608/12
nodding [1] 773/22	611/25 659/8 659/10	observations [1]	605/22 622/19 624/11	633/5 772/18
non [3] 682/19 762/3	659/11 745/18	629/15	626/11 628/5 630/4	open-ended [1] 540/5
762/12	now [78] 538/5 542/12	obtain [8] 576/24	630/14 630/19 631/24	opened [1] 555/15
non-compliant [1]	545/18 554/19 555/10	625/11 636/14 643/17	634/11 635/5 636/7	opening [12] 686/20
762/12	555/14 556/2 556/5	724/17 733/24 734/7	636/13 636/25 636/25	687/14 690/19 720/13
non-maturity [1]	563/8 563/10 564/1	737/18	640/4 640/6 645/20	722/4 722/8 737/23
682/19	568/19 571/12 584/19	obtained [6] 566/9	646/4 646/23 650/14	752/10 752/19 758/12
non-opposability [1]	585/19 586/5 588/3	576/23 583/14 583/22	653/7 654/9 654/16	760/22 766/20
762/3	589/15 590/7 590/11	641/18 699/23	657/11 662/9 662/19	operate [7] 598/3
none [8] 579/23	591/12 591/16 596/3	obviously [12] 651/20		628/14 662/8 678/7
621/20 665/4 669/24	601/1 608/14 610/21	654/9 655/1 655/13	669/23 671/19 676/11	678/12 678/16 719/3
672/22 678/7 678/11	615/22 618/16 619/11	656/17 667/4 676/6 688/18 712/13 717/21	677/1 679/3 679/20	operated [1] 678/14
780/7	620/23 629/13 630/8 633/5 637/9 638/15	775/1 778/7	683/23 684/21 685/19 688/2 689/17 690/23	operates [1] 646/8 operating [21] 572/11
nonsensical [1]	638/23 640/23 642/21	occasion [2] 735/24	691/2 698/17 699/19	586/14 586/17 586/20
692/10	645/19 649/7 649/24	735/24	699/25 700/2 700/24	593/19 593/19 595/16
norm [1] 655/5	650/9 652/2 652/9	occupied [1] 574/8	701/15 704/2 704/2	598/19 599/2 601/20
normal [5] 639/16	653/24 655/2 658/20	occurred [9] 663/25	704/16 704/20 704/21	604/19 605/5 615/20
727/6 727/7 731/5	659/4 660/21 664/20	664/1 667/25 668/2	706/8 708/3 709/8	617/4 623/10 634/23
735/20	666/16 670/12 671/16	705/22 723/24 740/7	709/15 711/12 711/14	647/11 664/14 685/18
normally [7] 542/2	672/23 679/11 680/15	743/23 773/2	711/18 713/9 713/11	694/2 712/16
549/4 549/13 550/21	681/11 688/21 693/7	occurring [1] 668/13	716/21 717/1 722/11	operation [7] 644/16
557/4 557/17 731/2	701/10 715/23 716/1	October [1] 646/18	724/16 724/23 729/10	649/1 649/20 658/8
normative [3] 575/19	716/6 716/8 719/7	off [7] 538/6 579/7	734/5 734/13 735/23	739/2 758/24 769/5
578/17 771/10	721/14 731/12 733/16	640/25 681/8 687/22	735/24 738/15 739/1	operations [21] 546/3
north [1] 681/18	735/11 735/13 736/20	745/3 745/15	739/3 740/14 741/2	563/13 586/15 588/13
not [470] notary [1] 760/14	739/24 752/15 758/13	office [8] 731/23	743/12 747/24 748/21	613/14 624/24 643/1
notation [1] 618/25	774/3 779/17 781/6	731/24 732/20 732/20	750/21 757/24 757/25	643/8 643/17 644/1
note [12] 579/3	781/7	764/20 765/5 765/13	760/1 764/1 765/4	644/7 644/15 647/10
601/10 608/4 632/18	number [29] 550/8	766/14	776/23 776/24 777/17	658/4 669/14 686/12
650/13 652/6 656/1	550/9 550/14 550/19	officer [1] 735/22	779/24	707/8 715/1 715/4
656/4 660/1 707/20	550/20 551/4 552/13	official [7] 723/5	one-year [1] 657/11	721/8 740/11
748/17 773/10	570/8 586/9 590/13	728/21 730/5 732/8	ones [4] 558/11	opine [2] 615/4
noted [5] 608/15	590/14 616/6 626/4	732/12 735/17 759/4	575/17 597/12 780/20	684/22
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
0	658/9 658/24 661/1	718/22 722/4 726/22	607/9 607/15 611/14	548/16 548/23 770/23

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 528-781
0	658/9 658/24 661/1	718/22 722/4 726/22	607/9 607/15 611/14	548/16 548/23 770/23
	675/8 679/8 679/13	737/8 738/13 740/6	626/1 627/19 629/6	paragraph 4 [1] 543/9
opined [1] 764/18	681/19 682/8 682/11	744/10 748/4 754/2	629/16 633/8 633/9	paragraph 43 [2]
opinion [11] 544/25	687/7 689/17 690/3	772/1 778/22	660/16 660/18 698/18	575/3 576/4
545/5 550/10 550/12	696/5 696/10 700/17	outcome [2] 654/6	709/11 753/10 753/11	Paragraph 46 [1]
575/7 581/19 609/24	700/20 702/14 704/18	709/20	772/18	544/22
615/18 660/11 687/13	705/17 706/5 706/19	outcomes [2] 712/19	page 103-104 [1]	paragraph 5 [1]
710/21	707/12 711/10 711/12	712/21	709/11	543/19
opinions [2] 544/5	711/17 712/20 716/21	outflow [3] 627/3	page 14 [1] 569/1	paragraph 51 [1]
544/7	716/25 717/1 717/23	629/2 642/1	page 18 [2] 626/1	616/25
opportunities [1]	718/1 721/2 724/25	outflows [1] 646/10	627/19	paragraph 53 [1]
710/22	727/18 727/20 728/7	outlined [1] 601/17	page 24 [1] 602/13	628/2
opportunity [18]	731/24 731/25 740/16	outset [2] 696/20	page 31 [2] 629/6	paragraph 59 [1]
571/8 571/10 591/7	740/16 741/3 741/4	698/24	629/16	618/1
591/9 674/20 675/3	748/15 749/2 758/21			• • • •
711/8 711/19 712/3	759/9 762/15 764/2	outstanding [4] 533/12 600/20 600/22	Page 34 [1] 633/9	paragraph 6 [1] 544/1
717/20 718/4 718/23			page 5 [1] 607/15	paragraph 604 [1]
719/8 719/17 739/25	775/3 778/8	628/24	page 8 [2] 604/14	702/11
742/11 747/7 774/4	others [3] 528/8 677/2		607/9	paragraph 61 [2]
opposability [1] 762/3	780/19	540/18 568/22 570/12	pages [8] 528/1	627/16 627/19
opposing [1] 533/16	otherwise [9] 553/9	574/24 608/2 615/12	605/25 606/1 698/11	paragraph 62 [1]
optimal [2] 603/15	572/10 635/2 731/11	626/8 638/21 643/17	698/14 698/18 762/19	626/1
630/3	742/14 758/24 759/24	644/8 644/17 645/14	772/19	paragraph 7 [1]
optimise [1] 603/8	761/25 778/22	645/18 645/20 647/23	paid [15] 586/6 587/19	
optimum [1] 631/19	ought [10] 650/24	659/22 667/6 682/6	658/15 687/11 731/8	paragraph 8 [1]
option [4] 735/5	666/18 669/21 676/13	695/3 711/16 714/13	731/9 731/20 731/22	756/11
737/11 737/17 738/3	676/22 677/15 677/16	720/19 722/1 722/10	743/1 746/19 759/11	paragraphs [8] 543/8
options [6] 721/21	677/18 677/20 699/10	732/25 743/21 757/3	760/25 761/5 761/6	544/19 544/20 544/21
733/1 733/3 733/4	our [69] 534/5 538/8	762/21	771/24	545/14 545/24 545/25
733/5 733/8	538/15 538/19 558/3	overall [2] 536/24	pain [1] 704/19	562/24
OQ [2] 528/15 529/9	558/7 558/9 559/3	646/14	paper [4] 602/10	parameters [1] 623/13
Or is [1] 535/18	562/20 563/1 563/4	overestimation [1]	688/6 698/14 698/17	parcel [1] 681/16
	563/18 564/1 564/9	600/23	papers [1] 691/16	parcels [1] 570/14
oral [1] 752/5	580/7 582/5 587/12	overnight [1] 533/6	paragraph [42] 543/9	Pardon [1] 608/9
order [15] 539/6 547/20 548/6 548/8	588/3 588/24 589/12	overrides [1] 543/21	543/10 543/19 544/1	part [22] 544/18 546/9
560/5 563/22 578/14	589/20 591/14 598/11	overriding [2] 543/19	544/22 545/4 546/8	549/22 555/8 562/20
	605/12 612/22 621/10	594/9	546/9 546/14 548/11	562/24 563/3 563/3
578/15 605/23 606/10 618/11 642/22 690/4	623/7 623/12 624/7	overstated [1] 643/8	548/16 548/23 548/23	563/4 589/18 610/1
	626/12 626/19 628/5	own [20] 544/3 544/4	556/3 556/4 556/7	620/22 624/7 636/4
693/15 751/23	628/17 630/6 636/4	546/2 555/4 601/19	556/20 556/24 557/2	641/12 681/16 688/8
Orders [1] 778/16	636/13 638/9 679/11	608/5 608/6 636/17	558/7 558/23 574/7	718/14 724/23 739/17
ordination [1] 728/25	679/15 690/5 697/8	636/19 647/6 693/10	574/8 575/3 576/4	743/14 773/24
organic [3] 560/4	703/10 705/5 711/9	693/25 697/16 698/9	607/14 608/20 613/4	parte [7] 724/17
560/21 560/24	711/15 714/13 715/13	717/15 735/14 739/2	613/16 616/25 618/1	724/20 725/19 727/10
organised [2] 714/12	717/15 720/12 720/16	779/22 780/5 780/5	626/1 627/16 627/19	727/15 766/2 767/12
714/22	720/17 720/18 741/4	owned [9] 587/25	628/2 628/5 702/11	participants [4] 529/1
original [16] 543/4	742/21 743/3 743/7	607/21 610/13 611/2	753/11 756/11 756/25	530/1 531/1 603/8
543/6 551/17 569/23	747/13 768/21 773/16	641/2 660/3 660/14	760/23 770/23	participate [1] 614/1
570/4 586/20 604/22	773/19 773/23 775/7	689/6 744/11	paragraph 14 [1]	particular [14] 534/6
606/15 606/20 617/1	776/3 778/1 779/10	owner [12] 615/12	760/23	535/8 556/3 564/3
617/9 641/17 651/24	779/23 780/12 781/6	615/13 624/21 625/1	paragraph 16 [1]	591/17 593/1 601/11
652/6 656/5 659/11	781/8	625/2 661/23 662/9	558/23	603/21 654/22 702/10
originally [1] 571/16				
other [88] 535/2 539/2	ourselves [1] 602/15	662/20 744/20 746/2	paragraph 18 [4]	704/4 749/25 779/3 779/20
540/25 545/23 553/2	out [46] 533/15 543/7	746/18 747/17	607/14 608/20 613/4	
553/3 558/1 558/16	552/6 560/10 568/19	owners [1] 726/13	613/16	particular issue [1]
561/3 563/3 564/17	571/14 580/22 585/5	ownership [9] 607/25	paragraph 21 [2]	535/8
567/19 572/17 575/22	614/18 640/4 644/9	608/10 614/8 614/13	574/7 574/8	particularly [6] 590/13
576/20 582/25 593/5	644/10 644/17 647/16	660/6 660/12 662/3	paragraph 26 [1]	596/11 608/17 633/11
594/7 603/9 609/9	648/5 648/13 648/19	743/14 743/25	558/7	667/3 765/24
613/19 620/12 622/14	651/24 652/21 654/3	owns [4] 608/22 613/9		parties [20] 530/11
623/9 623/10 625/5	654/15 655/20 690/14	615/22 660/23	556/3 556/4 556/20	539/22 540/11 543/12
634/22 634/23 643/3	694/8 695/19 697/24	Р	556/24 557/2	545/7 591/13 633/17
643/11 645/17 645/25	698/5 698/15 699/19		paragraph 30 [2]	637/18 687/6 687/6
647/7 653/2 653/5	705/4 705/6 706/22	page [20] 545/24	546/9 546/14	687/12 712/3 761/10
653/7 653/11 653/25	710/11 710/17 716/9	569/1 602/13 604/14	paragraph 31 [3]	767/9 771/20 774/1
000/20				
	I	www.dianaburden.com	I	I

ICSID ARB 16 8	Word Index
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Revised

13 December 2017
Pages 528-781

0				1 4900 020 701
Р	536/3 537/14 538/12 591/24 593/24 594/3	720/16 724/11 725/24 728/3 728/8 731/2	philippesands [2] 529/7 529/7	planting [2] 723/19 734/20
parties [4] 774/8				
776/2 777/16 778/13	594/21 598/25 599/11	731/3 731/5 732/13	phosphate [1] 557/23	plays [1] 755/5
parties' [1] 761/21	600/5 601/3 606/2	733/20 736/13 736/17	phosphorous [2]	pleaded [1] 753/7
partners [1] 603/5	621/6 621/25 622/13	736/18 742/23 744/14	558/6 558/8	pleading [1] 776/5
parts [8] 535/12	622/17 622/24 623/17	760/3 775/2	photograph [3]	pleadings [4] 581/10
535/13 542/4 543/4	628/16 628/24 634/22	period [22] 563/21	576/11 576/11 576/13	727/23 736/25 766/9
562/15 562/16 562/18	703/7 705/11 717/18	573/2 626/15 629/4	photographs [3]	please [10] 595/12
713/12	Penguin [1] 780/10	636/3 642/1 642/4	577/3 577/8 580/12	598/24 614/24 626/5
party [11] 587/19	people [18] 542/23	643/18 643/23 644/1	photos [1] 578/2	639/9 639/13 695/21
612/11 617/21 721/11	613/21 650/2 653/10	644/9 645/1 645/19	phrased [1] 664/19	706/16 745/17 775/14
723/8 723/22 725/20	680/23 688/24 689/15	645/21 645/23 667/6	physical [3] 608/1	pleasure [6] 753/3
726/23 757/25 762/4	705/3 714/16 721/2	682/7 685/24 700/23	613/8 773/2	771/17 772/2 772/3
764/3	726/17 757/6 757/9	701/11 714/20 716/4	physically [2] 613/12	780/16 781/3
pass [2] 533/15	759/18 759/22 759/24	periods [2] 568/21	613/23	plenty [1] 769/13
732/25	760/15 763/23	583/11	physician [1] 750/19	plot [2] 563/20 756/4
passed [1] 778/8	per [51] 536/14	permission [1] 604/25	phytosanitary [1]	plots [5] 546/19
past [12] 568/18	546/11 547/13 547/17	permit [1] 765/1	548/5	546/20 549/22 557/8
584/22 659/15 680/24	548/10 548/11 550/1	permitted [1] 757/19	pick [1] 676/25	726/11
685/21 685/22 736/11	550/7 550/18 550/20	PERNT [5] 531/4	picked [1] 559/10	ploughs [3] 575/17
738/18 740/11 750/23	551/3 551/4 551/5	541/2 541/6 543/7	picture [5] 575/25	575/22 700/12
751/1 753/20	552/1 557/10 560/17	552/10	576/6 577/4 577/5	plus [8] 599/6 599/6
paste [2] 593/3 593/4	567/15 569/19 570/17	person [7] 625/4	685/21	636/7 636/25 645/20
	570/19 572/2 572/2	706/3 706/6 706/21	pictures [7] 577/10	699/25 700/2 700/24
patches [1] 657/23 patience [1] 637/22	572/4 572/12 588/16	708/20 763/2 773/3	577/12 577/18 577/19	pm [9] 659/21 659/21
pattern [5] 648/3	588/20 594/5 594/13	personal [2] 614/1	578/4 578/7 580/8	716/2 719/22 720/6
722/12 723/15 729/11	597/18 617/25 618/1	773/12	piece [2] 698/14	720/6 774/16 774/16
756/6	626/5 629/9 644/3	personally [3] 716/12	698/17	781/14
Pause [3] 584/1 712/9	645/14 646/14 647/12	773/20 779/5	pieces [3] 750/7 751/4	PO6 [1] 717/17
717/9	647/16 647/21 647/23	persons [3] 613/19	751/21	poignant [1] 739/11
pay [6] 599/9 599/10	647/24 652/9 652/11	688/17 762/15	pin [1] 689/10	point [87] 538/9
644/21 648/19 658/22	655/23 660/14 662/19	perspective [7] 631/8	PIOTR [3] 528/8	538/15 539/6 542/25
732/12	692/19 692/21 693/22	644/18 656/20 692/15	530/12 530/14	563/6 566/21 566/25
payables [1] 628/23	731/16 739/5	701/7 731/13 754/11	place [14] 529/10	570/24 579/18 581/25
paying [2] 599/7	per se [1] 536/14	persuade [1] 716/20	529/14 534/11 578/5	583/3 587/4 592/4
741/20	perceive [1] 603/23	persuaded [1] 711/19		597/13 603/13 605/23
payment [3] 658/25	perceived [1] 698/3	persuasively [1]	627/8 698/10 706/8	606/10 609/10 612/13
731/25 776/15	perceives [1] 699/10	716/23	716/10 732/23 742/24	615/14 615/19 617/6
payments [3] 551/20	perceiving [1] 704/21	pertain [2] 612/18	744/1	618/11 627/5 631/9
551/25 731/24	percent [4] 560/1	630/16	places [6] 596/4	632/23 635/6 641/9
pays [1] 701/22	595/4 630/5 662/9	pertained [2] 629/23	704/10 704/11 704/18	643/9 645/25 646/23
peasants [1] 583/21	percentage [1] 558/5	663/1	706/5 742/24	647/16 649/9 650/7
peer [60] 531/17	percentages [1] 551/7		Plains [1] 572/19	651/8 654/3 654/9
532/11 532/15 536/14	perfect [2] 624/2	587/22 606/15 615/2	plan [30] 548/6 649/13	
539/12 586/3 591/18	685/8	pertains [6] 587/14	649/21 649/23 649/24	658/14 659/17 660/15
591/25 593/15 593/16	perfectly [3] 621/3	589/17 592/12 662/7	650/4 650/5 669/13	661/6 662/5 663/23
594/13 595/7 595/13	621/5 621/7	677/23 717/23	669/17 669/19 669/22	664/13 664/21 666/25
595/15 596/22 598/17	perform [2] 620/24	pertinent [1] 766/9	669/25 670/4 670/8	667/7 669/20 679/13 601/3 701/10 706/17
599/4 600/17 601/16	693/25	pesticides [19]	688/22 688/24 689/1	691/3 701/19 706/17
601/24 602/2 602/12	performance [7]	548/24 548/25 549/3	690/25 697/3 697/8 697/9 697/12 697/18	707/1 709/2 713/15
621/12 622/5 623/16	558/18 563/14 563/16 620/19 620/25 623/3	549/4 549/7 549/12 549/13 549/13 549/16	697/9697/12697/18	719/16 721/13 721/17 724/11 726/22 729/13
635/16 637/10 638/4	620/19 620/25 623/3 644/2	549/17 550/24 564/22	714/12 714/22 715/2	732/15 732/24 736/10
638/24 639/2 639/3	o44/2 performed [9] 558/22	644/22 645/22 652/7	714/12/14/22/15/2	737/5 737/22 740/5
639/13 659/3 659/7	592/5 612/2 612/18	653/8 653/9 653/12	planned [3] 568/3	741/12 745/5 746/2
659/9 659/12 659/24	613/11 642/16 646/25	672/8	583/16 730/24	747/1 747/15 748/9
664/7 678/17 679/12	682/24 698/25	pests [1] 550/22	planning [1] 536/19	748/21 750/1 753/12
680/16 680/17 686/14	performing [4] 575/10		plant [8] 533/21	755/1 768/18 771/15
688/14 689/20 693/17		phase [1] 538/21	548/24 558/19 567/15	773/17 776/18 778/2
693/20 693/23 695/14	perhaps [30] 538/13	PhDs [1] 552/24	627/11 653/8 653/11	778/12 778/21
695/21 699/4 706/15	548/5 556/17 601/10	Philippe [4] 528/17	701/2	Point 9 [1] 768/18
706/17 711/18 712/11	604/24 614/10 624/12	529/4 585/2 639/4	plantations [1] 574/16	
715/10 718/22 718/24	624/22 672/23 681/18	Philippe Sands [2]	planted [3] 537/18	point, December 2012
719/4 740/18	691/24 704/11 712/4	585/2 639/4	645/11 714/15	[1] 737/2
Peer's [25] 536/2				
1			1	1

ICSID ARB 16 8		Word Index	13 December 2017	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova		Revised	Pages 528-781	
-	P	618/19 721/16 powers [1] 764/22	539/13 540/13 540/16 540/17 585/19 585/21	 proceedings [13] 541/14 585/11 618/21

	v Republic of Moldova	Reviseu		Fages 520-701
Р	618/19 721/16	539/13 540/13 540/16	pricing [1] 714/7	proceedings [13]
pointed [4] 543/7	powers [1] 764/22	540/17 585/19 585/21	primarily [2] 640/17	541/14 585/11 618/21
640/4 651/23 655/20	practice [3] 557/6	591/14 604/8 609/5	761/18	671/17 683/16 724/22
points [8] 538/23	563/19 580/22	628/7 629/12 639/24	primary [3] 600/4	725/19 736/7 749/1
548/8 591/21 634/10	practices [1] 714/19	650/14 659/2 659/6	654/1 662/25	766/2 767/24 773/24
721/15 729/6 768/16	practise [1] 554/15	659/25 660/1 660/15	Prime [4] 536/22	779/6
768/23	practising [1] 756/1	660/17 660/19 666/20	538/3 756/15 756/24	proceeds [2] 641/16
Poland [8] 588/13	practitioner [1]	666/24 721/16 724/11	Prime Minister [2]	641/18
588/16 624/16 624/24	733/17	724/14 769/22	538/3 756/24	process [14] 617/2
686/5 688/1 714/25	pre [7] 590/25 591/6	presentations [2]	Prime Minister	639/16 652/25 701/21
738/19	591/15 651/10 654/20	585/12 719/12	himself [1] 756/15	721/19 729/14 729/19
police [7] 729/4	656/12 742/20	presented [6] 579/11	Prime Minister Vlad	729/21 729/23 730/1
733/11 735/14 735/21	pre-award [4] 591/6	647/14 648/7 695/24	Filat [1] 536/22	730/10 730/23 730/24
735/23 765/9 765/12	651/10 654/20 656/12	716/23 731/16	primitive [1] 753/23	735/15
Polish [3] 624/17	pre-judgment [3]			processed [2] 563/24
625/9 635/7	590/25 591/15 742/20	720/16	principle [3] 576/15	759/12
polluted [1] 560/18	precisely [2] 704/6	presently [1] 582/2	593/16 710/2	processes [1] 554/14
pollution [1] 560/16	708/6	preserve [5] 541/14	principles [2] 594/9	processing [2] 549/22
poor [3] 556/8 556/25	predict [2] 685/23	718/7 718/9 737/19	631/5	554/16
753/23	712/19	738/4	print [1] 633/22	procured [1] 714/15
poorly [1] 556/8	predictability [1]	president [26] 528/17	prior [6] 572/20 697/4	produce [6] 555/21
popping [1] 600/13	714/7	529/3 529/19 571/3	711/24 727/23 729/19	640/9 658/12 675/1
population [1] 755/9	predicted [3] 595/20	574/15 581/24 585/15	744/16	691/1 695/18
portion [4] 610/13	658/4 667/10	606/6 610/16 614/18	private [11] 723/1	produced [8] 571/17
611/1 616/5 739/24	predicting [2] 646/9	633/2 679/7 712/7	729/18 729/24 730/2	643/16 665/23 667/13
posed [1] 772/21	681/2	715/7 723/12 723/13	731/11 759/5 760/18	667/15 674/22 695/6
position [13] 537/20	predominantly [2]	728/13 728/13 739/10	761/10 761/10 767/9 771/20	695/8 producers [4] 536/23
539/20 556/25 607/24	699/2 739/16 prefer [1] 638/15	739/19 743/18 748/5 758/16 758/17 759/6	privilege [2] 585/2	producers [4] 536/23 537/6 537/25 555/9
608/14 692/11 711/9	preference [5] 657/11	759/15	781/4	product [2] 537/19
718/20 737/25 743/16	710/3 774/21 775/7	President correctly	privileged [1] 781/2	648/6
772/22 777/16 778/1	775/13	[1] 759/6	probability [1] 636/8	production [13] 537/7
positive [2] 598/22	preferred [1] 697/16	President just [1]	probably [8] 555/10	548/3 548/5 563/14
599/5				
positively [1] 595/24	prejudice [1] 718/5	614/18	615/14 625/4 626/11	563/15 566/17 566/18
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22	614/18 President of [4]	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1]	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8]
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6]	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1]	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1]	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25 697/4 697/12 714/8	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19 previous [4] 601/17	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23 734/6	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7 Professor [33] 528/16
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 post-hearing [6]	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25 697/4 697/12 714/8 714/9 719/12 721/16	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19 previous [4] 601/17 632/20 634/1 768/16	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23 734/6 procedures [9]	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7 Professor [33] 528/16 528/17 529/4 529/13
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 post-hearing [6] 717/12 717/14 717/20	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25 697/4 697/12 714/8 714/9 719/12 721/16 prepares [1] 698/2	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19 previous [4] 601/17 632/20 634/1 768/16 previously [3] 600/8	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23 734/6 procedures [9] 541/16 569/12 572/16	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7 Professor [33] 528/16 528/17 529/4 529/13 531/16 552/25 556/19
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 post-hearing [6] 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25 697/4 697/12 714/8 714/9 719/12 721/16 prepares [1] 698/2 preparing [4] 613/1	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19 previous [4] 601/17 632/20 634/1 768/16 previously [3] 600/8 649/5 686/2	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23 734/6 procedures [9] 541/16 569/12 572/16 573/19 573/20 573/23	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7 Professor [33] 528/16 528/17 529/4 529/13 531/16 552/25 556/19 556/24 585/4 635/6
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 post-hearing [6] 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 postage [1] 760/3	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25 697/4 697/12 714/8 714/9 719/12 721/16 prepares [1] 698/2 preparing [4] 613/1 616/16 701/14 768/3	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19 previous [4] 601/17 632/20 634/1 768/16 previously [3] 600/8 649/5 686/2 price [5] 533/19	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23 734/6 procedures [9] 541/16 569/12 572/16 573/19 573/20 573/23 573/25 574/17 735/5	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7 Professor [33] 528/16 528/17 529/4 529/13 531/16 552/25 556/19 556/24 585/4 635/6 639/6 639/25 683/8
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 post-hearing [6] 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 postage [1] 760/3 potatoes [1] 553/7	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25 697/4 697/12 714/8 714/9 719/12 721/16 prepares [1] 698/2 preparing [4] 613/1 616/16 701/14 768/3 prerogative [1]	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19 previous [4] 601/17 632/20 634/1 768/16 previously [3] 600/8 649/5 686/2 price [5] 533/19 533/22 603/4 680/9	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23 734/6 procedures [9] 541/16 569/12 572/16 573/19 573/20 573/23 573/25 574/17 735/5 proced [5] 606/9	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7 Professor [33] 528/16 528/17 529/4 529/13 531/16 552/25 556/19 556/24 585/4 635/6 639/6 639/25 683/8 696/15 710/17 718/16
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 post-hearing [6] 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 postage [1] 760/3 potatoes [1] 553/7 potential [12] 547/21	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25 697/4 697/12 714/8 714/9 719/12 721/16 prepares [1] 698/2 preparing [4] 613/1 616/16 701/14 768/3 prerogative [1] 754/16	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19 previous [4] 601/17 632/20 634/1 768/16 previously [3] 600/8 649/5 686/2 price [5] 533/19 533/22 603/4 680/9 714/1	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23 734/6 procedure [9] 541/16 569/12 572/16 573/19 573/20 573/23 573/25 574/17 735/5 proced [5] 606/9 614/16 638/17 748/18	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7 Professor [33] 528/16 528/17 529/4 529/13 531/16 552/25 556/19 556/24 585/4 635/6 639/6 639/25 683/8 696/15 710/17 718/16 719/17 723/2 728/3
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 post-hearing [6] 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 postage [1] 760/3 potatoes [1] 553/7 potential [12] 547/21 547/23 563/23 583/2 585/24 590/16 590/19 600/24 636/11 637/7	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25 697/4 697/12 714/8 714/9 719/12 721/16 prepares [1] 698/2 preparing [4] 613/1 616/16 701/14 768/3 prerogative [1] 754/16 prescribed [1] 773/6	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19 previous [4] 601/17 632/20 634/1 768/16 previously [3] 600/8 649/5 686/2 price [5] 533/19 533/22 603/4 680/9 714/1 prices [11] 650/10	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23 734/6 procedures [9] 541/16 569/12 572/16 573/19 573/20 573/23 573/25 574/17 735/5 proceed [5] 606/9 614/16 638/17 748/18 779/12	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7 Professor [33] 528/16 528/17 529/4 529/13 531/16 552/25 556/19 556/24 585/4 635/6 639/6 639/25 683/8 696/15 710/17 718/16 719/17 723/2 728/3 733/18 753/21 755/8
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 post-hearing [6] 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 postage [1] 760/3 potatoes [1] 553/7 potential [12] 547/21 547/23 563/23 583/2 585/24 590/16 590/19	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25 697/4 697/12 714/8 714/9 719/12 721/16 prepares [1] 698/2 preparing [4] 613/1 616/16 701/14 768/3 prerogative [1] 754/16 prescribed [1] 773/6 present [7] 530/11	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19 previous [4] 601/17 632/20 634/1 768/16 previously [3] 600/8 649/5 686/2 price [5] 533/19 533/22 603/4 680/9 714/1 prices [11] 650/10 650/24 651/15 651/15	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23 734/6 procedures [9] 541/16 569/12 572/16 573/19 573/20 573/23 573/25 574/17 735/5 proceed [5] 606/9 614/16 638/17 748/18 779/12 proceeded [1] 652/13	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7 Professor [33] 528/16 528/17 529/4 529/13 531/16 552/25 556/19 556/24 585/4 635/6 639/6 639/25 683/8 696/15 710/17 718/16 719/17 723/2 728/3 733/18 753/21 755/8
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 post-hearing [6] 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 postage [1] 760/3 potatoes [1] 553/7 potential [12] 547/21 547/23 563/23 583/2 585/24 590/16 590/19 600/24 636/11 637/7 706/13 739/6 potentially [1] 706/5	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25 697/4 697/12 714/8 714/9 719/12 721/16 prepares [1] 698/2 preparing [4] 613/1 616/16 701/14 768/3 prerogative [1] 754/16 prescribed [1] 773/6 present [7] 530/11 573/21 577/6 611/4	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19 previous [4] 601/17 632/20 634/1 768/16 previously [3] 600/8 649/5 686/2 price [5] 533/19 533/22 603/4 680/9 714/1 prices [11] 650/10 650/24 651/15 651/15 651/17 694/2 709/22	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23 734/6 procedure [9] 541/16 569/12 572/16 573/19 573/20 573/23 573/25 574/17 735/5 proceed [5] 606/9 614/16 638/17 748/18 779/12 proceeded [1] 652/13 proceeding [5] 720/14	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7 Professor [33] 528/16 528/17 529/4 529/13 531/16 552/25 556/19 556/24 585/4 635/6 639/6 639/25 683/8 696/15 710/17 718/16 719/17 723/2 728/3 733/18 753/21 755/8 755/14 755/17 755/21 759/8 760/11 761/16
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 post-hearing [6] 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 postage [1] 760/3 potatoes [1] 553/7 potential [12] 547/21 547/23 563/23 583/2 585/24 590/16 590/19 600/24 636/11 637/7 706/13 739/6 potentially [1] 706/5	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25 697/4 697/12 714/8 714/9 719/12 721/16 prepares [1] 698/2 preparing [4] 613/1 616/16 701/14 768/3 prerogative [1] 754/16 prescribed [1] 773/6 present [7] 530/11 573/21 577/6 611/4 730/8 738/20 779/15	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19 previous [4] 601/17 632/20 634/1 768/16 previously [3] 600/8 649/5 686/2 price [5] 533/19 533/22 603/4 680/9 714/1 prices [11] 650/10 650/24 651/15 651/15 651/17 694/2 709/22 713/4 713/25 714/4	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23 734/6 procedure [9] 541/16 569/12 572/16 573/19 573/20 573/23 573/25 574/17 735/5 proceed [5] 606/9 614/16 638/17 748/18 779/12 proceeded [1] 652/13 proceeding [5] 720/14 730/24 735/12 746/25	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7 Professor [33] 528/16 528/17 529/4 529/13 531/16 552/25 556/19 556/24 585/4 635/6 639/6 639/25 683/8 696/15 710/17 718/16 719/17 723/2 728/3 733/18 753/21 755/8 755/14 755/17 755/21 759/8 760/11 761/16 763/14 763/25 764/18
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 post-hearing [6] 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 postage [1] 760/3 potatoes [1] 553/7 potential [12] 547/21 547/23 563/23 583/2 585/24 590/16 590/19 600/24 636/11 637/7 706/13 739/6 potentially [1] 706/5	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25 697/4 697/12 714/8 714/9 719/12 721/16 prepares [1] 698/2 preparing [4] 613/1 616/16 701/14 768/3 prerogative [1] 754/16 prescribed [1] 773/6 present [7] 530/11 573/21 577/6 611/4	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19 previous [4] 601/17 632/20 634/1 768/16 previously [3] 600/8 649/5 686/2 price [5] 533/19 533/22 603/4 680/9 714/1 prices [11] 650/10 650/24 651/15 651/15 651/17 694/2 709/22	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23 734/6 procedure [9] 541/16 569/12 572/16 573/19 573/20 573/23 573/25 574/17 735/5 proceed [5] 606/9 614/16 638/17 748/18 779/12 proceeded [1] 652/13 proceeding [5] 720/14	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7 Professor [33] 528/16 528/17 529/4 529/13 531/16 552/25 556/19 556/24 585/4 635/6 639/6 639/25 683/8 696/15 710/17 718/16 719/17 723/2 728/3 733/18 753/21 755/8 755/14 755/17 755/21 759/8 760/11 761/16
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 post-hearing [6] 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 postage [1] 760/3 potatoes [1] 553/7 potential [12] 547/21 547/23 563/23 583/2 585/24 590/16 590/19 600/24 636/11 637/7 706/13 739/6 potentially [1] 706/5	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25 697/4 697/12 714/8 714/9 719/12 721/16 prepares [1] 698/2 preparing [4] 613/1 616/16 701/14 768/3 prerogative [1] 754/16 prescribed [1] 773/6 present [7] 530/11 573/21 577/6 611/4 730/8 738/20 779/15	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19 previous [4] 601/17 632/20 634/1 768/16 previously [3] 600/8 649/5 686/2 price [5] 533/19 533/22 603/4 680/9 714/1 prices [11] 650/10 650/24 651/15 651/15 651/17 694/2 709/22 713/4 713/25 714/4	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23 734/6 procedure [9] 541/16 569/12 572/16 573/19 573/20 573/23 573/25 574/17 735/5 proceed [5] 606/9 614/16 638/17 748/18 779/12 proceeded [1] 652/13 proceeding [5] 720/14 730/24 735/12 746/25	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7 Professor [33] 528/16 528/17 529/4 529/13 531/16 552/25 556/19 556/24 585/4 635/6 639/6 639/25 683/8 696/15 710/17 718/16 719/17 723/2 728/3 733/18 753/21 755/8 755/14 755/17 755/21 759/8 760/11 761/16 763/14 763/25 764/18
positively [1] 595/24 possession [1] 725/4 possibilities [1] 682/11 possibility [6] 648/18 682/8 682/14 687/10 777/17 777/24 possible [11] 550/3 563/15 565/2 580/21 661/1 661/2 704/3 712/19 763/3 763/20 775/14 possibly [3] 646/18 700/23 770/20 post [9] 640/24 664/19 699/10 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 post-hearing [6] 717/12 717/14 717/20 718/15 751/23 775/19 postage [1] 760/3 potatoes [1] 553/7 potential [12] 547/21 547/23 563/23 583/2 585/24 590/16 590/19 600/24 636/11 637/7 706/13 739/6 potentially [1] 706/5	prejudice [1] 718/5 prejudiced [2] 725/22 726/16 premise [4] 662/21 663/4 667/6 760/3 premised [1] 608/19 preparation [2] 638/5 638/10 prepare [5] 638/2 639/24 692/13 694/19 717/9 prepared [28] 553/25 591/17 602/2 618/16 643/6 645/7 647/5 649/13 649/16 649/17 649/25 650/2 650/4 650/5 650/10 651/5 664/7 669/21 671/7 674/4 675/21 688/25 697/4 697/12 714/8 714/9 719/12 721/16 prepares [1] 698/2 preparing [4] 613/1 616/16 701/14 768/3 prerogative [1] 754/16 prescribed [1] 773/6 present [7] 530/11 573/21 577/6 611/4 730/8 738/20 779/15	614/18 President of [4] 739/10 739/19 758/16 758/17 President Zelenenco [1] 723/12 pressure [2] 640/9 730/4 presumably [6] 551/21 641/5 706/7 724/16 732/20 747/21 presume [1] 613/1 presumes [1] 681/14 presupposes [1] 682/6 pretend [1] 679/9 pretty [6] 536/18 593/2 630/21 670/10 688/1 688/19 previous [4] 601/17 632/20 634/1 768/16 previously [3] 600/8 649/5 686/2 price [5] 533/19 533/22 603/4 680/9 714/1 prices [11] 650/10 650/24 651/15 651/15 651/17 694/2 709/22 713/4 713/25 714/4	615/14 625/4 626/11 637/10 649/19 690/2 711/16 probative [1] 759/7 problem [16] 534/4 534/22 542/16 549/11 557/5 557/5 558/6 571/4 655/7 711/7 726/18 736/5 747/5 747/8 754/13 754/17 problems [12] 553/12 560/15 681/1 690/23 725/10 732/9 750/23 750/25 750/25 751/2 755/11 773/5 Procedural [1] 778/16 Procedural Orders [1] 778/16 procedure [2] 733/23 734/6 procedure [9] 541/16 569/12 572/16 573/19 573/20 573/23 573/25 574/17 735/5 proceed [5] 606/9 614/16 638/17 748/18 779/12 proceeded [1] 652/13 proceeding [5] 720/14 730/24 735/12 746/25	563/15 566/17 566/18 593/22 628/3 665/14 671/8 681/17 745/7 productions [2] 547/9 547/10 productive [2] 547/20 668/20 productivity [8] 564/24 573/10 575/5 576/5 668/15 669/2 669/5 739/15 products [9] 533/21 548/5 548/25 589/25 593/23 651/19 665/11 665/20 713/14 Prof [2] 761/21 765/11 professional [6] 544/7 544/24 550/10 550/11 637/4 779/7 Professor [33] 528/16 528/17 529/4 529/13 531/16 552/25 556/19 556/24 585/4 635/6 639/6 639/25 683/8 696/15 710/17 718/16 719/17 723/2 728/3 733/18 753/21 755/8 755/14 755/17 755/21 759/8 760/11 761/16 763/14 763/25 764/18

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
P	properly [5] 725/15	published [1] 780/10	question [77] 537/5	R-15 [1] 762/14
Professor Knieper [8]	726/1 734/11 734/14	pun [1] 689/3	537/16 542/15 546/1	R-16 [1] 762/14
556/19 556/24 585/4	767/18	punished [1] 720/4	547/16 551/2 551/3	R-19 [1] 762/16
639/6 683/8 696/15	property [2] 682/16	punt [2] 706/6 706/24	551/12 556/20 558/21	R-9 [4] 581/13 611/8
719/17 772/12	773/4	purchase [1] 581/5	559/23 562/15 564/24	745/22 746/16
Professor Knieper's	proponent [1] 623/21	purchased [6] 573/5 576/15 580/2 609/2	565/8 571/15 574/9 574/22 575/6 582/7	raise [2] 744/17 747/9 raised [8] 536/2
[1] 635/6	proposition [1] 537/10	609/14 609/15	574/22 575/6 562/7 582/19 584/4 587/13	589/16 737/22 744/15
Professor Rusu [13]	prosecutor [1] 728/25		587/17 595/10 602/23	746/24 747/2 747/6
723/2 728/3 733/18	prosecutors [1]	634/18	604/13 609/1 610/18	750/21
753/21 755/8 755/14	728/23	purely [4] 625/10	610/24 614/19 619/16	raises [1] 704/20
755/17 755/21 760/11 761/16 763/14 763/25	prospective [1] 686/1	627/18 700/6 730/13	622/24 624/12 624/13	ran [1] 588/12
764/18	prospects [1] 698/5	purported [1] 643/7	626/9 635/5 635/22	range [2] 567/14
Professor Sands [2]	prosperous [1]	purportedly [2] 608/6	635/24 660/9 662/6	709/19
710/17 759/8	554/10	660/3	679/20 680/20 682/12	ranged [1] 567/12
Professor Sands' [1]	protectants [1]	purpose [8] 538/21	683/20 689/16 691/3	rape [2] 567/9 567/19
639/25	673/19	576/20 582/7 617/2 677/1 699/18 761/17	696/17 697/10 699/12 704/20 704/22 706/11	Rarely [1] 600/2
profit [9] 588/15	protection [7] 533/21 548/24 558/19 560/15	761/17	708/9 710/15 712/13	rate [18] 552/14 601/3 602/20 650/18 650/18
588/19 597/10 598/19	653/9 653/11 701/2	purposes [7] 569/25	714/11 724/5 724/7	650/21 650/21 651/1
599/3 621/23 672/8	proud [1] 554/18	607/5 636/13 677/14	731/6 731/12 737/3	651/7 651/9 651/11
739/5 740/13	prove [3] 553/7	700/7 739/24 776/3	741/7 743/10 743/12	654/22 655/24 656/13
profitability [18] 596/24 597/2 642/23	588/14 756/8	pursuant [2] 540/16	743/19 746/10 749/14	657/7 657/9 742/20
643/7 644/7 647/12	proved [1] 686/4	582/4	752/15 752/16 758/1	742/20
667/2 676/14 676/18	proven [1] 661/25	push [2] 705/9 706/18	771/9 772/14 772/21	rates [4] 591/6 650/24
677/4 677/5 677/19	provide [17] 546/2	pushing [1] 707/16	774/6 776/23 778/3	709/21 709/23
677/24 712/15 738/19	549/4 585/23 597/5	put [48] 535/24	778/24	rather [17] 548/12
738/20 738/22 740/25	618/5 647/22 650/12	556/19 563/1 568/3	questioning [8] 607/5	593/21 595/1 617/21
profitable [9] 599/18	652/22 655/10 704/22 705/1 717/24 719/2	579/8 579/9 579/13 580/13 580/14 582/23	608/17 614/15 618/16 637/19 637/25 696/19	621/2 623/9 625/5 653/23 657/19 680/11
599/24 658/10 668/20	763/11 764/22 772/14	583/1 587/17 606/4	756/19	691/9 695/3 699/9
686/10 686/12 692/17	774/23	608/18 610/19 610/20	questions [44] 532/4	717/1 739/21 746/12
692/19 692/21	provided [31] 535/5	611/9 624/6 630/1	532/10 532/16 533/10	754/2
profits [5] 588/7 599/10 635/17 704/17	556/8 588/13 593/12	644/23 648/13 661/17	539/2 541/5 541/8	ratio [5] 596/12 629/8
740/10	593/13 617/4 617/12	664/13 666/15 667/4	552/16 552/19 552/20	629/11 630/11 677/18
programmed [1]	621/8 633/21 633/23	678/10 678/15 691/13	556/16 569/1 582/3	rationale [2] 537/7
583/16	651/20 652/2 652/10	691/19 691/22 697/23	582/15 582/17 585/12	537/9
progress [1] 690/7	663/6 667/17 669/23	707/19 711/9 711/10	604/9 606/12 606/14	ratios [1] 655/6
prohibited [1] 701/5	701/2 725/13 731/1	715/3 719/8 742/21 744/1 744/23 751/15	608/19 612/24 614/7	re [16] 532/3 532/5
project [12] 542/9	735/7 745/6 751/7 753/16 759/21 761/7	754/3 754/12 759/18	614/9 627/15 632/14 635/20 654/17 659/19	532/9 532/14 532/17 533/9 541/10 582/20
579/23 613/21 625/2	769/13 769/18 769/25	760/1 760/9 776/6	659/25 674/24 680/7	632/16 659/17 679/18
670/21 679/21 679/22	770/2 770/4 770/15	776/19 777/25	680/18 681/6 685/9	679/19 701/10 712/10
680/8 701/15 702/15	provides [4] 570/5	puts [1] 691/5	696/25 705/5 712/2	752/11 766/16
713/2 733/15	585/22 759/9 779/24	putting [5] 577/2	715/9 717/22 718/1	re-direct [4] 533/9
projected [13] 596/18 596/20 656/4 658/4	providing [2] 544/23	579/7 664/23 700/15	747/8 747/16 757/20	659/17 679/18 766/16
667/1 670/17 671/1	652/23	718/10	772/11	Re-examination [10]
671/14 674/8 674/11	proving [1] 588/12	Q	quick [2] 640/1 743/12	
675/23 678/20 680/10	provision [2] 652/24		quickly [3] 551/14	532/14 532/17 541/10
projecting [2] 671/3	655/8	QC [2] 528/15 529/9 qualification [3] 545/7	633/18 691/16	582/20 632/16 679/19 712/10
676/15	public [21] 579/6 722/20 723/5 724/6	731/12 731/17	quite [12] 561/20	re-incur [1] 701/10
projection [6] 626/15	724/8 729/18 730/12	qualify [1] 763/2	566/13 588/12 588/18	re-read [1] 752/11
629/3 636/3 649/15	730/13 731/11 731/25	quality [8] 556/14	618/3 626/3 633/19	reach [1] 563/22
671/11 676/9	732/17 732/17 732/23	559/3 593/11 611/20	654/4 681/3 717/21	reached [4] 561/1
projections [7] 645/7	733/10 735/17 736/17	625/11 697/6 699/5	744/8 780/9	584/17 603/13 756/12
650/10 656/8 671/5 672/13 672/16 692/12	736/20 756/8 760/19	773/8	quoted [1] 569/8	reacted [1] 732/7
prominent [1] 758/10	761/12 773/4	quantify [1] 648/23	R	reaction [2] 534/21
promptly [1] 767/16	publication [3] 569/15			606/2
proof [5] 579/17	569/17 570/4	719/1 721/24 738/12	R-11 [3] 581/14	read [23] 537/13
695/10 695/11 695/12	publicity [1] 761/17	740/14 741/19 743/3	612/11 746/20	543/10 544/20 556/2
776/15	publicly [1] 623/10	768/21 775/6 quarter [1] 659/15	R-13 [2] 745/13 745/16	557/1 557/3 594/12 602/14 611/12 637/16
proper [3] 699/13	publicly-listed [1] 623/10	Quebec [1] 529/11	R-14 [1] 762/13	639/9 639/10 659/5
725/7 735/2				
	I	www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	W
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 528-781
R	622/16 624/4 628/16	753/14 754/9 754/14	765/24 768/23 771/3	reliability [8] 558/24
read [10] 669/7	640/19 662/25 700/17	754/16 754/18 754/21	regardless [2] 764/15	558/24 559/24 560/3
689/21 708/19 708/22	775/7	754/24 755/3 757/17	766/17	561/1 603/23 675/2
	rebel [1] 759/24	759/18 762/16 765/15	regards [16] 565/23	740/25
709/8 752/11 754/2	rebuttal [2] 579/8	767/14 772/6 777/3	592/11 593/11 594/13	reliable [15] 592/23
754/10 754/15 780/9	579/15	records [7] 587/18	609/11 625/11 631/25	595/5 597/19 642/10
readdress [1] 722/11	recalculation [1]	588/12 609/6 609/12	636/3 636/7 636/15	661/3 661/6 675/9
reader [1] 600/14	605/11	610/11 635/7 635/8	684/7 686/6 686/12	675/11 683/25 684/9
readily [1] 629/24	recall [11] 537/15	recoup [1] 648/15	694/2 701/1 743/14	692/12 693/1 694/10
reading [7] 585/5	575/14 580/14 581/8	recouped [2] 642/3	region [2] 710/13	694/20 712/18
702/10 708/18 754/14	611/5 660/5 661/19	648/6	739/4	reliance [6] 593/25
754/17 754/24 755/2	663/2 666/21 669/14	recover [1] 645/1	register [9] 580/24	596/13 616/24 617/23
ready [4] 577/6 720/7	763/7	recovered [1] 645/23	581/2 587/7 609/7	642/12 643/12
720/8 720/8	receivable [1] 600/16	red [1] 535/16	609/9 610/11 762/21	relied [12] 593/12
real [8] 565/1 620/25	receivables [1] 628/23		762/23 764/4	594/1 617/3 617/16
621/3 623/4 698/5	receive [2] 673/3	rediscuss [1] 695/22	registered [2] 724/1	620/20 624/1 642/19
703/22 738/2 780/21	705/25	redone [1] 762/18	766/14	678/4 699/1 770/7
realise [1] 580/14	received [16] 573/6	reduce [1] 683/23	registers [2] 587/5	770/10 771/3
realistic [5] 721/21	578/5 578/6 604/3	reduction [1] 550/18	605/14	relief [2] 767/12
733/1 737/10 737/17	606/13 639/20 649/1	refer [12] 544/8	registrar [2] 755/18	767/15
738/3	650/14 650/15 672/3	548/10 548/11 573/17	761/9	rely [6] 536/19 592/23
reality [9] 563/17	672/6 693/13 724/21	574/16 592/13 592/14	registration [18]	594/22 595/7 622/8
565/11 565/18 566/17	728/14 747/21 748/13	621/10 663/10 739/9	724/5 729/20 730/12	755/10
734/23 738/2 740/5	receiving [2] 730/21	752/10 773/11	730/24 731/9 731/20	relying [3] 595/2
740/8 740/10	731/1	reference [11] 565/16	760/25 761/5 761/16	627/20 629/9
really [36] 563/5	recent [1] 702/11	619/21 619/25 620/7	761/20 761/24 762/3	remain [4] 595/19
566/14 622/9 623/19	recently [4] 560/7	663/2 666/19 675/20	763/4 763/12 763/25	602/7 602/7 761/23
625/2 630/8 632/24	602/2 657/16 723/22	675/21 702/18 713/19	764/1 766/12 767/3	remainder [1] 731/21
632/25 637/3 637/18	RECHTSANWÄLTE	753/10	registry [2] 623/24	remained [1] 702/15
638/8 642/23 646/7	[1] 531/6	referenced [3] 587/9	684/16	remaining [1] 602/17
680/25 681/8 681/19 687/22 691/4 698/25	recognise [5] 612/16	620/6 620/8	regret [1] 590/5	remains [5] 581/1
705/6 706/18 708/3	668/24 688/7 715/14	references [2] 753/25	regrettably [1] 767/22	708/4 744/1 746/1
715/12 716/16 716/24	740/8	754/12	regular [3] 583/18	773/24
720/4 735/5 737/14	recognised [2] 538/3	referred [3] 544/2	646/20 648/3	remark [1] 681/5
752/21 771/16 772/13	595/11	648/21 761/4	rehabilitate [1] 644/24	remarks [5] 532/20
773/18 779/5 779/9	recollection [1]	referring [9] 546/13	reimburse [2] 706/7	632/20 686/20 738/6
779/19 781/4	580/16	578/3 605/7 619/11	742/12	774/17
realm [1] 688/9	recommendation [2]	659/25 663/14 695/20	reimbursed [1]	remedied [1] 564/15
rearrange [1] 584/21	558/10 695/16	713/19 777/6	741/12	remedies [7] 721/22
reason [14] 537/4	recommendations [1]	refers [1] 764/1	reiterate [1] 716/13	726/7 733/1 737/24
575/2 603/14 605/15	560/20	refinery [2] 689/6	Rejoinder [1] 773/11	738/4 765/23 767/19
640/10 658/20 662/1	Recommended [1]	689/7	relate [3] 537/21	remedy [4] 737/15
662/11 680/8 684/1	533/19	reflect [10] 566/17	538/9 596/18	737/18 738/2 764/25
700/3 737/6 754/19	reconfirmed [4] 637/2	628/19 665/25 707/3	related [9] 533/21	remember [4] 554/25
755/22	760/22 761/16 761/19	716/17 717/5 717/13	535/4 597/7 655/14	575/16 736/7 745/15
reasonability [2]	reconstitute [2]	718/12 718/13 719/16	714/16 726/10 732/21	remind [3] 728/18 729/9 751/25
636/2 642/16	643/21 644/23	reflected [2] 565/11 567/5	749/23 750/22	
reasonable [26]	record [64] 533/24 534/10 535/3 535/22	reflecting [1] 704/2	relates [1] 571/18 relating [3] 543/11	remodeled [1] 617/15 remotely [1] 531/10
593/10 597/4 609/11	535/24 536/15 538/6	reflection [2] 541/4	717/11 755/19	renal [1] 755/17
609/13 629/22 630/1	539/17 539/17 540/11	718/14	relation [8] 538/18	renewal [3] 627/12
631/1 631/18 631/23	577/22 579/6 579/19	reflective [1] 698/5	572/8 572/10 577/24	627/13 637/8
636/14 636/23 637/5	579/20 581/13 581/25	reflects [1] 583/23	582/16 656/3 743/10	renewing [1] 636/8
637/19 652/15 684/7	587/17 601/10 606/4	refreshing [1] 768/22	776/23	rent [2] 551/20 552/7
689/15 696/13 706/24	621/19 632/19 649/14	refusal [3] 763/11	relationship [6]	rented [2] 557/19
707/1 714/24 716/4	659/6 669/17 669/18	763/20 763/25	672/10 672/12 746/6	572/10
733/24 737/1 741/7	669/19 670/9 679/14	refused [2] 727/11	766/23 766/25 780/23	repay [1] 655/9
755/23 763/17	603/7 711/25 710/8	732/14	relatively [2] 640/18	repeat [4] 549/9
reasonably [6] 588/20	719/11 721/12 722/8	regard [2] 580/22	720/24	583/25 714/23 720/12
589/2 604/2 630/21	723/10 724/1 724/18	638/9	released [2] 584/20	repeated [3] 563/8
705/2 769/8	725/25 728/22 729/6	regarding [13] 590/25	715/23	669/12 756/19
reasoned [1] 763/15	731/22 744/18 745/4	598/12 601/12 635/6	relevant [5] 546/8	repeatedly [1] 757/12
reasoning [2] 766/21	746/23 747/25 751/15	635/6 661/18 669/11	731/13 765/24 766/6	repeating [2] 694/9
767/1	751/17 752/14 752/22	670/4 714/12 760/18	766/23	771/17
reasons [8] 586/16				
	l		I	l

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 528-781
R	740/22 740/23 741/20	respect [6] 537/17	rev C-95 [1] 777/1	727/14 735/1 761/21
repetition [1] 716/15	742/21 769/2 769/4	618/15 642/8 654/4	revenue [22] 593/25	762/7 764/14 768/12
rephrase [2] 595/10	769/7 769/20 770/1	654/25 773/9	596/18 657/19 663/8	771/24
614/24	770/12 770/13 770/14	respectfully [2]	663/18 663/23 665/2	rise [1] 773/5
replace [3] 618/24	770/23 775/5	772/17 778/15	665/8 665/10 666/3	risk [11] 656/3 656/6
701/12 701/23	reporter [1] 754/7	respective [7] 573/9	666/16 671/25 674/15	656/10 656/22 656/24
replaced [1] 701/20	reporters [4] 529/21	592/19 598/13 612/6	675/23 676/10 678/20	657/3 657/6 657/7
replacement [2]	637/21 638/9 780/13	683/19 712/5 716/19	679/23 679/25 680/6	657/9 704/7 704/16
652/25 701/18	reports [15] 542/5	respectively [2]	680/10 680/11 741/23	risk-free [2] 657/7
replacing [1] 701/8	543/4 544/19 554/1	716/24 773/19	revenues [9] 595/24	657/9
Reply [1] 736/22	589/12 598/14 603/24	respond [4] 556/18	596/2 600/18 600/19	risked [1] 713/20
report [171] 536/2	617/17 686/21 694/19 715/20 719/7 740/14	581/17 694/17 777/19	620/23 657/18 674/9 674/12 681/3	risks [1] 704/10
536/3 536/14 537/14	769/3 770/15	Respondent [43] 528/12 531/2 532/8	revert [2] 661/6	risky [6] 704/15 706/4 706/9 706/25 713/12
538/12 539/8 542/18	represent [3] 538/1	532/12 532/14 532/19	664/24	731/5
543/6 544/3 544/14	544/6 598/6	534/8 534/20 534/24	review [9] 601/11	robbed [1] 742/15
544/23 545/15 545/23	representative [2]	535/5 538/9 538/17	601/13 616/11 616/14	ROGER [5] 530/16
546/8 546/10 549/1	578/6 580/5	538/23 539/5 540/18	616/20 616/21 764/20	722/19 724/10 724/13
549/11 551/17 555/10	representatives [1]	541/1 579/8 579/14	765/8 765/8	729/23
555/13 556/2 559/13	558/17	581/8 591/18 605/20	reviewed [4] 610/7	Roger Gladei [3]
562/15 562/19 563/1	represents [1] 590/13	639/12 670/3 679/19	620/9 620/10 765/5	722/19 724/13 729/23
563/7 565/14 565/19 566/11 566/16 567/2	REPUBLIC [10]	691/20 718/17 719/25	reviewing [2] 540/19	Roger Gladei's [1]
569/2 572/24 574/7	528/11 531/8 531/13	720/8 737/24 744/15	601/2	724/10
577/20 579/9 579/15	565/23 565/25 607/16	744/21 745/6 751/2	revise [2] 672/15	role [5] 727/21 727/24
586/3 589/17 589/17	613/17 736/15 736/17	752/6 752/7 761/8	674/11	755/5 755/6 758/10
589/23 590/3 591/17	752/17	762/16 765/18 768/17	revised [10] 533/17	roles [1] 727/6
591/21 591/24 592/15	request [9] 534/9	769/15 775/19 779/1	535/10 649/6 664/4	Rolf [3] 528/16 529/13
592/16 594/22 595/17	571/1 587/14 724/24	779/2	664/8 671/21 672/13	781/2
596/4 600/11 601/24	724/25 735/22 777/18	Respondent's [10] 582/4 589/16 718/19	674/2 674/4 674/8	rolf.knieper [1] 529/16
604/14 604/15 604/18	777/24 778/21 requested [9] 670/2	737/16 741/19 750/22	revision [2] 586/12 673/9	Romania [1] 623/25
604/23 605/13 605/25	670/3 729/4 732/8	767/5 767/6 773/11	revisit [1] 538/19	Romanian [7] 537/2
605/25 606/1 606/3	735/23 767/15 767/17	775/12	revisited [1] 605/12	543/4 543/6 545/25
606/8 606/13 606/15	774/24 776/19	Respondents' [1]	revocation [3] 592/18	547/7 556/6 763/16
606/17 606/20 606/21	requesting [1] 775/9	694/6	683/18 684/14	room [4] 534/4 584/22
607/1 607/4 607/9	requests [3] 577/24	response [1] 556/21	revoked [1] 684/16	653/10 672/22
607/14 608/4 608/8 608/25 610/6 610/8	756/19 776/13	responsibility [1]	rewarded [1] 591/9	Rosietici [5] 578/20
613/1 613/4 613/5	require [1] 700/18	709/4	RH [2] 659/6 659/7	578/23 579/25 589/14
615/18 616/3 617/1	required [4] 641/11	responsible [4]	RH-2 [1] 659/7	729/3
617/9 617/9 617/10	641/22 733/23 735/14	691/20 693/5 752/12	RH-3 [1] 659/6	rough [3] 572/1 572/3
617/14 617/16 617/24	requirement [2] 649/6	768/17	rich [1] 558/3	580/15
618/1 618/4 618/8	738/1	responsive [4] 536/3	Richard [1] 779/18	route [2] 767/23 775/6
618/12 618/18 619/2	requirements [1]	536/14 538/11 579/4	right [59] 533/15	row [1] 567/24
619/5 619/9 619/12	645/3	rest [7] 545/23 584/19		rule [1] 742/25
619/17 619/22 620/7	requires [3] 545/6 568/13 592/6	629/3 646/15 646/16 681/21 750/6	556/5 559/11 563/10 565/3 570/16 581/11	ruled [2] 766/7 766/18 rumour [1] 657/25
620/8 620/10 620/11	research [4] 547/22	result [7] 553/14	586/5 595/1 599/8	run [5] 589/24 625/5
620/17 620/21 621/11	555/5 560/10 749/4	705/12 736/6 769/11	599/9 607/1 620/17	627/20 630/21 631/17
622/13 622/17 623/7	researched [1] 566/4	769/17 769/24 770/8	629/21 631/7 632/4	running [4] 615/10
624/7 626/1 627/17	reservation [2] 534/3	resulted [1] 741/21	632/6 635/10 639/5	625/1 627/2 686/4
628/3 628/10 628/24	606/7	resulting [1] 590/20	654/5 658/19 663/19	runs [1] 540/7
629/6 629/14 630/14	reserve [7] 538/16	results [8] 562/12	666/11 667/2 669/9	RURAC [17] 530/17
633/6 633/10 635/3	538/20 539/22 717/25	599/9 625/7 643/5	669/15 670/5 670/22	532/2 533/2 534/3
637/17 639/20 639/24 640/5 643/12 643/13	748/11 777/23 778/1	651/6 664/12 692/9	671/4 672/19 672/23	542/1 548/18 553/20
644/11 646/1 647/1	reserved [1] 605/24	736/2	675/23 676/1 676/3	554/22 557/14 561/18
647/3 647/15 648/7	residual [2] 627/6	resume [1] 584/22	677/25 678/8 679/2	593/7 603/22 769/3
651/24 654/11 656/5	642/2	retire [1] 695/15	688/21 698/18 700/3	769/7 770/2 770/6
657/24 659/8 659/9	resolution [2] 733/6	retrieved [1] 566/8	705/13 710/19 710/21	771/9
659/11 662/25 663/7	735/7	retrospect [1] 752/16	716/25 717/25 718/8	Ruse [1] 761/18
663/10 670/14 673/16	resolved [4] 734/17	return [8] 657/7 693/6		rush [1] 778/4
674/22 675/2 679/15	736/9 746/11 752/22	704/5 705/20 705/21	746/15 747/17 748/8	Russia [1] 598/1
679/21 693/24 695/16	resolving [1] 733/3 resort [2] 622/6	727/12 742/22 746/19 returned [1] 749/2	748/11 750/8 763/1 766/15	Russian [2] 759/2 759/21
696/3 696/3 717/18	702/25	rev [2] 535/10 777/1	rights [9] 723/7 726/4	RUSU [36] 531/16
718/21 718/22 740/16				
		www.dianaburdon.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
R	529/4 585/2 639/4	scared [1] 750/12	security [1] 706/21	590/18 654/11 654/15
RUSU [35] 723/2	639/23 710/17 759/8	scenario [5] 565/2	see [41] 557/6 558/23	729/25 778/7
723/13 728/3 728/12	Sands' [1] 639/25	707/5 707/6 707/9	567/16 567/24 568/7	separates [1] 665/12
730/9 730/15 733/18	sat [2] 702/12 708/1	733/21	569/18 570/25 571/3	September [3] 587/12
753/21 753/22 753/24	satisfied [6] 589/2	SCHNEIDER [1] 531/5		646/18 730/20
755/8 755/10 755/14	604/2 715/4 769/9	schoenherr.eu [5]	575/24 576/3 586/22	September 2010 [2]
755/16 755/17 755/19	778/22 778/23	531/8 531/9 531/9	588/18 590/19 597/1	587/12 730/20
755/21 755/23 760/11	satisfy [2] 690/5	531/14 531/14	597/11 597/16 597/25	sequestrated [1]
760/12 761/11 761/16	778/13	school [1] 554/11	599/2 599/17 599/22	659/12
761/19 761/21 762/5	satisfy our [1] 690/5	Schottenring [1]	599/23 601/7 611/10 611/24 617/10 617/13	sequestration [1] 638/22
763/14 763/15 763/18	Saulieu [1] 529/15	531/7 SCHÖNHERR [3]	619/2 619/24 626/13	
763/20 763/25 764/2	save [4] 735/20 754/3 754/4 760/3	531/6 531/12 720/13	636/21 642/24 653/17	series [2] 721/9 722/5 serious [5] 668/8
764/14 764/18 765/10	saved [1] 599/7	science [7] 546/17	653/24 659/15 690/22	669/8 728/6 750/23
765/11	saw [14] 552/11 573/7	546/19 546/20 546/22	733/4 737/14 750/14	750/25
République [1]	576/20 577/2 577/3	557/4 563/19 632/7	seeds [2] 553/8	seriously [2] 669/2
529/14	578/1 579/2 622/25	Sciences [1] 552/25	553/11	728/24
S	691/17 730/9 750/3	Sciences and [1]	seeing [1] 644/4	seriousness [1] 681/5
	758/22 765/9 771/7	552/25	seek [4] 726/7 738/1	servants [1] 755/13
sadly [1] 767/22	say [84] 535/4 536/20	scientific [8] 546/16	758/2 758/11	serve [1] 576/20
Safe [1] 781/8	538/16 540/15 541/22	547/12 559/17 560/20	seem [2] 652/15	serves [2] 736/8
safer [1] 704/18	FACIAE FAZIAO FACIAO	563/25 563/25 566/25	681/13	761/16
said [59] 540/6 540/19	548/24 549/13 554/17	682/2	seemed [1] 643/8	service [1] 715/16
548/18 548/19 548/21	555/22 556/2 556/5	scientifically [3]	seems [5] 572/5 667/8	
552/11 556/10 557/16 557/22 560/22 562/3	556/24 562/12 572/13	553/14 564/21 566/20	749/11 749/15 758/7	services [1] 647/18
562/18 563/10 564/14	574/8 574/25 575/2	score [5] 558/22	seen [18] 539/19	servicing [6] 663/1
574/5 578/1 578/16	576/2 576/3 578/25	558/24 558/24 559/19	539/20 561/22 576/10	665/9 665/18 665/19
579/5 580/2 581/10	583/18 607/15 608/21	559/24	577/9 591/24 594/4	666/9 761/5
583/25 610/6 616/11	613/4 613/16 613/18	scores [1] 558/25	631/4 636/6 653/21	set [11] 602/22 644/10
620/14 621/17 621/18	620/8 620/9 620/11	screen [3] 585/20	660/20 676/7 681/15	652/21 654/15 656/21
624/13 627/16 636/20	630/9 636/2 652/20	586/5 702/11	686/8 691/8 696/7	671/21 712/18 718/22
645/10 648/2 650/15	654/12 655/10 656/15	Scretariat [1] 529/17	715/4 723/2	728/20 771/18 772/1
656/1 671/8 673/10	657/19 676/25 677/13	scroll [2] 611/13	sees [1] 775/19	sets [2] 698/15 715/20
677/7 684/13 684/14	682/9 684/19 685/3	633/18	segmentation [3]	SETTLEMENT [1]
686/2 687/14 688/23	685/8 686/11 689/3	se [1] 536/14	663/8 666/5 666/6	528/2
691/3 693/20 696/20	689/20 695/14 698/13	season [5] 723/19	seized [2] 747/1 749/1	seven [9] 616/23
698/14 705/7 706/6	698/21 701/17 707/1	734/17 734/18 734/20	selected [2] 629/10	620/19 625/14 627/14
718/19 721/4 722/22	708/15 708/16 708/22	781/11	652/4	674/23 675/1 742/12
723/2 728/4 728/10	709/14 709/18 709/24	seasons [1] 734/9	selection [1] 622/25	742/13 748/1
729/22 729/23 731/20	711/21 712/21 713/1	second [14] 616/23	self [1] 779/15	several [9] 548/7
735/17 751/24 755/17	713/5 713/9 713/10	619/15 641/10 641/12		550/12 568/18 568/22
sake [1] 734/13	717/5 718/18 719/22	660/15 728/4 729/13	589/25 614/25 615/13	591/25 597/24 632/19
sale [19] 580/5 580/13	730/25 742/14 744/9	734/13 755/9 756/12 757/1 761/14 766/6	615/14 627/6	685/17 708/10
580/14 587/22 593/22	745/25 749/18 753/1 753/9 758/5 760/13	771/1	selling [1] 581/3 sells [1] 572/20	severe [1] 602/12 severity [1] 733/12
615/1 641/15 648/6	773/17 773/19 778/5	secondly [8] 587/4	Semanatoaea [1]	shall [2] 719/21
663/18 663/24 665/2	778/6 779/4 780/8	588/16 588/23 649/23	572/19	762/21
665/11 665/14 665/20	780/11	684/4 686/8 693/23	send [1] 764/19	share [4] 610/15
667/24 741/14 741/24	saying [20] 539/22	694/7	sense [10] 582/11	611/3 686/24 748/6
744/5 746/20	571/11 615/4 633/1	secret [1] 653/3	608/18 626/19 689/13	shareholders [1]
sales [3] 587/23	638/12 643/18 660/5	secretariat [1] 780/21	692/9 700/21 706/1	648/19
663/20 689/17	666/16 681/25 688/15	secretariats [1]	707/17 710/20 779/25	She [1] 759/14
same [20] 533/16	696/20 698/1 702/9	780/18	sensible [2] 556/21	sheet [1] 748/16
542/23 565/8 566/7	702/22 706/15 706/16	secretary [2] 529/18	637/10	shield [1] 658/7
584/13 595/20 604/25	707/13 717/6 738/14	618/23	sensitive [1] 734/4	shifting [1] 639/23
607/7 618/7 619/15	744/22	section [3] 554/9	sensitivity [1] 646/5	shoes [1] 583/1
656/16 668/25 671/2 676/5 680/21 688/20	says [20] 543/10	736/22 773/11	sent [6] 562/17 562/21	short [12] 584/24
710/13 744/2 755/12	544/22 549/1 549/11	section 32 [1] 773/11	724/23 725/1 760/2	635/21 637/11 683/1
758/3	551/21 556/7 556/24	section 7K [1] 736/22	769/23	688/2 716/20 717/14
Same handed [3]	627/19 645/12 670/11	sector [6] 623/11	sentence [2] 618/2	720/6 739/1 751/19
533/16 604/25 607/7	696/7 698/18 702/21	678/8 713/1 713/11	709/9	774/16 775/20
sample [2] 613/10	708/3 708/20 710/6	713/21 713/25	separate [2] 698/12	short-lived [1] 739/1
739/5	710/10 711/11 728/1	sectors [1] 546/11	743/25	shortly [1] 726/7
sands [7] 528/17	777/5	secure [1] 731/4	separately [6] 590/16	should [38] 543/5
μ		www.dianaburden.com	1	

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

Zbigniew Plotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 528-781
S	simplified [2] 589/23	smaller [4] 567/23	society [2] 753/19	somehow [10] 598/21
should [37] 591/8	590/2	685/24 771/1 771/3	758/9	623/17 632/1 632/5
600/20 612/20 613/13	simply [17] 566/19	smoke [2] 689/4	soil [8] 557/6 557/11	636/11 700/7 712/24
614/21 627/5 641/14	584/3 585/5 593/3	695/19	558/5 559/2 559/3	726/2 747/12 770/13
641/18 641/20 641/24	605/1 612/13 635/22	so [178] 533/5 534/5	560/6 643/21 673/19	someone [7] 739/21
641/25 642/5 642/7	636/20 637/23 654/6	534/11 534/15 535/7	soils [6] 557/11	742/15 742/16 742/16
645/15 646/7 646/9	680/7 693/20 701/22	536/17 538/5 539/20	557/12 557/18 558/3	742/17 742/22 757/2
650/25 651/4 651/5	754/23 762/18 763/19	539/21 540/16 540/20	558/7 559/6	something [27]
651/6 652/24 653/23	767/18	541/19 542/4 545/19	sold [22] 580/6 580/7	540/20 542/9 546/23
690/4 702/18 703/16	since [8] 538/10 657/8	545/21 547/10 548/5	580/25 581/14 581/15	557/17 557/20 612/19
716/25 720/25 721/5	690/10 690/10 743/12	549/23 552/11 554/23	582/2 582/4 600/21	621/25 622/7 627/7
731/13 742/25 743/1	762/25 765/6 772/21	555/20 556/20 558/12	612/11 612/15 612/25	631/10 631/11 679/1
748/13 749/5 749/17	sincere [1] 585/9	559/18 560/13 560/14	614/21 615/4 615/5	689/2 694/5 701/21
749/19 775/16 780/8	single [5] 538/13	560/25 561/22 562/21	628/4 646/17 662/14	701/25 705/24 717/2
	570/15 722/11 726/20	562/25 563/1 564/3	666/21 741/16 745/12	718/4 718/23 719/9
shouldn't [2] 657/19	775/21	564/20 567/16 568/14	747/19 748/10	723/6 723/7 723/16
741/14	singular [1] 696/9	568/20 568/21 569/9	sole [3] 545/8 629/23	724/2 728/9 752/15
show [11] 547/11	sir [3] 574/5 574/20	570/11 570/14 572/20	661/23	sometimes [6] 564/15
576/11 577/5 610/23	693/18	576/1 578/25 580/20	Sole Arbitrator [1]	594/6 594/8 622/8
611/10 618/8 619/16	sit [5] 585/3 659/18	580/24 583/6 583/11	545/8	703/19 779/11
664/12 756/4 756/5	692/21 695/18 781/4	590/5 595/25 599/3	solely [3] 627/20	somewhat [3] 653/17
767/14	site [5] 577/7 577/11	599/7 600/22 606/14	647/20 692/17	672/2 756/22
showing [2] 576/13	578/2 578/2 578/8	606/21 608/7 609/19	solemnly [1] 585/7	somewhere [4]
724/14	sites [1] 578/19	610/11 611/16 611/16	solicited [1] 728/22	552/13 565/11 705/20
shown [4] 542/5	sits [2] 702/1 740/17	611/16 613/3 618/23	solution [2] 572/17	737/9
576/5 661/19 766/6	sitting [3] 701/11	619/9 620/16 625/8	732/13	son [1] 737/14
shows [7] 540/11	701/24 753/2	625/25 626/21 627/24	solve [2] 732/9 755/11	
583/9 647/15 663/7	situation [16] 567/22	628/10 629/10 629/15	solved [1] 767/9	sooner [1] 765/19
725/25 731/16 732/6	627/23 644/19 687/21	629/21 630/1 630/3	solving [1] 758/11	sophisticated [2]
Shrugged [1] 599/21	691/6 731/4 733/3	634/12 636/9 637/22	some [97] 533/9	678/25 679/5
siblings [1] 555/2	733/13 734/5 734/9	638/7 639/22 641/7	538/15 543/4 543/8	Soroca [9] 566/2
side [5] 696/5 716/25	734/16 734/23 738/2	641/15 643/5 645/2	545/22 553/5 553/9	566/6 566/23 567/10
765/18 776/12 778/8	743/13 744/12 780/9	645/5 645/21 646/3	554/18 563/2 568/12	567/12 568/15 579/1
sidelines [1] 562/1	situations [2] 704/3	646/19 647/18 647/23	573/15 578/9 580/15	583/7 584/9
sides [4] 541/18 638/1	731/5	648/20 651/17 652/15	582/21 591/21 593/20	sorry [8] 533/5 555/25
773/21 774/14	six [2] 555/2 564/9	654/7 656/24 657/3	594/2 598/12 600/4	560/1 574/5 680/6
siege [1] 732/10	size [3] 570/9 697/22	657/24 658/8 658/17	604/8 629/11 638/2	694/9 710/12 777/6
sign [2] 759/12 761/1	739/6	658/20 660/9 664/6	639/22 640/2 640/9	
signal [1] 765/17	sized [2] 571/24	664/17 666/5 666/13	640/22 640/23 641/5	sort [11] 553/1 571/23 673/6 692/25 704/15
signature [3] 760/6	571/24		641/16 641/19 642/14	706/16 733/5 735/7
760/9 777/5		670/7 670/25 671/17		741/25 747/22 748/4
signed [8] 722/17	sleep [3] 534/13 534/17 535/1	678/24 679/25 682/3 682/3 683/14 683/17	643/3 646/12 649/3 651/16 652/8 653/11	
723/25 757/21 759/13				sorts [1] 553/23
759/18 762/2 762/13	slept [1] 535/1	685/4 685/9 687/12	654/23 656/25 657/16	sought [2] 759/12
762/15	slide [25] 586/5	689/20 690/8 690/16	657/21 659/17 660/22	766/2
significant [11]	590/12 590/14 590/24	691/5 692/10 693/13	660/22 665/16 668/2	souls [1] 756/3
600/24 601/15 617/17	597/1 597/11 597/13	694/4 695/4 700/12	673/6 675/6 679/9	sound [1] 711/5
626/14 640/8 648/23	598/10 598/12 598/15	700/12 701/19 703/4	681/5 681/16 682/9	sounded [1] 637/5
704/5 709/20 728/5	600/12 601/17 618/19	704/1 704/15 706/5	688/12 689/8 690/16	source [13] 551/21
729/16 749/3	643/10 646/22 648/1	708/18 708/22 711/12	691/15 691/16 692/25	569/3 569/5 594/11
significantly [5]	650/8 653/1 654/19	711/18 713/2 713/14	693/5 693/12 695/19	620/2 633/12 634/7
570/18 643/8 645/6	656/1 657/15 660/19	718/22 718/25 719/4	696/16 697/12 697/23	653/3 655/17 657/19
656/18 667/9	666/23 769/21 769/22	719/4 719/18 721/5	698/4 706/5 706/9	668/25 670/15 670/16
silly [1] 775/15	slides [1] 591/13	725/9 725/22 725/23	709/19 713/6 714/6	sources [7] 620/5
SILVIA [1] 529/25	slight [1] 741/23	727/13 730/5 730/18	715/1 718/1 720/21	620/7 620/9 620/12
similar [3] 551/2	slighted [1] 719/14	731/24 733/3 734/5	726/9 733/19 734/15	624/1 633/15 653/7
567/17 676/15	slightly [6] 540/4	734/17 737/14 744/17	735/14 745/1 746/22	south [3] 647/11
similarly [1] 628/14	542/15 605/17 605/18	745/22 747/2 747/13	746/25 747/21 748/9	681/17 753/5
simple [12] 559/23	647/23 744/9	747/14 749/3 749/18	748/25 749/3 749/15	southeastern [1]
562/16 575/8 638/5	small [15] 547/9	751/2 751/3 752/23	750/23 750/24 753/4	715/1
682/5 720/24 744/13	549/22 549/23 563/20	753/13 757/4 757/15	756/1 757/6 759/10	Soviet [1] 569/12
746/9 775/13 775/17	571/19 571/22 571/24	758/1 768/3 768/10	769/15 777/19 777/24	sowing [8] 554/15
776/4 776/21	586/12 618/11 640/18	773/10 773/19 774/14	779/15 780/6 780/18	573/7 573/23 574/3
simplicity [3] 586/16	657/21 657/23 657/23	775/20 776/13 777/12	somebody [4] 562/22	574/12 574/17 575/16
622/16 628/16	705/17 755/7	779/2 779/11	684/4 687/4 749/8	575/22
		www.dianaburden.com	1	1

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

zbigniew Plotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 528-781
S	602/23 602/24 602/25	663/9 663/13 665/5	strive [1] 603/8	succinct [1] 640/1
sown [2] 553/11 668/5	603/3 630/5 631/6	665/13 665/23 666/4	strong [1] 765/17	such [19] 549/24
soya [5] 567/9 567/16	631/7 648/8 655/5	666/6 666/18 682/17	strongly [2] 579/12	567/19 580/24 581/2
	697/15 699/6 764/10	693/21 711/25 727/10	594/25	581/5 581/7 688/24
567/19 568/13 568/13	standards [2] 697/6	732/4 741/18 742/2	structure [16] 560/5	697/24 702/1 702/16
space [1] 570/15	713/6	751/7 751/14 751/16	598/6 599/20 600/1	705/19 733/11 757/9
speak [5] 539/15	stands [1] 704/4	states [3] 530/8 704/8		757/16 764/22 767/15
542/1 688/18 691/7	start [20] 533/11	709/5	630/4 631/18 670/15	769/14 770/24 773/6
774/9	585/18 586/15 606/11	STATESCU [1] 529/25		suddenly [1] 599/18
speaking [4] 662/16	615/20 632/18 638/15	statistics [5] 569/7	720/22 720/24 743/25	suffered [1] 705/9
716/12 757/5 779/4	638/23 639/14 640/15	595/2 619/25 620/3	structures [1] 684/8	sufficed [1] 764/25
speaks [2] 739/1	663/17 664/14 682/22	771/2	struggle [2] 654/2	sufficient [8] 540/22
746/1	691/24 709/15 719/21	stay [3] 534/11 636/10		613/11 624/25 652/24
special [2] 683/16	724/10 729/22 730/18	715/25	students [1] 554/14	686/11 687/16 687/16
732/22	738/13	staying [2] 541/17	studies [1] 566/4	694/18
specialised [2] 559/8		619/19		
699/2	started [8] 555/1		study [3] 559/7 559/8 597/8	sufficiently [6] 642/10
specialist [1] 637/5	616/16 664/25 724/14	Stefan [5] 686/10		642/21 692/12 693/1
specific [19] 593/1	730/19 736/7 752/23	688/1 692/18 738/25	stuff [1] 698/15	695/2 736/25
594/17 598/6 606/12	768/3	758/16	stupid [1] 680/7	sugar [3] 536/12
612/21 616/17 616/19	starting [3] 554/4	Stefan Voda [5]	style [2] 720/16 780/3	536/24 537/24
634/14 634/16 654/24	667/7 669/20	686/10 688/1 692/18	subject [8] 538/18	suggest [1] 672/7
678/19 678/23 702/10	STASIUNAITE [1]	738/25 758/16	539/21 653/18 676/23	suggested [2] 694/4
703/10 708/12 708/24	530/5	step [2] 555/15 631/1	720/1 721/8 722/14	733/2
714/14 714/15 740/20	state [36] 546/10	stepped [1] 690/14	775/1	suggestion [4] 638/14
specifically [7] 581/9	547/1 547/4 552/23	Steppes [1] 557/18	subjective [1] 632/2	647/10 692/20 754/1
647/2 662/6 662/16	566/5 566/5 566/22	steps [1] 602/21	submission [12]	suggestions [1]
712/17 714/18 736/16	567/18 616/25 656/5	stick [2] 655/11	532/18 532/19 602/11	646/24
specifics [4] 591/19	660/13 689/7 693/4	711/24	719/1 720/9 743/6	suggests [1] 657/17
684/5 712/24 713/2	721/10 722/13 729/12	still [22] 581/25 582/3	743/7 749/22 752/7	Suite [2] 529/10 530/7
	733/10 734/2 735/10	607/21 608/5 608/7	756/7 774/20 776/3	sum [6] 590/19 657/2
speculate [4] 636/7	735/11 735/13 735/22	615/13 619/12 621/7	submissions [9]	658/22 687/3 687/11
744/18 758/20 759/21	735/25 736/2 749/12	621/9 632/5 635/25	565/9 729/7 752/5	768/16
speculation [3]	752/12 753/5 756/6	641/2 644/21 660/3	774/6 774/7 775/16	summarise [5] 591/20
752/13 758/13 772/5	764/20 764/23 765/6	660/14 672/12 673/25	775/20 776/14 778/17	732/15 735/4 738/12
speculations [1]	765/7 765/14 770/20	684/17 740/5 743/24	submit [5] 537/25	762/9
709/23	772/1 772/4	748/13 763/20	579/15 606/7 748/9	summarised [1]
speculative [9]	State Chancellery [10]		751/11	766/10
681/24 702/15 702/22	733/10 734/2 735/10	597/21	submitted [9] 535/9	summary [1] 748/10
703/9 706/25 707/2	735/11 735/13 735/25	stock-listed [1]	539/9 544/13 545/14	summer [1] 668/3
709/19 710/23 712/14	736/2 765/6 765/7	593/18	602/2 657/17 669/25	summing [1] 590/20
speedy [1] 538/8	765/14	stolen [1] 749/2	745/5 748/1	sums [1] 776/18
spend [2] 545/19	stated [13] 589/12	stood [1] 726/25	subsequent [2]	Sunday [2] 681/2
673/2	589/18 621/20 628/2		723/16 730/11	681/3
spends [1] 673/18	669/6 722/8 722/19	stop [3] 632/11 704/24 727/21	subsequently [4]	sunflower [7] 567/9
spent [2] 704/1 750/4	752/10 752/19 756/21		545/5 609/17 609/25	567/16 567/18 574/19
spoke [1] 539/13	757/22 766/13 769/6	stored [1] 580/9		574/19 583/18 685/6
spot [1] 718/11		story [3] 629/19 753/8 754/21		
spread [1] 570/12	statement [34] 537/23 538/1 546/15 546/16		subsidiaries [1]	superior [1] 730/4
spring [1] 723/19		straight [2] 571/15	630/19	superseded [1] 629/12
Springs [2] 750/20	585/8 585/12 613/6	719/25	substance [1] 771/4	
772/25	620/22 621/17 622/22	straightaway [2]	substantial [2] 620/22	
sprinklers [1] 611/15	665/8 667/21 668/19	535/19 536/18	773/8	606/17
square [1] 549/24	669/7 674/10 677/9	straightforward [2]	substantiates [1]	supplementary [1]
SRL [9] 588/2 588/17	723/10 750/10 750/14	671/6 673/12	657/25	605/24
607/19 722/7 723/8	750/18 756/12 756/18	strange [8] 556/14	substantiation [1]	supply [2] 547/25
725/8 725/16 725/17	757/1 760/24 765/14	688/12 722/21 722/23	594/12	714/1
730/10	772/24 773/1 775/13	725/4 752/16 758/7	subtle [1] 779/11	support [6] 537/3
SRL's [1] 612/9	775/17 776/3 776/4	760/3	success [4] 704/17	537/10 687/16 727/10
stamp [1] 760/6	776/11 776/21 778/4	strategy [2] 691/1	720/25 739/8 740/10	753/9 758/11
stamped [1] 722/18	statement/submissio	758/6	successful [8] 554/24	supported [3] 667/8
	n [1] 776/3	street [3] 530/7	588/18 653/4 687/25	727/8 767/6
stand [9] 638/11 679/14 679/15 695/21	statements [27]	534/14 534/18	715/1 736/6 740/4	supportive [1] 769/13
	544/13 587/6 588/17	stretch [1] 637/22	742/7	suppose [2] 698/1
722/8 737/25 742/19	610/10 613/8 623/24	stretched [1] 767/23	successfully [1]	706/11
751/8 751/10	647/14 660/21 663/5	strike [1] 696/12	588/12	supposed [2] 653/16
standard [13] 597/14		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
	1		1	1

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
S	656/7 700/21 706/6	570/22 572/18 573/11	643/14 648/22 671/10	741/18
	706/14 707/25 716/10	573/21 575/5 576/5	722/9 732/5 739/10	their [44] 535/6 537/6
supposed [1] 658/3	733/19 738/23 742/7	576/6 578/13 653/6	739/12 760/23 761/4	554/14 581/9 587/5
supposition [4] 752/13 759/7 772/5	743/21 748/13 770/12	653/6 653/16 713/17	769/20	594/1 603/24 603/24
780/25	776/13	technology-based [1]	testing [3] 546/11	634/3 637/18 637/22
sure [20] 535/23	takes [8] 549/22 572/3	653/16	567/10 699/19	638/18 643/1 653/19
536/23 542/3 542/16	701/12 706/24 717/2	ted.gleason [1] 530/9	text [3] 629/19 776/25	653/20 670/24 679/11
545/18 545/21 609/1	734/5 742/21 772/2	television [1] 562/10	777/2	690/24 690/25 690/25
629/22 650/9 653/12	taking [12] 538/8	tell [18] 564/12 569/4	textbook [1] 628/22	712/4 720/13 720/15
678/13 685/22 698/9	572/1 572/1 582/22	572/7 606/12 616/13	than [58] 545/23	727/6 734/21 735/20
708/23 713/23 724/11	612/3 637/7 664/18 664/23 706/21 725/6	616/18 689/18 703/15 703/21 710/10 711/10	546/12 546/19 547/14 547/17 548/10 548/12	737/19 755/11 756/6 757/22 758/2 759/11
744/19 746/13 747/4	758/8 767/22	730/16 730/17 744/19	549/19 558/11 567/23	760/22 761/3 761/6
760/2	taking that [1] 767/22	745/3 746/3 753/8	570/18 593/22 595/2	762/7 765/18 766/15
surface [1] 556/8	talk [20] 541/13	780/16	600/15 603/11 613/19	767/20 770/7 770/22
surfaces [1] 549/23	545/21 546/6 563/12	telling [3] 703/13	617/21 623/9 625/5	770/23 771/10 773/22
surprised [2] 556/1	563/15 565/14 617/20	707/22 754/20	626/5 629/25 630/23	them [54] 539/15
653/17	659/13 659/14 680/23	tells [2] 642/21 711/13	643/22 644/8 653/4	549/20 553/13 554/17
surrounding [2] 734/25 757/20	721/14 721/21 724/3	template [1] 759/21	655/23 656/18 657/23	557/1 559/12 562/12
survey [1] 657/21	726/9 727/19 732/11	temporary [2] 766/4	667/7 667/10 673/20	562/17 562/25 567/25
suspensive [1]	735/10 742/10 750/2	766/5	673/21 680/11 688/5	576/1 576/15 578/5
765/20	750/14	ten [9] 606/13 616/4	691/9 691/15 695/1	580/5 593/12 593/20
system [5] 704/9	talked [7] 534/16	629/13 639/17 640/12	695/3 696/22 699/9	600/21 604/3 608/14
704/21 715/17 737/16	581/9 647/9 722/18	656/25 685/6 731/16	699/17 706/4 712/20	609/17 609/25 610/7
767/5	722/21 726/24 731/7	753/12	713/5 717/1 719/5	613/4 615/15 621/21
systems [1] 780/5	talking [13] 545/19 552/9 566/15 591/5	ten per cent [1] 731/16	721/2 725/3 731/2 731/5 741/3 741/4	623/25 626/4 641/6 642/25 643/2 653/18
Т	603/4 635/1 666/8	tendering [1] 537/4	746/12 754/2 762/15	665/24 675/12 675/14
-	666/10 676/4 680/5	term [8] 653/9 664/22	770/14 771/2 780/19	676/2 676/21 677/12
table [30] 533/18	688/21 688/21 710/24	665/17 665/18 665/19	thank [87] 533/23	678/3 701/23 712/5
533/21 551/13 551/16 551/18 551/19 551/20	talks [1] 604/16	666/9 666/13 666/13	535/17 540/24 541/4	729/8 749/16 751/9
567/7 569/1 569/2	tariffs [2] 569/3	terminate [2] 627/5	541/5 541/6 541/15	754/14 754/15 754/17
573/18 582/22 582/24	572/13	723/7	541/19 551/17 552/17	754/24 755/2 763/24
583/9 600/10 600/12	task [1] 697/2	terminated [1] 759/17	552/18 552/21 561/5	765/21 778/9 779/23
604/16 604/16 604/16	tasks [1] 683/23	termination [10]	565/6 568/24 579/20	781/1 781/4
604/21 607/8 625/25	taught [1] 553/22	722/17 722/22 723/4	584/15 585/10 585/15	themselves [5] 603/7
626/2 629/5 663/10	tax [4] 598/25 658/3	723/15 726/19 757/18	585/17 586/22 587/13	642/7 666/7 680/11
741/19 770/4 770/11	658/7 658/24	757/20 758/2 763/8	589/15 591/12 596/3	774/15
770/12 770/14	taxation [1] 581/6 taxes [5] 599/4 599/7	763/10 terminations [2]	598/24 601/25 602/14 602/16 603/18 604/7	then [81] 533/9 538/19 540/11 550/17
tables [2] 567/4 567/5	599/8 599/9 599/10	723/24 759/19	604/9 604/11 605/19	553/19 556/9 557/22
tabulated [1] 741/18	Tcaci [1] 634/1	terminology [3] 666/2		558/18 560/6 564/1
tail [1] 689/10	team [11] 534/5	676/4 713/21	624/9 625/13 632/11	564/8 564/10 564/23
tailored [1] 714/18 take [49] 536/17 538/5	542/13 554/11 587/2	terms [19] 574/25	632/12 632/17 633/2	565/14 566/17 566/24
538/8 543/5 555/16	593/9 607/15 613/18	575/8 608/22 641/8	635/5 635/19 639/14	574/18 594/7 599/4
567/3 568/17 568/22	613/21 613/22 613/23	645/6 666/16 671/6	659/3 659/20 679/17	599/18 629/2 630/3
569/1 579/18 579/19	616/22	671/14 673/2 687/10	680/3 680/14 687/19	631/11 631/11 631/16
583/11 583/17 584/21	teams [1] 613/21	704/23 736/12 740/24	693/17 693/19 696/22	632/14 634/17 636/21
591/5 592/6 615/1	tear [1] 654/13	741/2 743/1 750/7	712/1 712/7 715/7	638/16 638/17 641/16
617/6 617/14 618/9	tears [1] 737/13	751/19 779/12 780/20	715/8 715/11 715/22	646/15 647/22 650/17
628/13 629/5 630/22	technical [5] 573/10 600/3 604/13 755/18	terrific [4] 780/6 780/18 780/19 780/20	718/16 720/10 720/14 738/7 738/8 738/10	650/18 658/22 659/17 661/12 662/15 665/24
639/25 643/20 655/17	755/18	terrified [2] 737/6	743/4 743/8 748/19	666/13 666/17 667/12
664/13 679/1 681/16	technological [6]	737/7	752/2 752/3 752/5	676/13 676/21 677/24
704/7 704/10 705/11	569/12 572/16 573/20	Territorial [3] 764/20	772/8 772/9 773/20	681/18 681/23 685/3
706/9 719/5 721/25 728/23 733/22 742/13	575/11 578/14 713/7	765/5 765/13	775/11 775/21 776/1	685/7 688/3 688/4
743/6 748/17 750/13	technologically [2]	test [3] 547/13 644/2	778/25 780/11 780/12	690/14 693/25 700/3
750/18 757/3 762/22	678/25 679/5	671/9	780/12 780/15 781/1	701/7 709/16 710/18
767/23 770/18 771/16	technologies [4]	testified [7] 592/22	781/8 781/12	717/25 718/14 719/24
774/13 779/16	564/8 569/11 572/15	691/18 753/18 755/14	thanks [3] 720/13	722/1 723/15 723/25
taken [23] 538/14	575/1	756/25 759/23 770/22	720/18 779/3	727/5 730/1 730/15
577/10 578/4 582/12	technology [18]	testifies [1] 756/11	that [1336]	731/6 733/22 740/22 740/23 741/25 742/10
611/25 614/21 615/7	558/17 558/18 560/25 564/22 569/7 569/13	testifying [1] 609/23 testimony [11] 580/11	that in [1] 608/8	740/23 741/25 742/10 745/11 745/12 754/13
617/8 649/3 655/25	007/22 008/1008/10			170/11/170/12/04/10
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

· 3 · · · · · · · · · ·	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 528-781
Т	747/16 750/4 750/15	778/17 780/18	603/7 607/20 608/11	770/19 771/4
	751/14 751/20 753/25	thickening [1] 756/4	609/8 609/12 609/21	tightly [1] 778/1
then [5] 754/17	755/15 757/3 757/23	thing [10] 540/4 576/7		time [95] 539/4 539/12
759/18 768/8 775/20 778/9	758/22 759/18 760/6	637/10 647/7 676/5	615/9 620/9 620/12	539/15 539/24 540/1
THEODORE [1] 530/3	772/14 779/22 779/24	698/16 704/12 711/21	621/22 623/13 623/22	540/3 540/22 541/17
theories [1] 691/9	these separate [1]	773/13 779/15	626/10 628/19 635/8	544/23 545/14 545/19
theory [2] 614/21	698/12	things [14] 553/23	641/22 642/19 642/23	555/8 568/21 571/9
703/19	they [171] 535/24	556/9 563/2 582/9	647/13 650/2 650/19	580/18 584/18 595/20
there [278]	536/3 539/16 539/16	641/20 651/18 652/2	651/1 651/1 651/6	601/9 601/13 604/7
there and [1] 664/24	542/24 543/1 544/7	682/4 704/2 754/3	652/13 652/16 653/13	606/4 615/14 617/7
There's [1] 626/11	553/22 554/19 555/18	770/17 779/22 779/25	654/17 654/18 655/9	618/10 622/14 626/9
therefore [19] 536/15	555/19 555/21 557/7	780/6	655/11 657/4 660/20	626/9 627/6 628/4
539/10 641/5 641/13	558/2 560/22 562/17	think [104] 534/15	661/7 663/9 663/13	632/5 632/24 637/15
643/21 645/4 649/1	566/7 569/7 574/16	539/19 541/18 548/1	668/15 669/2 671/22	637/20 637/20 638/2
651/3 652/12 655/17	575/9 575/10 575/13	551/18 552/19 561/1	678/7 678/11 683/10	638/10 639/22 641/19
656/23 657/5 672/9	576/1 576/6 576/8	561/15 562/3 565/10	687/9 693/7 693/8	646/12 646/13 650/3
673/11 676/24 693/11	576/14 576/22 577/7	571/11 573/15 576/23	693/10 693/10 693/13	650/7 656/21 656/23
753/8 763/3 764/6	577/10 577/11 577/13	579/5 582/12 584/16	696/9 700/2 700/7	657/7 664/21 668/2
	578/8 578/24 580/8	585/11 588/19 593/5	701/4 701/8 701/12	668/13 669/8 671/2
thereof [1] 765/25 these [148] 535/25	581/10 581/10 581/11	594/15 595/9 595/10	701/19 708/3 714/16	674/23 679/11 680/22
541/14 541/16 542/21	581/20 581/21 582/8	597/3 597/5 601/23	722/14 727/20 736/24	682/7 690/14 697/23
544/12 544/19 544/21	582/9 584/2 588/25	614/17 615/10 615/17	741/22 749/4 749/6	699/8 701/11 701/13
551/6 551/8 551/23	589/5 597/20 598/4	618/19 618/22 631/22	749/14 751/1 751/2	701/20 702/1 704/2
551/24 551/25 552/12	605/18 607/17 608/3	632/13 634/25 637/22	751/4 751/15 751/16	713/16 714/20 717/3
558/8 558/25 559/9	608/6 608/6 609/13	637/22 638/1 644/16	751/21 751/25 753/17	717/4 717/6 719/20
559/10 560/9 560/20	609/15 610/7 613/2	645/9 648/10 648/10	754/12 759/12 766/11	720/3 720/11 720/15
562/14 564/2 564/6	615/3 615/5 615/5	652/19 654/16 659/4	774/8 778/11 780/6	729/10 729/24 732/9
564/7 564/23 564/25	615/15 615/16 620/12	666/15 670/10 675/1	though [8] 550/23	733/14 733/19 734/4
566/8 566/11 567/4	621/2 621/7 623/14	675/5 675/13 676/22	579/14 595/6 622/24	734/15 737/6 738/14
567/6 567/13 568/2	623/14 623/24 626/21	681/6 685/10 687/1	670/19 686/16 751/17	738/23 741/8 746/2
568/9 569/10 574/23	629/17 630/15 640/6	687/20 688/6 688/13	765/10	754/5 755/12 758/3
574/24 576/20 577/12	641/14 642/6 642/21	688/18 688/19 689/22	thought [3] 591/2	758/23 758/25 765/1
579/24 580/9 582/7	642/24 643/2 644/9	689/23 692/11 692/15	610/16 697/24	765/15 768/9 776/20
579/24 580/9 582/7	644/16 644/25 645/11	693/1 693/2 695/17	thoughts [1] 716/7	777/21 777/22 778/15
596/23 597/23 598/2	645/12 650/15 650/20	695/18 696/8 698/19	threat [2] 713/15	time-sensitive [1]
598/5 600/10 602/3	651/8 651/15 651/17	699/6 702/24 704/13	773/5	734/4
605/15 608/5 608/7	652/14 652/15 653/21	705/5 705/7 705/12	threatened [3] 727/3	times [8] 591/25 592/2
609/19 614/8 618/21	654/4 655/9 655/10	706/22 706/23 707/20	732/11 737/7	622/5 639/17 648/21
621/14 622/19 623/7	656/23 656/24 657/1	712/2 712/23 713/11	threats [1] 773/3	750/4 757/13 776/16
624/1 631/25 633/6	657/3 657/6 661/8	713/19 713/21 714/23	three [34] 545/9	timetable [2] 532/20
633/10 633/14 633/23	661/9 661/11 661/12	714/24 715/23 716/3	563/21 564/2 564/5	774/17
636/17 636/24 637/2	661/13 671/7 671/8	719/16 739/9 739/12	570/13 571/23 574/15	timing [5] 536/16
640/9 641/2 641/4	671/14 676/12 676/13	741/7 742/14 748/19	575/15 575/21 579/24	723/18 736/5 750/16
641/8 641/10 641/13	676/15 676/24 677/1	750/21 754/10 758/21	636/6 636/18 636/25	774/20
641/20 641/21 642/3	677/12 677/13 677/14	776/3 776/14 776/17	639/16 640/11 640/13	timings [1] 718/5
645/18 651/14 658/17	677/15 677/17 677/18	776/19 776/21 777/3	642/4 643/20 645/20	title [1] 608/22
662/15 668/8 669/9	678/2 678/14 678/16	777/8 778/10 778/23	698/18 699/25 700/2	titles [1] 533/13
669/14 671/17 676/8	687/7 690/25 691/17	779/17	700/23 701/16 716/18	tobacco [1] 555/1
676/12 676/14 676/20	692/5 692/9 699/17	thinking [6] 570/16	721/25 722/10 733/3	today [19] 534/16
676/23 677/5 677/11	699/18 709/14 709/18	708/7 716/10 717/10	733/4 733/8 739/13	556/11 570/3 571/2
677/23 680/6 682/4	709/24 719/11 720/11	746/15 779/24	753/17 770/17 770/18	585/18 590/9 591/22
682/18 684/15 684/17	721/3 722/9 722/23	third [11] 612/11	threshing [1] 573/8	628/8 642/14 678/10
685/9 688/3 698/12	725/18 725/25 728/5	620/18 639/21 721/11	thrilled [1] 640/12	684/17 718/20 718/23
705/18 708/19 709/4	728/9 728/14 730/16	723/8 723/22 725/20	through [15] 605/13	740/19 743/13 744/2
709/23 711/16 715/3	730/18 734/1 736/24	726/23 729/1 732/24	611/13 630/19 654/16	744/22 745/6 775/2
716/18 721/11 722/7	742/6 744/16 746/11	771/6	655/19 697/21 706/23	today's [3] 687/10
722/21 723/4 724/20	749/21 751/8 751/10	thoroughly [1] 697/14		713/6 769/21
724/25 725/5 725/7	755/8 757/9 757/24	those [100] 533/14	736/24 741/24 747/13	TODD [1] 530/3
725/13 725/15 725/18	759/2 759/13 760/2	533/15 535/18 538/25	766/20 779/9	todd.wells [1] 530/9
725/23 726/2 726/2	763/15 763/17 763/23	544/4 554/18 573/24	throughout [4] 630/6	together [16] 546/2
726/12 726/13 726/14	768/20 769/6 770/2	578/6 579/15 581/4	648/5 648/14 671/17	555/2 616/21 620/15
727/8 729/6 731/1	770/3 770/24 771/7	582/2 583/11 586/24	throw [1] 580/3	621/24 630/16 631/14
731/10 733/4 733/5	771/8 771/10 772/10	593/13 596/9 596/25	thrown [1] 560/14	652/14 659/18 680/10
746/11 746/13 747/7	772/15 774/1 778/13	597/15 597/18 597/21	Thus [4] 536/2 723/23	684/2 692/24 696/21
140/11/40/13/4///			-	
1	1	www.dianaburden.com	1	1

ICSID ARB 16 8	v
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

Zbigniew Plotr Grot et al		Revised		Pages 528-781
Т	660/24 660/25 661/2	tries [1] 656/15	U	652/14 653/3 653/6
together [3] 696/22	transient [1] 620/5	triggered [1] 765/8	UK [1] 704/7	653/11 653/24 654/14
697/17 714/20	transitioned [1]	triggers [1] 765/11	Ukraine [1] 597/25	654/17 658/14 662/5
	557/21	trouble [2] 706/19		667/5 669/10 673/24
told [15] 556/22	translated [3] 535/12	776/20	ultimate [1] 655/24	695/9 695/10 699/7
558/22 565/9 573/25	562/6 562/25	truck [1] 611/16	ultimately [6] 679/6	705/9 706/20 711/4
574/24 611/22 625/16	translation [9] 535/5	truck-lift [1] 611/16	724/21 735/11 735/14	738/15 741/1 747/11
631/20 635/23 665/16	535/6 535/11 537/2	true [14] 537/25 544/5	735/25 736/9	753/16 773/14
665/19 703/8 756/14	549/10 559/18 559/22	544/6 544/24 556/13	unable [2] 673/10	understanding [7]
759/15 768/8	560/1 562/3	565/5 583/12 595/6	673/11	549/1 649/10 668/1
tolerance [2] 541/16	translations [1]	628/6 628/8 662/2	unacceptable [1]	681/14 691/4 740/21
720/17	541/21	664/20 676/8 713/3	726/15	748/6
tolerant [1] 720/16	transparency [4]	truly [7] 702/22 705/4	unanimous [2] 702/13	understands [1]
tonight [1] 637/20	534/24 671/13 671/18	716/14 740/14 742/15	702/13	744/3
tons [9] 560/9 594/5	748/7	753/16 769/18	uncertain [1] 702/16	understate [1] 703/3
645/13 645/14 645/14	transparent [3] 534/2	trust [2] 739/21 755/8	uncertainties [1]	understatement [1]
666/20 667/13 667/15	534/7 671/6	trusting [1] 742/16	701/1	601/22
668/25	transpired [1] 753/17	truth [1] 658/5	uncertainty [11]	understood [11]
too [14] 589/23 590/1			636/12 682/10 682/19	
619/14 619/15 659/12	travelling [1] 587/2	try [11] 639/25 640/2	683/21 683/24 685/4	536/9 562/18 566/16
661/16 700/14 702/15	travels [1] 781/8	640/9 649/2 680/19	685/10 685/12 685/25	576/10 576/13 582/6
702/22 703/9 707/1	treasury [2] 657/10	686/15 692/24 695/22	726/15 748/24	632/25 671/10 679/17
710/12 710/22 744/4	657/11	710/17 736/20 753/13	unclear [3] 614/14	689/2 710/13
took [15] 550/15	treated [2] 778/14	trying [16] 553/15	769/18 769/25	undertaking [1]
552/6 559/16 566/21	778/19	571/13 576/9 581/18	uncontested [1]	629/15
566/24 567/19 589/23	treaty [4] 688/10	582/10 614/6 648/20	751/12	underwent [1] 565/24
592/16 594/13 611/21	688/11 728/2 743/2	648/22 649/25 690/3	uncontradicted [2]	undisclosed [1] 655/3
614/18 628/16 681/8	tremendous [2]	691/11 705/6 706/15	751/8 751/10	unduly [1] 767/17
721/15 735/25	704/17 715/16	744/10 754/14 754/23	uncontroverted [1]	unenforceability [1]
tool [1] 623/18	trend [1] 538/1	turn [18] 536/4 544/18	731/21	762/4
tools [1] 575/18	tribunal [80] 528/14	546/7 548/15 551/13	under [32] 538/16	unforeseen [1] 541/17
top [3] 716/14 745/4	529/2 529/18 529/19	588/3 589/16 598/11	548/6 549/24 564/23	unfortunate [2]
745/15	532/4 532/10 532/16	607/8 607/11 607/13	564/25 579/19 581/15	690/20 696/12
total [7] 537/6 570/11	533/9 538/6 540/9	654/20 725/9 740/13	599/11 607/21 639/23	unfortunately [8]
572/5 574/9 574/22	541/19 543/20 552/19	751/4 751/20 760/15	640/8 641/3 662/8	534/3 534/10 540/14
629/9 707/13	552/20 553/24 571/5	770/7	674/22 675/1 682/18	651/1 721/7 744/12
totality [3] 707/12	571/11 579/13 585/3	turned [2] 739/14	683/15 708/15 721/12	747/4 748/22
716/17 779/8	591/1 601/6 601/11	768/10	732/10 732/10 736/18	unhappy [1] 759/11
touch [1] 746/14	605/23 606/5 631/25	turning [1] 731/10	738/1 739/4 743/1	unique [1] 678/18
touched [2] 743/13	632/14 632/25 633/18	two [55] 540/7 555/6	755/6 760/10 763/19	United [3] 529/6 530/8
750/4	635/20 637/23 639/5	563/21 564/2 564/5	764/4 765/11 766/23	704/8
track [1] 714/25	654/16 656/20 676/6	564/6 566/11 566/23	767/13	United States [1]
tractors [2] 575/16	678/10 680/18 702/12	568/20 573/22 573/24	under-evaluated [1]	704/8
607/18	702/17 702/20 702/21	575/16 575/22 580/18	548/6	university [3] 552/23
trade [2] 628/22	703/8 707/1 707/4	582/7 586/1 593/10	underlined [1] 602/11	554/11 555/5
628/23	710/8 711/2 715/17	597/15 598/13 604/1	underlying [2] 570/25	unlawful [1] 765/16
traders [1] 593/21	717/19 718/2 719/9	612/24 622/4 630/15	592/13	unlawfully [1] 738/23
trades [1] 600/15	719/18 720/15 724/12	634/10 640/20 641/1	underreporting [9]	Unless [1] 661/9
trading [1] 651/17	725/11 729/7 729/10	643/20 645/2 646/4	536/25 537/5 537/11	unlike [1] 757/22
	731/7 732/6 736/1	647/19 653/7 657/4	536/25 537/5 537/11	unlikely [1] 538/13
traditional [3] 569/11 573/19 704/11	738/11 738/18 741/1	659/15 659/18 680/13	658/1 771/3 771/5	unpredictability [1]
	742/1 744/3 747/12	687/6 690/22 695/15		712/22
training [1] 554/17	749/5 752/8 752/11	696/10 696/12 696/21	underscore [2]	unqualified [1] 722/20
transaction [2] 603/6	752/20 754/23 769/15	698/18 701/15 710/21	622/12 632/3	unrealistically [1]
611/5	771/16 772/7 772/23	719/7 724/15 725/10	understand [56]	692/17
transactions [1]	774/25 775/3 775/8	734/9 740/14 741/1	539/18 541/15 541/22	unregistered [1]
743/23	775/18 775/25 778/12	749/18 750/7 757/13	542/4 543/19 544/21	761/23
transcript [2] 537/1	779/3	765/23 770/18	550/2 558/25 566/15	unrelated [1] 579/16
754/4	Tribunal's [7] 582/16	two that [1] 540/7	566/19 568/10 573/13	unreliable [3] 634/24
transfer [7] 587/23	591/13 722/15 751/4	type [4] 575/10 577/7	573/16 574/2 574/20	662/2 662/11
603/6 661/18 662/4	751/20 755/1 774/21	577/11 698/16	574/21 576/18 577/1	unsold [1] 581/1
662/7 662/17 745/19	tribunals [3] 709/25	types [4] 571/24	581/21 603/18 605/23	unsuccessful [1]
transferred [5] 569/22	710/3 710/5	577/12 586/1 704/18	606/3 612/23 615/17	748/14
588/1 744/25 745/24	tried [3] 639/23	typical [1] 736/14	616/2 621/6 624/3	unsuitable [1] 769/1
746/16	735/13 765/20	-Jhion [1] 100/14	624/9 629/11 630/13	unthought [1] 739/14
transfers [4] 660/22	100/10/100/20		643/14 646/11 652/11	
		www.dianaburdan.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	Wo
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	R

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

Loiginew i loti Giot et di		Revised		Fages 520-701
U	702/20 703/15 705/3	675/16 675/17 676/17	689/5 689/19 689/19	582/14 582/17 583/15
until [16] 560/8 592/8	707/2 707/5 707/7	677/8 699/7 709/8	691/19 691/22 694/10	584/15 584/17 590/4
603/13 612/5 631/16	707/22 710/6 710/18	773/21 779/20	694/14 696/11 697/15	590/4 593/1 593/17
635/23 661/8 664/15	710/25 711/10 711/13	useless [1] 635/1	697/23 699/1 701/3	600/3 601/6 603/25
	711/14 711/15 715/21	uses [9] 548/25 549/3	701/5 701/20 703/22	609/23 610/24 612/2
681/2 681/3 690/15 702/1 725/18 730/20	716/11 716/21 716/23	549/11 549/16 594/6	703/22 705/8 705/16	615/18 615/24 618/24
	719/17 720/14 738/13	594/8 601/19 646/1	705/17 709/16 710/23	621/12 627/3 627/4
736/10 770/21	739/9 739/11 740/8	654/10	710/24 738/14 740/19	629/1 631/5 632/2
until December 2010	740/14 740/18 747/6	using [19] 540/14	747/20 759/7 760/12	633/18 634/14 634/15
[1] 730/20	748/3 749/9 750/6	566/8 582/25 593/17	valued [3] 594/18	634/15 635/21 637/6
unusual [7] 687/21	751/25 754/20 758/7	596/1 600/18 612/20	673/25 674/7	637/6 644/18 647/1
696/19 696/21 708/5	760/4 769/23 772/14	617/3 621/21 621/25	values [3] 650/12	649/18 650/15 653/17
722/23 731/4 755/24	773/16 779/10 781/7	622/4 649/16 651/7	650/16 650/19	657/20 659/3 666/5
unworkable [1]	781/7	651/9 651/11 652/16	valuing [3] 687/2	668/20 673/12 673/15
740/19	US-based [2] 658/16	696/9 701/5 720/4	703/7 713/12	679/17 680/14 682/24
up [54] 559/10 560/9	658/17	usual [1] 704/18	vanished [1] 691/16	682/25 686/10 687/21
561/1 567/19 569/19	USA [1] 749/20	usually [4] 600/16	variable [3] 589/21	688/12 689/8 689/9
572/16 580/13 580/14	usable [2] 621/23	603/11 613/20 626/25	590/4 600/6	689/14 690/25 691/6
582/16 582/18 582/24	676/24	utilised [1] 702/16	variables [3] 570/9	694/17 694/24 696/6
586/15 590/20 600/13			589/18 719/14	
604/21 611/9 618/23	USD [22] 565/24 566/1 569/19 569/24	utmost [1] 593/5		696/13 696/24 699/7 704/5 708/5 709/8
620/16 626/4 633/6		V	variance [1] 712/22	
634/10 638/11 645/9	571/17 572/2 572/4		variant [1] 703/6	710/16 711/11 712/1
657/16 661/17 676/2	572/6 573/3 586/10	v.pernt [1] 531/9	variation [1] 705/11	714/24 715/2 715/8
682/1 682/1 684/9	590/21 640/23 649/20	VALERIU [2] 530/14	variety [1] 597/17	715/12 715/15 715/19
688/15 689/3 689/16	650/13 651/10 651/11	728/20	various [10] 547/21	716/7 716/19 716/20
692/24 694/10 695/15	651/12 657/9 657/10	valid [4] 635/25	553/11 642/20 651/18	717/15 718/25 720/18
698/25 700/1 700/22	694/16 699/22 769/19	636/18 723/7 761/23	708/13 712/24 726/24	722/12 722/24 723/18
700/23 704/19 705/18	use [40] 546/8 548/24	validate [1] 761/25	773/6 778/16 779/12	725/6 729/6 731/21
716/3 716/4 720/1	549/7 549/12 549/17	validated [2] 633/4	Varvareuca [7] 578/20	
720/2 728/20 735/25	550/23 555/18 564/22	740/15	579/24 589/14 728/18	736/1 739/7 739/11
740/15 754/22 756/13	569/11 572/16 576/7	validation [1] 647/8	757/21 762/12 763/9	740/7 744/4 746/24
768/16 770/18 771/18	596/22 603/15 622/19	validity [1] 761/22	vastly [1] 690/9	750/3 750/5 752/3
776/16	623/18 625/8 627/11	validly [1] 731/14	Veaceslav [2] 750/10	752/3 753/6 755/7
updated [8] 535/6	628/2 630/13 635/24	valuable [2] 704/12	750/14	757/1 768/21 769/4
590/9 616/3 628/7	638/4 643/2 645/24	742/18	vegetable [1] 560/21	769/23 772/9 773/7
639/20 652/17 666/18	648/9 648/16 649/25	valuation [38] 586/8	vehicles [5] 573/1	773/16 773/17 773/17
692/8	664/22 666/25 676/21	589/10 589/11 592/2	587/20 604/17 633/5	773/18 773/20 775/20
updates [1] 591/14	679/10 685/22 686/17	592/8 592/9 592/24	634/8	776/1 777/20 777/22
upheld [1] 742/25	700/21 702/2 702/4	594/10 594/16 597/6	vein [1] 692/4	777/25 778/25 779/6
uphold [1] 728/2	703/15 705/14 707/2	597/8 601/15 602/22	venture [1] 688/9	779/7 779/17 780/23
	709/25 767/19	603/1 612/19 612/21	ventures [1] 687/25	781/8 781/9 781/12
upon [17] 534/9 538/16 541/4 585/7	used [61] 533/21	612/22 615/8 617/2	verify [2] 624/25	Vice [3] 723/13 728/13
586/3 594/1 594/22	547/21 551/6 558/19	623/12 627/1 631/3	633/19	756/22
595/7 617/4 627/21	560/5 560/8 560/10	631/15 632/5 635/7	verifying [1] 587/3	Vice-Minister [1]
636/5 642/19 647/2	560/22 560/25 563/11	663/25 664/3 664/10	versed [2] 688/24	756/22
	564/1 564/7 570/22	674/3 682/25 687/4	695/6	Vice-President and [1
658/3 678/4 681/13	575/19 576/17 576/22	687/5 689/9 703/19	version [7] 535/6	728/13
770/7	577/6 577/6 578/18	712/23 717/23 741/4	543/7 546/9 556/6	VICTORIA [1] 531/4
urgency [2] 733/12	582/22 583/6 591/25	747/15	619/4 628/7 639/22	video [4] 536/8 536/20
736/13	592/1 594/24 595/13	valuations [4] 622/4	versions [1] 724/15	536/21 537/1
Ursu [1] 750/10	595/15 595/16 595/21	632/3 683/8 683/22	versus [5] 645/14	VIENNA [7] 528/20
us [81] 533/7 539/9	596/10 596/25 602/25	value [65] 582/1 586/1		531/7 533/5 541/17
547/13 548/1 563/1	612/21 613/13 614/9	586/2 597/6 602/23	749/16	545/20 584/18 715/25
569/4 572/7 572/23	615/16 620/1 620/1	602/23 602/25 602/25	very [154] 533/6	view [17] 548/8
573/3 573/25 575/3	620/10 620/12 620/21	603/2 603/3 603/10	533/23 535/17 539/2	566/21 567/1 574/1
578/14 582/8 585/18	621/12 622/16 624/14	603/14 608/6 614/20	541/9 541/15 541/18	587/5 609/11 612/13
618/8 619/16 620/2	629/7 644/6 651/3	615/19 627/7 630/6	544/18 549/23 551/13	615/21 640/15 686/24
623/15 625/16 658/16	651/23 652/4 652/8	630/25 631/6 631/6	552/17 553/1 554/10	699/14 700/16 702/9
658/17 658/23 659/1	653/9 655/24 687/24	631/7 631/8 636/11	554/17 554/18 554/21	702/13 711/9 714/13
672/22 684/6 684/9	694/4 709/6 710/7	636/15 641/17 641/19	555/17 555/20 556/8	733/16
685/5 688/16 689/15	713/21 714/4 724/16	642/3 648/20 655/16	556/15 558/10 558/15	viewing [1] 538/16
689/18 689/22 690/8	725/18 726/3 771/8	656/22 657/7 674/1	561/2 561/5 562/16	views [2] 712/13
691/5 691/13 691/19	useful [12] 623/18	678/22 683/1 683/4	565/6 568/24 570/10	717/15
691/22 692/23 695/15	626/9 675/6 675/13	684/10 687/9 689/2	571/19 571/25 575/16	village [6] 560/13
695/24 696/22 701/6	02013 01310 013/13	55-1 10 001/0 000/Z	571/18 571/25 575/10	vinage [0] 000/10
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		13 December 201 Pages 528-78
v	717/12 717/13 717/14	688/19 695/14 696/6	752/24 757/8 757/23	581/1 582/15 611/1
	717/15 717/25 718/7	711/11 712/12 721/7	757/24 759/2 759/10	611/21 615/4 619/16
village [5] 724/16	718/10 718/12 719/20	723/13 728/12 728/17	760/1 760/24 762/12	621/8 624/12 633/12
729/1 729/3 756/2	720/5 727/21 729/9	730/18 730/22 732/3	762/13 762/15 764/8	635/25 636/17 641/8
760/15	735/16 738/13 744/17	734/16 736/1 736/11	766/10 766/14 770/22	642/9 656/6 664/24
villagers [10] 753/21 753/24 755/10 757/24	754/15 759/20 776/6	752/22 775/2 781/2	770/24 772/15	669/4 675/10 676/14
	776/19 777/23 778/5	WELLS [2] 530/3	weren't [1] 746/14	687/15 688/10 689/16
758/1 758/10 759/11 759/12 760/4 763/9	779/16 779/20	530/6	western [1] 558/2	689/18 691/13 691/20
	wanted [7] 534/6	went [6] 560/12	what [258]	693/9 693/10 693/11
villages [3] 727/22 753/18 755/7	587/16 611/20 628/9	578/25 605/13 689/3	whatever [5] 572/11	700/5 701/20 701/21
Ville [1] 529/10	737/13 742/17 774/9	727/6 759/13	627/11 700/3 700/8	703/6 729/17 731/8
violated [1] 766/3	wants [4] 557/9	were [174] 536/2	748/12	743/9 749/15 752/11
violation [2] 597/12	557/10 712/12 778/12	542/5 542/6 543/5	wheat [15] 566/13	752/16 752/18 761/6
700/5	was [414]	551/20 552/9 553/4	567/9 567/16 573/18	772/4 772/10 774/9
violent [1] 737/7	was February 2011 [1]	553/7 553/8 553/9	573/20 574/18 574/18	775/16
VIOREL [1] 531/16	589/12	553/11 553/12 553/16	645/12 645/13 646/13	which [188] 535/14
vis [2] 707/21 707/21	wasn't [10] 652/1	554/17 555/13 557/24	666/21 667/9 667/15	535/22 536/2 536/8
vis-à-vis [1] 707/21	673/14 697/10 721/6	560/10 560/14 560/23	667/25 668/25	536/19 542/5 542/6
visible [1] 568/11	735/20 737/10 737/17	562/16 565/9 566/3	when [76] 545/20	543/5 544/2 544/4
visit [3] 578/19 584/19	739/20 746/23 750/9	566/5 566/13 571/4	547/8 547/24 553/4	544/7 544/20 547/16
690/4	waste [2] 560/21	572/25 573/25 574/24	554/25 555/2 555/23	547/17 549/6 549/6
visited [5] 561/21	632/24	575/4 575/15 576/7	556/2 557/20 560/10	551/20 557/11 558/8
562/11 607/16 613/16	water [4] 547/25	577/7 577/10 577/11	563/12 565/15 566/12	560/22 564/1 565/2
771/8	560/16 560/17 560/18	577/12 578/8 578/24	574/17 575/4 576/20	565/16 565/17 569/6
Visoca [23] 546/7	way [35] 555/14	579/6 580/7 583/1	580/13 581/14 583/13	572/15 573/2 578/24
548/1 548/2 548/4	558/25 560/4 563/25	583/4 583/14 586/6	583/15 583/21 583/21	578/25 581/4 583/19
548/23 549/6 549/12	564/1 635/8 646/8	586/8 586/24 602/2	591/5 592/24 595/13	586/14 587/7 587/10
549/17 549/19 549/22	650/20 657/25 695/22	607/20 609/2 611/21	596/23 600/9 604/14	587/23 588/14 588/20
550/2 550/18 550/23	704/21 706/12 706/12	611/22 612/9 612/25	604/20 605/12 613/1	589/11 591/10 591/11
558/11 566/22 567/18	706/20 708/21 708/24	613/2 617/7 618/3	614/21 614/25 615/1	591/14 592/1 592/9
567/20 568/5 568/15	710/17 711/10 711/14	621/21 627/8 628/21	616/13 616/16 620/16	592/17 593/18 594/11
579/1 583/8 584/13	712/4 720/4 726/12	631/20 632/19 633/3	623/12 623/22 629/13	595/3 595/16 597/18
770/20	747/6 747/13 748/4	633/20 633/23 634/3	643/5 645/9 646/2	598/21 599/4 599/7
Vlad [1] 536/22	758/21 764/13 766/12	635/23 635/25 636/18	646/16 646/17 653/14	600/14 600/15 600/16
Voda [5] 686/10 688/1	779/5 779/7 779/22	636/19 640/24 641/11	653/18 661/21 662/18	601/21 603/6 603/13
692/18 738/25 758/16	779/24 780/4 780/5	641/16 641/18 641/22	663/17 665/8 667/24	607/9 607/11 607/14
volatility [2] 713/8	781/5	644/25 645/12 645/19	678/20 680/22 682/14	608/5 608/19 608/20
713/25	ways [5] 642/24	650/2 650/6 655/9	689/3 691/18 713/3	612/4 612/19 612/20
volume [1] 633/20	688/12 695/25 711/17	655/10 658/22 663/6	727/14 728/7 728/19	613/13 617/12 617/22
voluminous [1] 634/6	726/24	665/15 665/16 665/18	729/4 732/7 734/2	619/12 620/1 620/12
volunteers [1] 759/1	WC1R [1] 529/6	666/21 667/15 668/12		
Volvo [1] 611/16	we [570]	669/12 670/19 670/20	743/20 750/2 750/16	625/15 628/6 628/6
	we can [1] 604/25	671/2 671/5 671/22	757/11 762/1 763/20	629/1 630/4 630/6
W	wear [1] 654/13	672/11 674/25 676/15	768/12 768/20 774/22	630/16 630/18 632/2
WACC [5] 629/6	Wednesday [2]	680/24 682/8 684/16	where [43] 542/24	633/8 637/1 646/8
630/10 632/1 655/22	528/21 533/1	684/17 690/6 691/15	551/3 552/13 557/19	646/17 651/8 651/25
656/13	week [1] 777/10	692/2 692/6 692/23	559/5 563/20 567/4	654/14 657/10 657/13
WACCs [1] 682/4	weeks [1] 616/15	698/6 699/22 700/7 700/17 702/4 714/5	567/4 567/24 580/8	667/9 667/18 674/5
walk [2] 639/1 687/7	weight [1] 538/24		588/18 592/11 596/6	681/19 681/20 682/13 682/25 686/25 687/2
walked [1] 766/20	weighted [3] 591/2	714/14 719/7 719/11	596/7 597/23 602/10	
want [63] 534/1	602/19 603/16	719/14 719/15 721/9 721/11 722/14 722/17	604/3 607/17 608/4	687/23 688/4 688/6 689/2 691/15 691/16
541/20 542/24 544/20	welcome [5] 585/1		608/8 618/8 619/17	
545/25 549/9 552/11	585/10 639/3 639/4	722/23 723/4 723/24	625/6 632/10 646/19	691/17 696/14 697/5
561/25 566/19 581/21	715/25	723/25 724/7 724/15	652/7 656/11 663/7	697/9 697/18 698/17
588/3 593/24 601/14	welcoming [1] 720/14	725/12 725/15 725/18	685/11 685/14 691/3	698/18 699/13 699/23
605/1 609/23 610/22	well [44] 533/9 534/11 534/12 535/4 554/19	725/20 725/23 726/1 726/3 727/15 727/18	706/8 706/24 707/18 708/4 708/17 709/15	700/9 702/12 702/12 702/25 704/4 704/10
631/2 633/18 634/11	534/12 535/4 554/19 555/21 556/15 558/16	728/11 729/17 730/18	712/21 716/13 740/12	702/25 704/4 704/10 704/20 704/22 705/12
637/19 642/11 645/25		731/9 731/14 731/24	742/25 776/24 778/12	705/13 705/22 707/10
646/23 651/14 659/13	576/01 677/01 600/10	131/3/31/14/31/24		
	576/24 577/24 608/13		whoreas [1] 557/05	700/3 700/0 700/00
670/12 675/19 678/15	619/2 619/3 625/23	733/2 733/8 735/18	whereas [1] 557/25	709/3 709/9 709/20
670/12 675/19 678/15 690/8 693/19 699/11	619/2 619/3 625/23 635/3 646/21 661/5	733/2 733/8 735/18 741/15 741/17 741/18	wherever [2] 535/1	710/22 711/3 711/11
670/12 675/19 678/15 690/8 693/19 699/11 705/9 706/18 709/1	619/2 619/3 625/23 635/3 646/21 661/5 663/16 665/12 665/22	733/2 733/8 735/18 741/15 741/17 741/18 742/6 742/6 743/20	wherever [2] 535/1 781/9	710/22 711/3 711/11 713/9 713/16 714/8
670/12 675/19 678/15 690/8 693/19 699/11 705/9 706/18 709/1 711/21 715/13 715/22	619/2 619/3 625/23 635/3 646/21 661/5 663/16 665/12 665/22 666/4 668/20 678/1	733/2 733/8 735/18 741/15 741/17 741/18 742/6 742/6 743/20 747/14 747/19 748/1	wherever [2] 535/1 781/9 whether [47] 544/21	710/22 711/3 711/11 713/9 713/16 714/8 716/19 718/24 718/24
670/12 675/19 678/15 690/8 693/19 699/11 705/9 706/18 709/1	619/2 619/3 625/23 635/3 646/21 661/5 663/16 665/12 665/22	733/2 733/8 735/18 741/15 741/17 741/18 742/6 742/6 743/20	wherever [2] 535/1 781/9	710/22 711/3 711/11 713/9 713/16 714/8
670/12 675/19 678/15 690/8 693/19 699/11 705/9 706/18 709/1 711/21 715/13 715/22	619/2 619/3 625/23 635/3 646/21 661/5 663/16 665/12 665/22 666/4 668/20 678/1	733/2 733/8 735/18 741/15 741/17 741/18 742/6 742/6 743/20 747/14 747/19 748/1	wherever [2] 535/1 781/9 whether [47] 544/21	710/22 711/3 711/11 713/9 713/16 714/8 716/19 718/24 718/24

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

13 December 2017 Pages 528-781

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 528-781
W	635/12 648/15 653/4	735/18 742/23 774/23	604/13 606/19 620/15	648/15 648/20 657/11
which [43] 722/14	662/2 662/11 682/12	willingness [1]	630/9 684/1 684/25	667/6 667/10 667/16
722/17 723/4 724/16	682/17 684/1 691/17	779/10	698/4 718/24 769/6	668/4 671/12 671/12
724/19 724/23 725/5	698/19 709/24 711/4	winter [8] 645/12	780/13 780/17	695/3 701/15 714/3
725/20 726/16 727/17	716/24 716/25 721/6	645/13 646/13 666/21	working [35] 542/8	733/19 734/5 736/11
728/1 729/1 731/8	741/7 741/17 746/13	667/9 667/15 667/25	554/25 555/8 589/19	738/19 738/20 740/12
731/9 731/14 731/15	747/8 754/24 757/4	668/25	590/3 600/6 600/7	741/16 765/4 770/21
733/8 733/23 734/7	758/1 763/6	wired [1] 731/23	601/5 601/12 601/16	781/11
737/18 744/18 744/21	widespread [1]	wisdom [2] 690/24	601/18 601/18 601/20	years [64] 555/5 555/6
746/4 746/13 747/9	537/11	755/1	602/4 603/20 603/21	560/10 563/21 564/2
747/21 748/23 750/6	WIECHEN [40] 530/18	wise [1] 690/25	607/25 621/21 622/16	564/5 564/6 564/9
750/11 751/11 751/23	532/6 532/15 539/8	wish [9] 664/13	624/7 627/15 628/17	568/18 568/20 568/23
752/10 756/8 763/13	540/14 540/16 572/24	691/17 696/21 771/18	628/17 628/20 628/25	580/15 580/18 580/19
763/23 764/9 767/5	584/23 584/25 585/1	771/20 771/23 778/17	629/3 645/3 648/8	583/21 586/23 587/8
767/21 773/5 775/1	585/17 591/16 598/15	779/11 780/11	649/4 649/6 677/15	607/12 626/8 626/24
777/17 779/18 780/7	601/25 602/17 604/12	within [13] 543/20	684/21 697/24 705/4 730/13	632/4 636/9 636/10 636/18 636/19 636/20
while [7] 568/15	605/21 606/11 607/4 610/12 614/11 629/7	544/3 544/4 567/14 613/14 617/1 655/8	works [6] 547/22	636/22 637/6 637/8
641/13 648/7 688/2	632/11 632/17 633/1	655/22 658/10 694/19	571/16 572/20 621/24	639/17 640/12 643/20
702/1 717/10 764/25	633/3 637/24 638/24	716/4 719/14 735/19	672/10 672/12	643/22 644/5 644/7
whilst [1] 757/9	659/13 675/21 680/15	without [14] 539/10	world [5] 546/20	644/14 644/15 644/17
who [66] 542/17 559/1	680/17 695/14 702/3	572/20 599/19 599/25	557/12 612/19 613/7	644/20 650/25 651/1
581/5 581/19 587/19	708/9 712/11 717/24	606/5 619/19 649/23	637/20	656/25 663/14 683/9
592/22 608/14 608/22	719/12 769/8 769/9	673/23 674/16 705/21	worldwide [3] 547/18	685/6 685/17 694/8
608/22 613/23 614/10	Wiechen's [2] 696/18	718/4 740/20 740/20	548/12 548/14	695/3 699/24 700/1
615/21 625/2 633/24	746/12	764/6	worry [1] 775/14	700/23 701/4 701/16
634/1 637/21 650/2 650/6 650/9 660/23	will [110] 533/8 535/3	witness [20] 556/10	worth [3] 688/6 688/7	701/16 704/1 711/16
	535/18 535/18 538/13	556/17 618/17 619/8	689/11	713/7 739/13 742/2
680/23 684/4 684/5 684/6 687/6 688/25	538/14 538/19 538/25	619/15 632/21 667/21	would [381]	742/12 742/13 770/18
689/8 695/7 696/6	539/12 540/7 540/9	691/1 727/9 732/4	would also [1] 726/22	770/23 770/25
696/12 698/2 698/6	540/14 540/22 541/8	750/10 750/13 750/18	wouldn't [1] 698/22	years' [1] 626/8
706/3 711/13 715/16	541/9 545/7 546/8	751/16 756/12 757/1	wrap [2] 657/16 716/3	Yemen [1] 749/25
721/2 721/3 722/21	546/15 556/15 570/8	758/15 758/19 760/24	wrestling [1] 688/20	yes [103] 537/9
726/1 728/3 735/19	571/7 571/11 577/23	772/25	write [3] 556/11	541/23 541/24 542/3
735/22 739/20 739/21	579/19 579/22 584/22	witnesses [11] 530/13		542/7 542/11 542/23
742/16 742/16 742/17	585/8 585/11 585/13	690/22 691/8 696/4	writing [2] 718/4	543/14 543/17 543/24
742/23 751/7 751/7	586/4 596/1 604/8	721/3 723/14 751/7	772/1	543/25 544/10 544/11
759/15 759/21 759/22	606/14 606/17 606/18	751/15 752/1 753/15	written [9] 555/10	544/15 545/2 545/3
760/14 762/6 762/20	610/19 626/13 632/5 632/13 632/14 637/9	758/14	612/17 688/23 723/9 727/22 729/6 732/4	545/11 545/12 545/16
765/1 769/18 769/25	637/16 637/22 638/4	won't [1] 611/12 wonder [3] 621/24	736/25 774/5	545/17 546/4 546/5 548/14 548/20 549/2
770/7 770/9 774/9	638/17 638/23 639/24	629/13 708/6	wrong [6] 632/4 632/6	
778/11 780/13 780/15	640/6 640/19 642/8	word [1] 536/5	700/3 703/14 716/25	550/16 551/10 552/5
780/25	643/9 644/16 646/20	wording [1] 760/10	742/17	553/18 553/21 554/2
whole [5] 535/12	659/4 659/14 659/15	words [12] 583/1	wrongful [2] 709/5	554/2 555/24 557/3
578/11 681/16 701/14	662/15 664/13 664/24	608/18 614/18 661/2	752/18	558/14 559/11 559/14
743/14 wholly [2] 587/25	665/24 680/19 686/15	664/23 675/8 700/20	wrote [2] 566/10	562/5 565/5 568/6
wholly [2] 587/25 655/18	687/17 691/21 696/19	707/12 716/11 724/25	629/14	569/16 570/1 570/21
wholly-owned [1]	707/16 709/8 710/7	728/7 731/25	Y	578/11 581/12 583/5
587/25	710/11 711/12 713/15	work [32] 540/19		583/10 583/13 584/2
whom [5] 581/15	716/1 718/11 719/18	542/17 542/24 543/1	year [63] 536/22 552/7	584/7 589/8 590/6
602/24 688/17 770/10	719/25 720/3 721/21	553/2 554/14 555/6	557/8 557/25 563/24	590/10 604/5 605/9
771/21	721/23 721/25 722/1	561/21 564/25 571/14	568/19 568/19 571/16	605/18 616/9 616/12
Whose [1] 550/9	722/13 724/19 726/5	582/9 594/2 613/21	572/2 572/4 580/17	619/1 619/10 619/23
why [52] 549/5 549/17	727/19 734/12 738/6	636/4 639/17 639/19	582/23 583/14 583/15	620/17 622/3 623/1
549/19 550/1 550/23	738/7 739/6 747/11	680/9 684/4 687/24	583/18 583/19 583/20 583/24 584/5 584/9	624/19 625/24 628/11
556/11 556/21 558/8	748/10 748/17 748/18	692/24 698/20 698/24 701/18 705/6 715/14	583/24 584/5 584/9 584/10 584/12 588/18	631/17 632/8 634/5 634/9 634/20 635/15
560/11 567/22 570/6	750/14 751/23 751/23 751/24 753/8 753/9	701/18 705/6 715/14 716/9 740/18 744/10	589/9 601/20 604/17	635/18 638/23 655/24
571/12 575/19 578/17	751/24 753/8 753/9 753/9 753/13 754/4	716/9 740/18 744/10 747/13 754/8 780/16	606/22 616/7 626/6	664/2 669/11 671/13
588/6 591/1 592/22	754/6 754/25 758/7	747/13 754/8 780/18	635/24 636/25 642/4	672/16 674/12 674/17
602/18 603/14 604/18	774/3 777/12 778/11	worked [18] 540/18	643/18 643/19 644/1	675/6 675/18 677/6
605/1 605/15 608/16	780/4 780/24 781/1	542/12 542/19 546/2	644/9 645/2 645/19	678/10 683/21 685/2
610/20 611/9 622/15	willing [5] 603/5 704/7	554/9 562/23 589/4	645/21 648/5 648/14	685/18 691/25 695/23
634/12 634/17 634/22		00110 002/20 000/7		
		<u> </u>		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised	13 December 2017 Pages 528-781
Y	592/20 594/11 596/13		
yes [9] 708/13	596/18 599/17 599/23		
708/14 710/14 713/22	602/10 603/12 603/21		
718/7 745/20 751/18	604/7 604/13 604/14		
751/21 772/17	604/18 604/24 606/13		
	606/15 606/15 606/20		
yesterday [18] 540/17 540/20 542/1 542/5	607/14 607/22 608/8		
	608/15 608/24 609/23		
542/22 543/7 552/9 606/6 618/20 639/21	610/1 610/6 610/8		
	613/1 613/4 614/14		
643/14 650/15 671/10	615/18 615/18 616/2		
672/4 672/7 684/15 753/18 766/25	616/24 617/1 617/9		
yet [14] 555/18 608/3	617/23 618/1 620/11		
630/10 642/21 662/1	622/23 624/10 626/1		
687/23 717/12 718/18	626/1 627/16 628/3		
719/1 719/2 726/2	628/20 629/6 629/14		
	629/15 629/16 631/12		
739/18 756/4 770/3	632/24 633/4 633/6		
yfortier.ca [1] 529/12	634/7 635/6 635/7		
yield [18] 546/19	635/9 635/23 636/17		
547/11 548/2 548/7	636/19 638/3 638/8		
549/5 567/1 583/8	638/11 638/13 657/3		
602/7 643/17 667/6	659/4 659/25 660/1		
671/5 672/13 672/15	660/15 662/24 663/10		
679/23 680/1 680/6	664/4 664/13 665/21		
695/3 695/3	666/20 669/18 670/14		
yield and [1] 680/6	670/14 670/16 670/20		
yielded [1] 547/13	673/9 674/19 675/2		
yields [52] 533/20	676/22 677/8 679/21		
533/22 536/25 537/12	683/20 683/23 684/12		
538/2 547/9 549/5	685/16 686/21 686/24		
549/14 549/18 555/19	696/3 697/2 699/5		
558/10 563/13 563/16	711/9 711/19 711/21		
564/24 583/3 583/8	713/19 715/20 716/7		
594/5 594/13 594/23	716/9 716/11 716/18		
595/21 643/21 644/5	717/9 719/21 720/5		
644/14 644/20 644/25	720/17 721/15 743/5		
645/18 651/22 651/23	743/16 748/6 751/25		
652/4 654/2 657/18	752/4 752/5 752/5		
657/23 658/1 670/17	754/16 772/22 778/24		
671/1 671/3 671/15	779/10 780/5 780/5		
671/19 673/4 673/13	yours [1] 663/1		
673/20 679/21 680/2	yourself [7] 575/24		
680/9 680/9 680/11	583/1 613/19 620/9		
684/8 692/7 694/2	621/20 622/1 623/2		
701/1 770/20 771/2	yourselves [3] 554/3		
you [945]	688/25 711/9		
you for [1] 718/11	Yves [4] 528/15 529/9		
you integrated [1]	529/10 781/2		
562/17	yves.fortier [1] 529/12		
young [1] 737/14			
your [163] 533/8	Z		
537/4 538/23 541/16	ZBIGNIEW [4] 528/8		
543/4 543/6 544/13	530/12 530/14 738/16		
544/19 546/2 546/8	Zbylski [1] 750/19		
546/10 547/7 548/19	Zelenenco [4] 723/12		
549/1 549/7 549/11	728/12 730/9 730/15		
550/10 551/17 553/2	zero [3] 599/8 629/17		
556/2 556/21 556/25	693/23		
559/9 559/13 562/13	Zyblski [1] 772/25		
562/15 562/19 563/7			
565/13 565/19 566/16			
567/5 574/7 579/18			
580/11 581/23 584/18			
584/19 589/25 591/20			
			1