Abengoa S.A. y COFIDES S.A. v. USD 68,999,725.32  
Matthew Hodgson and Daniel Hrcka, Allen & Overy LLP  
28-Oct-2011 (RFA) 17-Apr-15  
Respondent won on jurisdiction. (para. 203(1)) The Tribunal decides (para. 202):

- (1) each party shall pay its own legal costs;
- (2) each party shall pay 50% of the Tribunal costs.

Aguaytia Energy, LLC v. Peru, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/13

- N/R
- USD 700,000 paid by parties to ICSID as deposit for Tribunal and expenses (para. 312). Respondent does not submit details on the costs (para. 313).
- Respondent win. Claims dismissed: some were declared inadmissible, the others failed on the merits (para 199).
- This amounts to 75% of the Respondent's total costs (including Tribunal costs)

ADC Affiliate Limited and ADC & ADMC Management Limited v. Republic of Hungary, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/16

- ICSID 3: Prof. William W Park (President), Judge Charles N Brower, J Christopher Thomas QC
- Respondent ordered to pay the Claimant USD 218,556,798.00 (para 314(5))
- Each party to pay its own costs, and the costs of the arbitration to be split equally.

Achmea B.V. v. The Slovak Republic, 15 of 352

- Claimant's claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (para. 291)
- USD 3,759,511.70
- Respondent win. Claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (page 44).

ADC Affiliate Limited v. Republic of Hungary, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/16

- ICSID 3: Judge Florentino P. Feliciano
- n.b. Tribunal applied

US$ 1 = EUR 0.7669

ADC Affiliate Limited v. Republic of Hungary, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/16

- 21.07.2000 (notice) 9-Jan-03
- USD 7,623,693 in Claimant's costs and expenses of the arbitration, minus USD 350,000 ICSID advance, i.e. USD 4,380,335 in Respondent's costs and expenses of the arbitration minus USD 350,000 ICSID advance = USD 218,556,798.00 (para 314(5))

Alpha Projektholding GmbH v. Ukraine, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/16

- ICSID 3: Fernando Mantilla-Serrano
- n.b. Although Claimants appeared to be claiming for amount

Alapli Elektrik B.V. v. Republic of Turkey, ICSID Case No. ARB/08/13

- ICSID 3: Heribert Golsong, Keba Mbaye
- Comprising: (1) USD 3,560,000 and (2) USD 2,399,330

Amco Asia Corporation and others v. Republic of Indonesia, ICSID Case No. ARB/81/1

- ICSID 3: Judge Commerce
- USD 3,759,511.70

USD 9,000,000

USD 209,657.92

Not disclosed.

Not disclosed

USD 9,000,000

USD 209,657.92

Not disclosed

USD 9,000,000

USD 209,657.92

Not disclosed.
Claimant's claims dismissed on merits (para. 323) The Tribunal decides (para. 323):

19 (paras 304-322)

(converted from EUR 132,696.91 (para. 205) to USD 183,017.99 (USD 283,068.48)

USD 1,500,000,000

Prof. August Reinisch; Prof. Philippe Sands QC

CZK 4,557,430.91 (CZK 4,329,800.60 + CZK 120,852.85 + CZK 99,861.85 + CZK 6,915.61)

Note: the claimant's legal fees are not quantified - the above

Arbitration relates to the claimant seeking relief for deprivation of the (previous) arbitral award sum due to the undue delay in the enforcement thereof (para. 210). In all these years, it has claimed CZK 1,959,444.50 and CZK 1,774,765.30 (para. 278).

Figures not disclosed in the award.

Claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction ratione temporis (para. 143)

2) USD 488,700.24 (USD 4,853.25 + USD 283,068.48)

N/A N/A N/A

Figures not disclosed in the award.

Policy Hub notes that the claim is for USD 16.3 million (CNY 100 million) - see: http://investmentpolicyhub.unctad.org/ISDS/Details/602

5-Feb-10 7-Feb-14

21-Sep-07 14-Jun-13

14,683.96) + USD 26,601.16 + USD 108,850 + USD 112,940.38 (EUR 82,966) + USD 4,483.84 (EUR 3,293.83) + USD 132,163.64)

USD 5,488,695.91

1,222,584.38 for the Respondent's legal costs; USD 1,785,084.38 (USD 750,000)

Respondent ordered to pay USD 54,972.40 representing 1/3 of the Claimant's fees and expenses, and to bear the cost of its own counsel fees and expenses, and to pay all relief stems of USD 1,599,000 (exclusive of costs) to the Claimants, and to bear 60% of the arbitrators' fees and expenses and the charges for the use of the facilities of the Centre (para 116).

1,759,084.38

Each party to bear its own legal costs; costs of the arbitration to be borne in equal shares (para 107).

USD 637,951.95

Not disclosed, however a total of USD 750,000

USD 595,279.91

USD 1,500,000,000

USD 1,222,584.38 for the Respondent's legal costs; USD 1,785,084.38 (USD 750,000)

Respondent ordered to pay USD 54,972.40 representing 1/3 of the Claimant's fees and expenses, and to bear the cost of its own counsel fees and expenses, and to pay all relief stems of USD 1,599,000 (exclusive of costs) to the Claimants, and to bear 60% of the arbitrators' fees and expenses and the charges for the use of the facilities of the Centre (para 116).

USD 1,222,584.38 for the Respondent's legal costs; USD 1,785,084.38 (USD 750,000)

Respondent ordered to pay USD 54,972.40 representing 1/3 of the Claimant's fees and expenses, and to bear the cost of its own counsel fees and expenses, and to pay all relief stems of USD 1,599,000 (exclusive of costs) to the Claimants, and to bear 60% of the arbitrators' fees and expenses and the charges for the use of the facilities of the Centre (para 116).

1,785,084.38

1 of 442

UNCITRAL (see para. 106)

1 of 148

Each party to bear its own costs and counsel fees, and the Respondent shall bear the fees and expenses of the arbitrators and the costs of the ICSID Secretariat except for USD 34,496, which shall be borne by the Claimant (para 441).

3 of 425

Each party to bear its own costs and counsel fees, and the Respondent shall bear the fees and expenses of the arbitrators and the costs of the ICSID Secretariat except for USD 34,496, which shall be borne by the Claimant (para 441).

N/R

1,599

N/R

N/R

N/R

N/R

N/R

N/R

N/R

N/R

N/R

N/R

N/R

N/R
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Details</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Tribunal Members</th>
<th>Applicable Law</th>
<th>Award Date</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>US$ 64,896,339</td>
<td>USD 624,390 + GBP 3,448,773</td>
<td>UNCITRAL</td>
<td>A.R. Williams, Michael Hwang</td>
<td>NAFTA</td>
<td>31-Dec-1999</td>
<td>USD 13,269,877.75</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>+ interest (para. 251) plus interest (para. 88 onwards) + USD 104,009.25 + USD 25,653.74 + USD 152,659.77 (converted from GBP 97,778.58)  (disbursements)  + USD 1,799.39 ... (converted from GBP 1,456) + USD 1,080 (expert disbursements) (para.965 et seq.) = USD 13,269,877.75 (para. 965 et seq.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>USD 20,158,775</td>
<td>USD 45,571,235.14</td>
<td>ICSID</td>
<td>Alejandro M. Garro, Albert Jan</td>
<td>ICSID</td>
<td>30-Jun-2000</td>
<td>USD 4,057,657.55</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Claimants' claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (page 159).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>USD 792,902.24</td>
<td>USD 372,623.25</td>
<td>ICSID</td>
<td>Christer Söderlund (President); ICSID 3: G. Arthur A. Maynard, Rex Mckay</td>
<td>ICSID</td>
<td>22-May-2002</td>
<td>USD 238,100,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Respondent win. Claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction because there was no &quot;investment&quot; under NAFTA (para 233).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>USD 2,502,197.24</td>
<td>USD 2,950,000</td>
<td>ICSID</td>
<td>ICSID 3: Berardo M. Cremades, Prof. Ibrahim Fadlallah</td>
<td>ICSID</td>
<td>23-Jul-2003</td>
<td>USD 10,244,465</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Respondent win on jurisdiction (para. 215). The Tribunal ordered the Claimant to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceskoslovenska Obchodni Banka, a.s. v. Slovak Republic, ICSID Case No.</td>
<td><strong>Claimant win. Respondent ordered to pay in legal representation and assistance costs USD plus interest at the U.S. Monthly Bank Loan time value and opportunity cost of money</strong>, with 46.77% attributed to CdM (Cargill's wholly owned Mexican enterprise) and 53.23% attributed to Cargill (para 435).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paragraph 561:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Respondent to pay all of the costs of this arbitration and half of Claimant's costs of legal representation and assistance, in addition to its own costs of the proceeding (para. 36).</strong> It has been assumed that USD 1,675,473 equals half the Claimant's costs, which would therefore total USD 3,350,946.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Respondent to bear Claimant's legal fees and disbursements of GBP 100,000 i.e. USD 176,197, and to pay USD 40,000 to the Claimant in reimbursement of fees and expenses paid to the Tribunal and Centre (para 63).</strong> n.b. Unclear whether the USD 40,000 payment represented full reimbursement of the Tribunal's fees and expenses, or whether this was only partial reimbursement of a larger advance made by the Claimant. This figure has therefore been excluded from our costs awards calculations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,306,272, EUR 123,000 i.e. USD 148,090</strong> (converted from EUR 865,678.51) (para. 22 (paras 704-725)</td>
<td><strong>219,004</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 446,125.32 in legal fees plus USD 1,045,768.71 in disbursements, i.e. USD 1,491,894.03 (converted from EUR 1,053,378.51)</strong> (para. 219 (paras 566-570) <strong>219,004</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 2,530,931.63 USD 950,772.63</strong> (converted from EUR 865,678.51) (para. 245 (paras 351 + 374)</td>
<td><strong>4,306,272, EUR 123,000 i.e. USD 148,090</strong> (converted from EUR 865,678.51) (para. 22 (paras 704-725) <strong>219,004</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 1,605,000,000, plus pre-award compound interest until 31-Dec-10, to a total of USD 649,786,333 (paras 205 + 338).</strong> **22 (paras. 533-556) <strong>219,004</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chevron Corporation (USA) and Texaco Petroleum Company (USA) v. Republic of Ecuador, UNCITRAL, PCA Case No. 34877</strong></td>
<td><strong>269,814,000 (paras 620 + 649).</strong> **22 (paras. 533-556) <strong>219,004</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>269,814,000 (paras 620 + 649).</strong> **22 (paras. 533-556) <strong>219,004</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CME Czech Republic B.V. v. Czech Republic, UNCITRAL</strong></td>
<td>**22 (paras. 533-556) <strong>219,004</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**22 (paras. 533-556) <strong>219,004</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**22 (paras. 533-556) <strong>219,004</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The text appears to be a mixture of legal documents and financial data, possibly related to arbitration cases. The content includes references to costs, fees, and interest calculations, as well as specific amounts in various currencies.
ICSID 3: Prof. Francisco Orrego Vicuña

Claimant to transfer ownership of TGN shares to (President), The Honorable Marc Lalonde P.C. O.C. Q.C., H.E. Judge Francisco Rezek.

Each party shall bear its own fees and expenses. The arbitration costs, including the fees of the members of the Tribunal, shall be borne equally (para 472).

the event that Respondent decides to take title to shares, or USD 243,600,000 in the event that title to the share remains with CMS (para 396).

Each party shall bear one half of the costs of arbitration, and each Party shall bear its own legal fees and expenses.

USD 790,399 plus interest at 6%, compounded annually, on the amount of USD 51,000,000.00 as from 28 August 1997 until the date of payment, and on the further amount of USD 54,000,000 as from 5 September 2002 until the date of payment.

Jurisdictional phase: USD 701,961.08 in attorney fees and other costs excluding ICSID payments plus USD 4,312.15 in transportation costs for hearing, i.e. USD 706,273.23 (para 10.1.2).

N/R Over 6.13.1 + 10.1.4.

Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Compagnie Générale des Eaux v. Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/97/3 - VIVENDI I

US$ 1 = EUR 0.9049

USD 69,000,000

VIETNAM v. The Philippines, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/1

Response by Philippines: USD 3,850,000 (http://investmentpolicyhub.unctad.org/ISDS/Details/388)

This amount comprises:

(1) the Claimant shall pay 2/3 of the Respondent’s

(2) each party shall pay 50% of the Tribunal costs.

USD 168,952,643

The Tribunal decides (para. 681 (3)) The Tribunal ordered the Claimant to pay 50% of the

USD 2,800,000

Copper Mesa Mining Corporation v Ecuador (PCA Case No. 2012-2)

USD 19,447,494.80

The Tribunal decided the...of US dollars (USD)

USD 51,000,000 (http://investmentpolicyhub.unctad.org/ISDS/Details/388)

USD 69,700,000

N/R

Copper Mesa Mining Corporation v Ecuador (PCA Case No. 2012-2)

USD 69,700,000

N/R

Copper Mesa Mining Corporation v Ecuador (PCA Case No. 2012-2)

USD 69,700,000

N/R

Copper Mesa Mining Corporation v Ecuador (PCA Case No. 2012-2)

USD 69,700,000

N/R

N/R

N/R

N/R

N/R

N/R

N/R

Copper Mesa Mining Corporation v Ecuador (PCA Case No. 2012-2)

USD 69,700,000

N/R

Copper Mesa Mining Corporation v Ecuador (PCA Case No. 2012-2)

USD 69,700,000

N/R

Copper Mesa Mining Corporation v Ecuador (PCA Case No. 2012-2)

USD 69,700,000

N/R
Respondent to pay 30% of Claimant's party representation costs (EUR 1,010,786) and an additional EUR 1,500 for the Stockholm Institute (para 383 of Partial Award).

USD 1 = EUR 0.7486494963 (converted from EUR 3,454,742.59) USD 3,640,566.77 in total costs including expenses of legal team, expert fees, and ICSID payments (para 879).

USD 1 = GBP 0.6619 (US$ 1 = EUR 0.7394) USD 228,200,000, i.e. USD 155,404, plus interest - but there is no reference to actual amount claimed, which may have been higher (paras 72, 94-96).

Respondent wins on jurisdiction (pages 5, 6). The Claimant ordered to pay the Respondent Respondent’s legal costs (converted from EUR 1,000,000).

Respondent to bear both Claimant’s costs and Respondent’s legal costs (converted from EUR 1,000,000).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Title</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Tribunal</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glamis Gold Ltd. v. United States of America, UNCITRAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEA Group Aktiengesellschaft v. N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R Claimed in request for arbitration:</td>
<td>USD 262,518.82</td>
<td>USD 1,705,860.80</td>
<td>USD 2,368,293.16</td>
<td>USD 3,385,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R Claimed in Notice of Arbitration and Memorial on Merits:</td>
<td>USD 519,394.36 + USD 1,028.80</td>
<td>USD 305</td>
<td>USD 254,4859.21 - EUR 425,000)</td>
<td>EUR 1,309,084.74 plus USD 315,016.44 plus interest claimed in Submission on Costs, i.e. EUR 2,553,437.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>n.b. Likely to include Tribunal Costs.</td>
<td>n.b. Likely to include Tribunal Costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USD 15,899.00 (converted from CZK 340,222.79 + CAD 1,549,847.74 + CAD 192,000 (para. 520-529) Tribunal dismissed claim due to lack of jurisdiction (para. 524)</td>
<td>USD 171,634</td>
<td>USD 15,508,381</td>
<td>USD 822,036.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flughafen Zürich A.G. and Gestión e Ingenería IDC S.A. v. Venezuela (Cyprus) v. Czech Republic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USD 2,577.51) (para. 975)</td>
<td>USD 2,305) plus interest</td>
<td>USD 3,637,187.25</td>
<td>USD 2,577.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-W Oil Interests Inc. v. Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/14</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USD 822,036.30</td>
<td>USD 19,928,261</td>
<td>USD 171,634</td>
<td>USD 2,577.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garanti Koza LLP v Turkmenistan (ICSID Case No. ARB/11/20)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USD 7,921,930</td>
<td>USD 171,634</td>
<td>USD 2,577.51</td>
<td>USD 2,305) plus interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kalimantan v. PT Kaltim Prima Coal, Rio Tinto plc, BP p.l.c., Pacific Resources Investments Limited, BP International Limited, Sangatta Holdings Limited, Kalimantan Coal Limited, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/3, Award on Jurisdiction

The Tribunal decides: (para. 524)

(1) the Claimant shall pay 80% of the Respondent's legal costs (USD 1,747,521);

(2) each party shall pay 50% of the Tribunal's costs.

Each Party shall bear its own costs of representation and half of the costs and expenses of the proceedings (para 246).

N.B. Previous amount of USD 38,000,000, revised down to USD 13,319,289.23 (converted from EUR 19,987,000) + interest at the average 6-month EURIBOR rate + 2% semi-annually compounding from 1 July 2002 till date award debt satisfied (paras 545 - 546)

Arbitration costs, including fees and expenses of Tribunal and ICSID Secretariat, to be borne two-thirds by Claimant and one-third by Respondent. Each party to bear its own legal costs and expenses (para 85).

The Claimants' experts valuations ranged from USD 109.4 million to USD 157.2 million (para. 311).

The Respondent win. Claims dismissed on merits as Claimant failed to prove liability and/or causation (paras 168-170)

The Respondent win. Most claims (expropriation, violations of FET standard, obligation to provide full protection and treatment) dismissed on merits, as Claimant failed to prove that Respondent had committed an act of denial of justice (para 508).

The Tribunal decides that the Respondent shall pay to the Claimant USD 1,403,854.59 (USD 1,340,885 + USD 62,971 (Converted from GBP 40,999.50)) (para. 141)

The Tribunal decides: (para. 532)

(1) each party shall pay 50% of the Tribunal costs; (2) each party shall pay their own legal costs.

The Respondent win. Claims dismissed but expropriation claim made by Rurelec upheld.

Not disclosed in the award.

Respondent win. Claims dismissed on merits as Claimant failed to prove liability and/or causation (paras 168-170)

The Tribunal decides: (para. 532)

(1) each party shall pay 50% of the Tribunal costs; (2) each party shall pay their own legal costs.

Respondent win. Claims dismissed on merits as Claimant failed to prove liability and/or causation (paras 168-170)

Each party shall bear the expenses incurred by it.

USD 1,031,293.36

USD 8,606,231.64

USD 6,403,612

USD 610,000

USD 6,086,168.83 (converted from EUR 5,632,140.01 (para. 592) plus interest at EURIBOR + 2%, compounded semi-annually) (paras 612-613). This amount includes costs of the arbitration and the legal costs incurred by the Claimant.

USD 119,362,503

USD 566,770,430.29

USD 174,870,435

USD 3,200,143

USD 8,737,603

USD 234,500 in arbitrators' fees and expenses, plus EUR 62,852.22 in other tribunal expenses (travel, translation, courier deliveries) and all other costs relating to the arbitration; EUR 64,135 for PCA's registry fees, i.e. 1/3 of EUR 192,405.

USD 3,180,000

USD 923,375.8 (converted from EUR 818,522.25) (see para. 384)

USD 16,086,200

EUR 2,503,867 requested in total, i.e. EUR 834,622.33 in arbitrators' fees and expenses (incl. travel, translation, courier expenses) and EUR 1,669,244.67 in all other costs (incl. Tribunal's additional expenses, expert fees and honoraria) and EUR 6,928.80 in ICSID's annual service fees (plus interest).

USD 8,606,231.64

USD 6,086,168.83 (converted from EUR 5,632,140.01 (para. 592) plus interest at EURIBOR + 2%, compounded semi-annually) (paras 612-613). This amount includes costs of the arbitration and the legal costs incurred by the Claimant.

USD 4,800,000

USD 13,319,289.23

USD 174,870,435

USD 3,200,143

USD 566,770,430.29

USD 3,180,000

USD 16,086,200

EUR 2,503,867 requested in total, i.e. EUR 834,622.33 in arbitrators' fees and expenses (incl. travel, translation, courier expenses) and EUR 1,669,244.67 in all other costs (incl. Tribunal's additional expenses, expert fees and honoraria) and EUR 6,928.80 in ICSID's annual service fees (plus interest).

USD 119,362,503

USD 566,770,430.29

USD 174,870,435

USD 3,200,143

USD 8,737,603

USD 234,500 in arbitrators' fees and expenses, plus EUR 62,852.22 in other tribunal expenses (travel, translation, courier deliveries) and all other costs relating to the arbitration; EUR 64,135 for PCA's registry fees, i.e. 1/3 of EUR 192,405.

USD 3,180,000

USD 923,375.8 (converted from EUR 818,522.25) (see para. 384)

USD 16,086,200

EUR 2,503,867 requested in total, i.e. EUR 834,622.33 in arbitrators' fees and expenses (incl. travel, translation, courier expenses) and EUR 1,669,244.67 in all other costs (incl. Tribunal's additional expenses, expert fees and honoraria) and EUR 6,928.80 in ICSID's annual service fees (plus interest).
Respondent win. Claims dismissed on merits as Respondent held not to have violated any of the NAFTA articles relied upon by Claimant (para 209).

Claimant to reimburse Respondent for USD 405,620 in fees of arbitrators plus USD 99,632.08 in expenses; USD 132,438 (converted from EUR 121,293.90) (para 562). ICSID 3: Mr Michael Hwang S.C.

Paragraphs on relief redacted (see. Sections F.I. and F.II.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Award Date</th>
<th>Monetary Award</th>
<th>Legal Fees</th>
<th>Tribunal Costs</th>
<th>Other Costs</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claimant's claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (para. 423).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claimants to bear all Tribunal fees and expenses and costs of assistance required by Tribunal in the amount of USD 37,905.45 (para 77).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The Claimant shall pay 100% of the arbitration costs.
2. The Claimant shall pay its own legal costs and 30% of the other party's legal costs.
3. The Claimant shall pay 72% of the Tribunal costs.
4. The Claimant shall pay 72% of the other party's legal costs.
5. The Claimant shall pay 72% of the other party's costs of representation.
6. Each party shall pay its own costs of representation.
7. Each party shall pay 50% of Tribunal costs; 
8. Each party shall pay its own legal costs.
9. The Claimant was ordered to pay USD 1,663,646, plus simple interest from date of rebates...
10. Claimant has paid interest and taxes totaling USD 1,084,389.77. |
<p>| The Tribunal decides (para. 178(c)): | | | | | | | | Each party to pay 50% of Tribunal costs; (2) Each party shall pay its own legal costs. |
| Claimant win. Respondent ordered to pay MXN 9,464,627.50, i.e. USD 928,350, plus simple interest from date rebates... | | | | | | | | Figures not disclosed. |
| Claimant's claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (para. 423). The Tribunal dismissed all other claims on the merits. | | | | | | | | Alternative amounts submitted: USD 90,000,000 using discounted cash flow analysis to establish fair market value of investment; USD 20-25,000,000 using actual investment value (para 114). |
| Claimants to bear all Tribunal fees and expenses and costs of assistance required by Tribunal in the amount of USD 37,905.45 (para 77). | | | | | | | | Each party to pay 50% of Tribunal costs; (2) each party shall pay its own legal costs. |
| MSS B.V. and Recupero Credito Acciaio N.V. v Montenegro (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/12/8) | Claimant: MSS B.V. and Recupero Credito Acciaio N.V. | Respondent: Montenegro | 25-Jan-08 | USD 3,374,575 | | | | Tribunal decides (para. 178(c)): Each party shall pay 50% of Tribunal costs; (2) each party shall pay its own legal costs. |
| Claimant's claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (para. 423). The Tribunal dismissed all other claims on the merits. | | | | | | | | Figures not disclosed. |
| Claimants to bear all Tribunal fees and expenses and costs of assistance required by Tribunal in the amount of USD 37,905.45 (para 77). | | | | | | | | Each party to pay 50% of Tribunal costs; (2) each party shall pay its own legal costs. |
| Claimant's claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (para. 423). | | | | | | | | Award in previous court lawsuit before Ecuadorian courts, Claimant had not shown loss, so no damages (page 128). |
| Claimants to bear all Tribunal fees and expenses and costs of assistance required by Tribunal in the amount of USD 37,905.45 (para 77). | | | | | | | | Each party to pay 50% of Tribunal costs; (2) each party shall pay its own legal costs. |
| Claimant's claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (para. 423). | | | | | | | | Figures not disclosed. |
| Claimants to bear all Tribunal fees and expenses and costs of assistance required by Tribunal in the amount of USD 37,905.45 (para 77). | | | | | | | | Each party to pay 50% of Tribunal costs; (2) each party shall pay its own legal costs. |
| Claimant's claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (para. 423). The Tribunal dismissed all other claims on the merits. | | | | | | | | Figures not disclosed. |
| Claimants to bear all Tribunal fees and expenses and costs of assistance required by Tribunal in the amount of USD 37,905.45 (para 77). | | | | | | | | Each party to pay 50% of Tribunal costs; (2) each party shall pay its own legal costs. |
| Claimant's claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (para. 423). The Tribunal dismissed all other claims on the merits. | | | | | | | | Figures not disclosed. |
| Claimants to bear all Tribunal fees and expenses and costs of assistance required by Tribunal in the amount of USD 37,905.45 (para 77). | | | | | | | | Each party to pay 50% of Tribunal costs; (2) each party shall pay its own legal costs. |
| Claimant's claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (para. 423). The Tribunal dismissed all other claims on the merits. | | | | | | | | Figures not disclosed. |
| Claimants to bear all Tribunal fees and expenses and costs of assistance required by Tribunal in the amount of USD 37,905.45 (para 77). | | | | | | | | Each party to pay 50% of Tribunal costs; (2) each party shall pay its own legal costs. |
| Claimant's claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (para. 423). The Tribunal dismissed all other claims on the merits. | | | | | | | | Figures not disclosed. |
| Claimants to bear all Tribunal fees and expenses and costs of assistance required by Tribunal in the amount of USD 37,905.45 (para 77). | | | | | | | | Each party to pay 50% of Tribunal costs; (2) each party shall pay its own legal costs. |
| Claimant's claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (para. 423). The Tribunal dismissed all other claims on the merits. | | | | | | | | Figures not disclosed. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Title</th>
<th>Relevant Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nova Scotia Power Incorporated (Canada) v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, UNCITRAL Case No. ARB/10/14</strong></td>
<td>Respondent to pay EUR 300,000, i.e. USD 360,060, towards Claimant's costs (para 119). Respondent to reimburse Claimant 50% of arbitration costs, such 50% being EUR 262,488 plus SEK 4,063, i.e. USD 315,544 (paras 121 + 123). Plus SEK 8,125 in SCC Arbitration Institute administrative fee and expenses; i.e. total of USD 631,088.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.T.D Equity Sdn. Bhd. &amp; M.T.D Chile S.A. v. Republic of Chile, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/7</strong></td>
<td>USD 3,959,529.67 plus DEM 14,179,564.12 claimed by Banks as outstanding principal amount of damages, i.e. USD 26,139,093.79, plus interest as before compounded from 31 July 2001 (para 35). USD 661,069.72 in fees and expenses of members of arbitral tribunal and expenses of its assistant; USD 65,000 for use of the Centre; USD 157,021.78 in costs incurred by Centre; i.e. total of USD 849,049.54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. Republic of Ecuador, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11</strong></td>
<td>USD 1,798,289.56 claimed in connection with contracts for drilling and exploitation of crude oil in the Deminera Field, damages including USD 1,303,746 for the 2004-2006 period, i.e. USD 2,152,966, plus post-award interest (para 374). Respondent to pay 55% of arbitration costs, i.e. USD 326,724.40 in total (or an extra USD 29,702.21), and Claimant to pay 45%, i.e. USD 267,319.98. Each party to bear its own costs for legal representation and assistance (para 216).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ömer Dede and Serdar Elhüseyni v. Romania, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/22</strong></td>
<td>Respondent ordered to pay LVL 1,600,000 inclusive of simple interest at 6% from the mid-point of the respective period in question until the date of the Award, i.e. USD 1,769,625,000 as marginal rate plus reference rate from 2 July 2001 to 30 October 2009, i.e. principal amounts plus interest totalling USD 27,780,000 plus USD 55,160,000 plus USD 87,220,000 plus USD 58,300,000, i.e. principal amounts totalling USD 203,580,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPIC Karimun Corporation v. Republic of Indonesia, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/15</strong></td>
<td>Claimant win. Respondent ordered to pay LVL 3,484,749.70, i.e. USD 6,461,675, plus 6% interest on amounts from 17 September 1999/ 28 February 2000 respectively (para 1.2.1, page 2). USD 849,049.54 in additional interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Petroleum Services Corporation v. Republic of Argentina, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/19</strong></td>
<td>The Tribunal decides (para. 641): Respondent to pay the Claimant USD 1,500,000 in costs of the Claimants’ legal counsel and USD 1,873,565.67 in costs of the arbitration (para. 642). Reimburse the Claimant’s costs of the arbitration (USD 53,592,439.25). USD 1,769,625,000 as marginal rate plus reference rate from 2 July 2001 to 30 October 2009, i.e. principal amounts plus interest totalling USD 27,780,000 plus USD 55,160,000 plus USD 87,220,000 plus USD 58,300,000, i.e. principal amounts totalling USD 203,580,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPIC Karimun Corporation v. Republic of Indonesia, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/15</strong></td>
<td>Respondent win. All claims dismissed on the merits as Claimants had not been able to prove indirect expropriation (para 693). USD 53,592,439.25 in costs of the arbitration. USD 2,152,966 in fees and expenses of members of arbitral tribunal and expenses of its assistant; USD 65,000 for use of the Centre; USD 157,021.78 in costs incurred by Centre; i.e. total of USD 849,049.54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Gas S.A.E. v. Arab Republic of Egypt (ICSID Case No. ARB/11/7)</strong></td>
<td>Claimant loses on jurisdiction (para. 158). Claimant ordered to pay all Tribunal costs (amount not disclosed) (para. 157). USD 1,798,289.56 claimed in connection with contracts for drilling and exploitation of crude oil in the Deminera Field, damages including USD 1,303,746 for the 2004-2006 period, i.e. USD 2,152,966, plus post-award interest (para 374). Respondent to pay 55% of arbitration costs, i.e. USD 326,724.40 in total (or an extra USD 29,702.21), and Claimant to pay 45%, i.e. USD 267,319.98. Each party to bear its own costs for legal representation and assistance (para 216).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Gas S.A.E. v. Arab Republic of Egypt (ICSID Case No. ARB/11/7)</strong></td>
<td>USD 1,000,000 claimed in connection with the purchase of half of the shares of National Gas (AG) S.A.E. with a view to the development of the Sidi Touil Field, claims including USD 263,500 for the 2004-2005 period, i.e. USD 999,500.00. USD 3,686,188, i.e. USD 6,835,196, plus interest as before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. Republic of Ecuador, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11</strong></td>
<td>The Claimants claimed USD 1,798,289.56, i.e. USD 2,152,966, in costs of the arbitration (para. 641). USD 1,769,625,000 as marginal rate plus reference rate from 2 July 2001 to 30 October 2009, i.e. principal amounts plus interest totalling USD 27,780,000 plus USD 55,160,000 plus USD 87,220,000 plus USD 58,300,000, i.e. principal amounts totalling USD 203,580,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holding AB v. Republic of Latvia, SCC Case No. A2002-013/1-A</strong></td>
<td>USD 1,769,625,000 as marginal rate plus reference rate from 2 July 2001 to 30 October 2009, i.e. principal amounts plus interest totalling USD 27,780,000 plus USD 55,160,000 plus USD 87,220,000 plus USD 58,300,000, i.e. principal amounts totalling USD 203,580,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.T.D Equity Sdn. Bhd. &amp; M.T.D Chile S.A. v. Republic of Chile, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/7</strong></td>
<td>USD 1,846,086.33 claimed in connection with contracts for drilling and exploitation of crude oil in the Deminera Field, damages including USD 1,303,746 for the 2004-2006 period, i.e. USD 2,152,966, plus post-award interest (para 374). Respondent to pay 55% of arbitration costs, i.e. USD 326,724.40 in total (or an extra USD 29,702.21), and Claimant to pay 45%, i.e. USD 267,319.98. Each party to bear its own costs for legal representation and assistance (para 216).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Petroleum Services Corporation v. Republic of Argentina, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/19</strong></td>
<td>USD 1,000,000 claimed in connection with contracts for drilling and exploitation of crude oil in the Deminera Field, damages including USD 1,303,746 for the 2004-2006 period, i.e. USD 2,152,966, plus post-award interest (para 374). Respondent to pay 55% of arbitration costs, i.e. USD 326,724.40 in total (or an extra USD 29,702.21), and Claimant to pay 45%, i.e. USD 267,319.98. Each party to bear its own costs for legal representation and assistance (para 216).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Gas S.A.E. v. Arab Republic of Egypt (ICSID Case No. ARB/11/7)</strong></td>
<td>USD 1,000,000 claimed in connection with the purchase of half of the shares of National Gas (AG) S.A.E. with a view to the development of the Sidi Touil Field, claims including USD 263,500 for the 2004-2005 period, i.e. USD 999,500.00. USD 3,686,188, i.e. USD 6,835,196, plus interest as before.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N/R Claimants submitted three amounts based on different USD 494,552,000; or (iii), using the third approach, President, Mr. L. Yves Fortier CC QC, Prof. Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler (President), Brigitte Stern, Marc Lalonde

Proceedings discontinued, at Respondent's request, due to failure by Claimants to pay their share of the second advance payment requested by ICSID (paras 52, 58 + 62). Quadrant Pacific Growth Fund L.P. and Canasco Holdings Inc. v. Republic of Costa Rica, ICSID Case No.

The Tribunal decides: (paras 626(f) and 626(g):

Claimant won on merits and entitled to damages amounting to USD 20,000,000. Not clear. However, USD 1,650,000 has been advanced by ICSID 3. Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler (President), Honorable Stuart E. Eizenstat, Prof. James Crawford (composed of USD 146,848,827 as of 30 June 2013 plus compound interest from that date + moral damages in the sum of USD 4,000,000 + declaratory relief (para. 73(a) and (b))

Claimant's claims dismissed on merits (para. 519). The tribunal decides (para. 519):... of making a commercial success of the project, plus interest at 10% per annum on all amounts awarded (para 75).

Respondent win. Claims dismissed on merits: although the Respondent had committed an arbitrary and discriminatory breach ... damages failed on causation (para 235). In relation to all other claims, Respondent held not to have breached the BIT.

Claimant win. Respondent ordered to pay principal amount of USD 75,000,000 claimed 24 March 2007 until date of payment (para 692).

Each party to bear its own costs and expenses and amounts paid to ICSID allocated equally (para 127). Parties shall bear the arbitration costs in equal shares. Each Party shall bear its own costs for legal representation and assistance (para 252).

Claimants' 60% shareholding as at 30 October 2003 (para 799).

n.b. Party Costs appear unusually high for such a small claim

n.b. Claimant estimated its loss in excess of USD 575,000 as the amount advanced by.
USD 6,304,378

USD 5,883,770.80 for amount of ICC Award, plus 3.375% interest from 7 June 1993 until 9 May 2003 as set out in that...bond, plus interest at six-month LIBOR rate from 31 December 200; i.e. principal sums totalling USD 7,424,378 excluding interest; plus

5-Oct-04 30-Jun-09

USD 8,444,994

Each party shall bear its own expenses. Parties to bear equally the Tribunal fees and expenses and charges for use of the Centre (para 104 of Award).

Respondent win. Majority of Claimants' claims dismissed on jurisdiction; remaining claims rejected on merits, as...

payment of the warranty bond (para 207).

USD 2,716,500

Claimant withdrew its claim(s) midway through the arbitration

(1) the Claimant must pay 80% (i.e. USD 518,398.72) of the Tribunal's Costs, the Respondent must pay the remaining 20%;

(2) the Claimant must pay its own legal costs and 80% costs, i.e. EUR 142,029.12, (USD 193,975.85);

USD 2,913,786.50 (para 396-397, 401 + 403).

Respondent further ordered to deliver Contract

USD 1,395,009.77

USD 2,970,787.83

USD 865,258.09

USD 8971,504.16 (USD 1,112,399.77) +

USD 1,121,180.55 in other costs and disbursements, i.e.

USD 2,226,438.65

USD 1,792,605.95 in legal fees and USD 1,121,180.55 in other costs and disbursements, i.e.

USD 209,380,000

USD 1,792,605.95 in legal fees and USD 1,121,180.55 in other costs and disbursements, i.e.

USD 209,380,000

USD 1,792,605.95 in legal fees and USD 1,121,180.55 in other costs and disbursements, i.e.

USD 209,380,000

USD 1,792,605.95 in legal fees and USD 1,121,180.55 in other costs and disbursements, i.e.

USD 209,380,000

USD 1,792,605.95 in legal fees and USD 1,121,180.55 in other costs and disbursements, i.e.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Tribunal</th>
<th>Awarded Amount</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Jurisdiction accepted</th>
<th>Jurisdiction rejected</th>
<th>Claimant's claims admissible</th>
<th>Respondent ordered to pay</th>
<th>Arbitration costs explained</th>
<th>Breakdown of expenses <strong>(para. 352)</strong></th>
<th>Claimant win</th>
<th>Respondent ordered to pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Enterprise “Energorynok” (Ukraine) v The Republic of Moldova, SCC Arbitration V (2012/175)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 159,128</strong></td>
<td><strong>USD 2,651,444.90</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suez, and Vivendi Universal v Argentina (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 20,732,568.74</strong></td>
<td><strong>USD 1,013,507.54</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swisslion DOO Skopje v. Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 5,533,017.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>USD 7,257,618.27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toto Costruzioni Generali S.p.A. v. Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 7,712,100.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>USD 900,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulo Costruzioni Generali S.p.A. v. Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 8,995,695.38</strong></td>
<td><strong>USD 137,017,887</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulip Real Estate and Development Netherlands B.V. v. Republic of Turkey, ICSID Case No. ARB/11/28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 2,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>USD 1,013,507.54</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transglobal Green Energy, LLC and Transglobal Green Energy de Panama, S.A. v Panama (ICSID Case No. ARB/13/28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 7,257,618.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>USD 137,017,887</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transglobal Green Energy, LLC and Transglobal Green Energy de Panama, S.A. v. Republic of Turkey (ICSID Case No. ARB/13/28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 7,257,618.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>USD 137,017,887</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCTAD v. Islamic Republic of Iran (Under theFull Title of the Claim)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 7,257,618.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>USD 137,017,887</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCITRAL 3, Dean Ronald A. Cass, L. Yves Fortier QC; Toby Landau QC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 7,257,618.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>USD 137,017,887</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCITRAL 3, Prof. Dr. Karl-Heinz Böckstiegel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 7,257,618.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>USD 137,017,887</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCITRAL 3, Prof. Hans van Houtte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 7,257,618.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>USD 137,017,887</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCITRAL 3, Prof. Georges Abi-Saab, Mr. Grant D. Aldonas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 7,257,618.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>USD 137,017,887</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**USD 1 = SEK 10.1214574900 / DKK 8.8573959260**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Institution</th>
<th>Date of Award</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Award Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74,152.90</td>
<td>23-Jul-12</td>
<td>USD 157,363,348</td>
<td>USD 7,036,487.52</td>
<td>USD 1,045,631.11 in arbitration costs (paras 730-731).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Mar-06</td>
<td>3-Apr-15</td>
<td>USD 1,600,042,482</td>
<td>USD 8,583,150</td>
<td>USD 675,000 + USD 10,885,596.59 (converted from GBP 7,659,105.76))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-May-02</td>
<td>9-Sep-03</td>
<td>USD 3,612,673.24</td>
<td>USD 2,320,549.48</td>
<td>USD 289,862 in total (para 340).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Jul-10</td>
<td>30-Nov-11</td>
<td>USD 2,636,447.18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>USD 230,000,000 (USD 200,000,000 for the damages and at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Jul-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>USD 120,186,762.49</td>
<td>USD 3,644,887.56</td>
<td>not stated in the award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Sep-07</td>
<td>9-Oct-14</td>
<td>USD 15,020,000</td>
<td>USD 74,152.90</td>
<td>As stated in the award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Jun-92</td>
<td>16-Feb-94</td>
<td>USD 1,047,000</td>
<td>USD 675,000</td>
<td>USD 289,855.07 in total (para 605 + 613).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The figures are rounded for clarity. The actual figures may vary slightly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Title</th>
<th>Decision &amp; Dispute Resolution Mechanism</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Award Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wintershall Aktiengesellschaft v. Respondent</td>
<td>Claim dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (para 197).</td>
<td>USD 5,664,815.06 (converted from CZK 35,940,599.34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USD 905,000 (with several alternative claims) (para. 58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USD 90,000,000 (in total between all three Claimants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claimant ordered to pay to the Respondent USD 1,856,276.12 (converted from CZK 35,940,599.34) as Respondent's legal costs and expenses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not disclosed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claimant's claim dismissed on the merits. (para. 192)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Tribunal decides (paras. 190-191): (1) each party will bear its own legal costs; and (2) Claimant shall pay USD 31,500,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Claimant's divided success on quantum reflected in a 20% reduction in the claimed legal costs, resulting in a net award ... Claimant. Respondent to pay 100% of the ICSID costs of Claimant in the amount of USD 299,908.16. Altogether, Respondent...
Courtyard Holdings and Construction Holdings v. Republic of South Africa, ICSID Case No. ARB/16/10

The Tribunal awarded to the Claimants the amount of USD 3,900,374.73, which included the entire Cost of the Arbitration. The Tribunal further ordered the Claimants to bear the costs of the arbitration. The Tribunal also ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 6,367,160.70 in costs and expenses.

I.C.W. Europe Investments Resources Inc. v. Slovak Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/14/14

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 2,145,136 in costs and expenses. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 1,367,956.51 in fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 99,453.95 in costs and expenses. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 9,914,000 in fees.

St. Gobain Holding S.A./S t-Gobain v. Republic of Colombia, ICSID Case No. ARB/13/12

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 99,140,000-99,250,000 in damages. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 13,535,031.85 in interest.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 322,561.14 for the expended portion of the Respondent's advances to ICSID. The Tribunal further ordered the Claimant to pay for legal costs in the sum of USD 3,226,429.21.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 436,328 in arbitrators' fees. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay USD 5,031,684.75 in legal fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 850,594,292. In addition, the Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay USD 2,381,199 in expenses and arbitration fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 501,283 USD in legal fees. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay USD 2,024,216 in expert fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 154,943 in costs.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 4,245,265 in costs.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 1,285,093 in costs.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 3,900,374.73, which included the entire Cost of the Arbitration. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 6,367,160.70 in costs and expenses.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 99,453.95 in costs and expenses. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 9,914,000 in fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 322,561.14 for the expended portion of the Respondent's advances to ICSID. The Tribunal further ordered the Claimant to pay for legal costs in the sum of USD 3,226,429.21.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 436,328 in arbitrators' fees. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay USD 5,031,684.75 in legal fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 850,594,292. In addition, the Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay USD 2,381,199 in expenses and arbitration fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 501,283 USD in legal fees. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay USD 2,024,216 in expert fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 154,943 in costs.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 4,245,265 in costs.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 1,285,093 in costs.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 3,900,374.73, which included the entire Cost of the Arbitration. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 6,367,160.70 in costs and expenses.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 99,453.95 in costs and expenses. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 9,914,000 in fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 322,561.14 for the expended portion of the Respondent's advances to ICSID. The Tribunal further ordered the Claimant to pay for legal costs in the sum of USD 3,226,429.21.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 436,328 in arbitrators' fees. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay USD 5,031,684.75 in legal fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 850,594,292. In addition, the Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay USD 2,381,199 in expenses and arbitration fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 501,283 USD in legal fees. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay USD 2,024,216 in expert fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 154,943 in costs.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 4,245,265 in costs.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 1,285,093 in costs.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 3,900,374.73, which included the entire Cost of the Arbitration. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 6,367,160.70 in costs and expenses.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 99,453.95 in costs and expenses. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 9,914,000 in fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 322,561.14 for the expended portion of the Respondent's advances to ICSID. The Tribunal further ordered the Claimant to pay for legal costs in the sum of USD 3,226,429.21.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 436,328 in arbitrators' fees. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay USD 5,031,684.75 in legal fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 850,594,292. In addition, the Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay USD 2,381,199 in expenses and arbitration fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 501,283 USD in legal fees. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay USD 2,024,216 in expert fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 154,943 in costs.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 4,245,265 in costs.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 1,285,093 in costs.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 3,900,374.73, which included the entire Cost of the Arbitration. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 6,367,160.70 in costs and expenses.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 99,453.95 in costs and expenses. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 9,914,000 in fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 322,561.14 for the expended portion of the Respondent's advances to ICSID. The Tribunal further ordered the Claimant to pay for legal costs in the sum of USD 3,226,429.21.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 436,328 in arbitrators' fees. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay USD 5,031,684.75 in legal fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 850,594,292. In addition, the Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay USD 2,381,199 in expenses and arbitration fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 501,283 USD in legal fees. The Tribunal further ordered the Respondent to pay USD 2,024,216 in expert fees.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 154,943 in costs.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 4,245,265 in costs.

The Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimants USD 1,285,093 in costs.
USD 71,526,686.37

Approx. USD 20,705,241

InfraRed Environmental USD 1,482,200,000 + interest

No separate decision on

USD 84,120,458

(190)

No separate decision on jurisdiction

EUR 1,704,438.11 (para 608)

(Para 614) Claimant win. Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay

USD 215,892.49... and EUR 1,303,368.55 (corresponding to 75% of the Respondent's legal fees and expenses). Claimant must therefore pay

USD 5,552,836.75

USD 1,173,330.24

(Para 248)

USD 5,885,344.17

amount of USD 332,507.42 for the expended portion of Uruguay’s advances to ICSID and USD 5,552,836.75 to cover Uruguay’s legal and expert fees and administrative ex...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Name</th>
<th>Parties</th>
<th>Date RFA/RFA Notice</th>
<th>Date Decision</th>
<th>Amount USD</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South American Silver Limited v. Watkins SRL</td>
<td>Watkins Holdings S.à r.l. and others v. Kingdom of Spain, ICSID Case No. ARB/15/44</td>
<td>13-Sep-2016 (RFA)</td>
<td>18-Feb-2020</td>
<td>10,109,872.71</td>
<td>No separate decision on jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PV Investors v. Spain, PCA Case No. 2012-14</td>
<td>The PV Investors v. Spain, ICSID Case No. ARB/12/24</td>
<td>12-Dec-2008 (RFA)</td>
<td>21-Jul-2017</td>
<td>10,920,000,000</td>
<td>No separate decision on jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caratube International Oil Company LLP and Devincci Salah Hourani v. Republic of Kazakhstan (II), ICSID Case No. ARB/13/13</td>
<td>Caratube International Oil Company LLP and Devincci Salah Hourani v. Republic of Kazakhstan (II), ICSID Case No. ARB/13/13</td>
<td>3-Dec-2013 (RFA)</td>
<td>09-Oct-2018</td>
<td>12,948,301</td>
<td>No separate decision on jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **USD 106,610,282.66** (Sun Reserve Luxco Holdings SRL) is mentioned for an amount.
- **USD 10,109,872.71** (South American Silver Limited v. Watkins SRL) is shown as the decision amount.
- **USD 10,920,000,000** (The PV Investors v. Spain, PCA Case No. 2012-14) is noted in the decision.
- **USD 357,006.075** (Others v. Republic of Venezuela, ICSID Case No. ARB/12/24) is indicated in the decision.
- **USD 12,948,301** (Caratube International Oil Company LLP and Devincci Salah Hourani v. Republic of Kazakhstan (II), ICSID Case No. ARB/13/13) is referenced in the decision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Title</th>
<th>Arbitration Institution</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Amount Claimed</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials Trading Inc. v. State of Libya, ICC Case No. 21603/ZF/AYZ</td>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>Materials Trading Inc.</td>
<td>State of Libya</td>
<td>USD 1,885,100.99</td>
<td>USD 622,110.49</td>
<td>Claimant to bear the costs of arbitration (para 133) LCIA Maxi Scherer Richard Jacobs Miodrag V Orlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enka Insaat ve Sanayi A.S. v. 1. Corporation v. Republic of Poland, PCA Case No. 2015-18</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>Enka Insaat ve Sanayi A.S.</td>
<td>1. Corporation</td>
<td>USD 11,014,745.35</td>
<td>USD 1,158,301.16</td>
<td>Claimant win. Respondent ordered to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anka Kapital A.S. v. Italian Financial Institutions, IA Centre Case No. 2017-5</td>
<td>IA Centre</td>
<td>Anka Kapital A.S.</td>
<td>Italian Financial Institutions</td>
<td>USD 2,143,568.79</td>
<td>USD 3,050,000</td>
<td>Claimant win. Respondent to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valoración y Participación S.A. v. Caja De Desarrollo Eucaristico, ANCP Case No. 2017-03</td>
<td>ANCP</td>
<td>Valoración y Participación S.A.</td>
<td>Caja De Desarrollo Eucaristico, ANCP</td>
<td>USD 1,100,000</td>
<td>USD 155,000</td>
<td>Claimant win. Respondent to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acuerdo del BID sobre Deuda del Uruguay con Dolphin Capital Partners, ICSID Case No. 5665/2013</td>
<td>ICSID</td>
<td>Acuerdo del BID sobre Deuda del Uruguay</td>
<td>Dolphin Capital Partners</td>
<td>14,143,568.79</td>
<td>USD 1,036,082.86</td>
<td>Claimant win. Respondent to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCPG v. Republic of Iraq, PCA Case No. 2015-9</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>OCPG</td>
<td>Republic of Iraq</td>
<td>USD 4,600,000</td>
<td>USD 51,000</td>
<td>Claimant win. Respondent to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enka Insaat ve Sanayi A.S. v. Budapest Bank, PCA Case No. 2015-32</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>Enka Insaat ve Sanayi A.S.</td>
<td>Budapest Bank</td>
<td>USD 1,002,875.81</td>
<td>USD 670,000</td>
<td>Claimant win. Respondent ordered to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankara Kapital A.S. v. Ukrainian National Coal Corporation, UNCITRAL</td>
<td>UNCITRAL</td>
<td>Ankara Kapital A.S.</td>
<td>Ukrainian National Coal Corporation</td>
<td>USD 1,885,100.99</td>
<td>USD 3,050,000</td>
<td>Claimant win. Respondent to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acuerdo del BID sobre Deuda del Uruguay con Dolphin Capital Partners, ICSID Case No. 5665/2013</td>
<td>ICSID</td>
<td>Acuerdo del BID sobre Deuda del Uruguay</td>
<td>Dolphin Capital Partners</td>
<td>USD 15,027,081.89</td>
<td>USD 367,000</td>
<td>Claimant win. Respondent to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCPG v. Republic of Iraq, PCA Case No. 2015-9</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>OCPG</td>
<td>Republic of Iraq</td>
<td>USD 4,600,000</td>
<td>USD 108,500,000</td>
<td>Claimant win. Respondent ordered to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anka Kapital A.S. v. Italian Financial Institutions, IA Centre Case No. 2017-5</td>
<td>IA Centre</td>
<td>Anka Kapital A.S.</td>
<td>Italian Financial Institutions</td>
<td>USD 1,885,100.99</td>
<td>USD 100,000</td>
<td>Claimant win. Respondent ordered to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acuerdo del BID sobre Deuda del Uruguay con Dolphin Capital Partners, ICSID Case No. 5665/2013</td>
<td>ICSID</td>
<td>Acuerdo del BID sobre Deuda del Uruguay</td>
<td>Dolphin Capital Partners</td>
<td>USD 15,027,081.89</td>
<td>USD 367,000</td>
<td>Claimant win. Respondent ordered to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCPG v. Republic of Iraq, PCA Case No. 2015-9</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>OCPG</td>
<td>Republic of Iraq</td>
<td>USD 4,600,000</td>
<td>USD 108,500,000</td>
<td>Claimant win. Respondent ordered to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anka Kapital A.S. v. Italian Financial Institutions, IA Centre Case No. 2017-5</td>
<td>IA Centre</td>
<td>Anka Kapital A.S.</td>
<td>Italian Financial Institutions</td>
<td>USD 1,885,100.99</td>
<td>USD 100,000</td>
<td>Claimant win. Respondent ordered to pay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>