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I Swing My Baby
In 1965 the Executive Directors of the World Bank proposed the ICSID Convention and establishment of the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID). Their proposal was motivated by the “desire to strengthen the partnership between countries in the cause of economic development,” and the conviction that an independent international facility such as ICSID was “a major step toward promoting an atmosphere of mutual confidence and thus stimulating a larger flow of private investment capital into those countries which wish to attract it.” This motivation continues to inspire the work of ICSID and seems especially apt in the face of recent challenges to the global economy.

What could not have been predicted in 1965 was the exponential increase in international investment treaties and the wave of disputes settlement based on treaty provisions. By 2010 there were more than 2,700 investment treaties world-wide, compared to approximately 70 such treaties in 1965. Most of these treaties offer dispute settlement under the ICSID Convention or the ICSID Additional Facility.
Rules. In addition, ICSID dispute settlement clauses continue to be incorporated in numerous international investment contracts and in the domestic investment laws of many States.

These developments have dramatically altered ICSID’s caseload. Most obviously, the number of proceedings has increased, from a single case in 1972 to an average of slightly over 23 new cases per year in 2000–2009. This trend continued in FY2010, when ICSID registered 27 new cases, administered 154 on-going cases, and concluded 34 proceedings. At the same time, the range of issues addressed in ICSID cases became more diverse, including questions related to the availability of provisional measures, the proper role of third non-disputing parties, the meaning of substantive obligations, and the application of customary international law.

ICSID has taken stock of recent developments and the environment in which it operates in FY2010. Our mission remains to provide facility users with expert, timely, cost-effective, and independent dispute settlement. Our priority is to enhance service delivery, recognizing that this is a key contributor to maintaining ICSID’s place as the leader in administration of international investment disputes.

To this end, the 2010 fiscal year began with extensive consultations with facility users and the development of a multi-year strategic plan to respond to the needs identified by facility users. Substantial effort has been devoted to expediting the arbitral process, especially those steps which are undertaken by the ICSID Secretariat. As a result, currently the screening of requests for arbitration takes an average of 27 days and the constitution of tribunals by ICSID takes on average 6 weeks after the parties ask ICSID to make the appointment. We have tendered for installation of an electronic case management system that ultimately will be available to all participants in ICSID arbitration, and we have completely modernized our in-house archiving systems. ICSID also entered into a partnership with the newly opened Maxwell Chambers in Singapore, allowing ICSID parties to use those facilities for ICSID proceedings. ICSID now has partnership agreements with 8 institutions around the world.

Numerous steps have also been taken to enhance prudent financial stewardship of ICSID as an institution and with respect to managing the funds held for the parties in individual proceedings. These include revised procedures to ensure timely refund of outstanding deposits at the conclusion of a case, and centralization of claims for fees and expenses.
Given the importance of accessible, accurate, and complete information about investment arbitration and ICSID, we also began several new knowledge-sharing initiatives in FY2010. Among these initiatives were the first webcast of an ICSID investment arbitration hearing, greater use of the ICSID website to communicate current events, and a tri-lingual online statistical report profiling ICSID arbitration and conciliation. ICSID designed and taught a one-day seminar for new users of the facility covering all aspects of conducting an ICSID Convention proceeding. ICSID has also undertaken a comprehensive project to obtain consent to publish awards, decisions, and procedural orders from concluded cases. Many of these materials are currently unavailable in the public domain, and their publication will assist facility users significantly. These and other initiatives will continue in the upcoming fiscal year.

It has been a privilege to serve as ICSID Secretary-General in the past year. I wish to thank facility users and the ICSID member States for their confidence in the Centre and to assure them that we will continue to strive for excellence as we build toward the ICSID of the future. This task could not be accomplished without the dedication, expertise, creativity, and hard work of every member of the ICSID Secretariat. Together we will accomplish the goals we have set for ICSID and, in turn, contribute to the partnership between countries in the cause of economic development.

Meg Kinnear
Secretary-General
Anonymous, Panama
Mola
As of June 30, 2010, 155 States were signatory to the ICSID Convention. Of these, 144 States are ICSID Contracting States by virtue of their having deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval of the ICSID Convention.

By letter received on July 6, 2009, the Government of the Republic of Ecuador notified the depositary of its denunciation of the ICSID Convention. The denunciation took effect on January 7, 2010, consistent with Article 71 of the ICSID Convention.

On October 27, 2009, Haiti deposited an instrument of ratification of the ICSID Convention with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank). The ICSID Convention entered into force for Haiti on November 26, 2009 pursuant to Article 68(2) of the Convention.

A map showing the distribution of the current ICSID membership and a complete list of the Contracting States and other signatories of the ICSID Convention follow.
This map was produced by the Map Design Unit of The World Bank. The boundaries, colors, denominations and any other information shown on this map do not imply, on the part of The World Bank Group, any judgment on the legal status of any territory, or any endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries.

CONTRACTING STATES TO THE ICSID CONVENTION
SIGNATORY STATES TO THE ICSID CONVENTION
LIST OF CONTRACTING STATES AND OTHER SIGNATORIES
OF THE CONVENTION

AS OF JUNE 30, 2010

The 155 States listed below have signed the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States on the dates indicated. The names of the 144 States that have deposited their instruments of ratification are in bold, and the dates of such deposit and of the attainment of the status of Contracting State by the entry into force of the Convention for each of them are also indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Deposit of Ratification</th>
<th>Entry into Force of Convention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Mar. 24, 1975</td>
<td>May 2, 1991</td>
<td>June 1, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>May 17, 1966</td>
<td>May 25, 1971</td>
<td>June 24, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>Dec. 19, 1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>Apr. 25, 1997</td>
<td>May 14, 1997</td>
<td>June 13, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Dec. 15, 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Deposit of Ratification</td>
<td>Entry into Force of Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Mar. 20, 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Jan. 27, 1966</td>
<td>Apr. 18, 1969</td>
<td>May 18, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Mar. 16, 1966</td>
<td>Apr. 21, 1969</td>
<td>May 21, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>Sep. 4, 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Deposit of Ratification</td>
<td>Entry into Force of Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nov. 18, 1965</td>
<td>Mar. 29, 1971</td>
<td>Apr. 28, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>June 9, 1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>June 1, 1966</td>
<td>Sep. 6, 1966</td>
<td>Oct. 14, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>Aug. 12, 1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Apr. 4, 1995</td>
<td>June 7, 1995</td>
<td>July 7, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Deposit of Ratification</td>
<td>Entry into Force of Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Nov. 22, 1995</td>
<td>Apr. 8, 1996</td>
<td>May 8, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Sep. 4, 1991</td>
<td>Aug. 9, 1993</td>
<td>Sep. 8, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Sep. 6, 1974</td>
<td>Sep. 12, 1975</td>
<td>Oct. 12, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>June 16, 1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>Oct. 1, 1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>May 9, 2007</td>
<td>May 9, 2007</td>
<td>June 8, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>June 4, 1984</td>
<td>June 4, 1984</td>
<td>July 4, 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Mar. 15, 1967</td>
<td>Apr. 9, 1973</td>
<td>May 9, 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>Nov. 3, 1970</td>
<td>June 14, 1971</td>
<td>July 14, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Deposit of Ratification</td>
<td>Entry into Force of Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Jan. 10, 1992</td>
<td>May 18, 1992</td>
<td>June 17, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>May 1, 1989</td>
<td>Mar. 21, 1990</td>
<td>Apr. 20, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>May 28, 1992</td>
<td>Aug. 9, 2000</td>
<td>Sep. 8, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Aug. 18, 1993</td>
<td>May 2, 1995</td>
<td>June 1, 1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
El Anatsui, Ghana
One Out of a Crowd, 1993
CHAPTER 3
PANELS OF CONCILIATORS AND OF ARBITRATORS

The ICSID Convention requires the Centre to maintain a Panel of Conciliators and a Panel of Arbitrators. Under Article 13 of the Convention, each Contracting State may designate up to four persons to each Panel. The designees serve for a renewable period of six years and may be nationals or non-nationals of the designating country. In addition, up to ten persons may be designated to each Panel by the Chairman of the Administrative Council.

The Panels are an important component of the ICSID system of dispute settlement. When the Chairman of the ICSID Administrative Council is called upon to appoint conciliators, arbitrators or ad hoc committee members under Articles 30, 38 or 52 of the ICSID Convention, these appointees must be drawn from the Panels. With an increasing ICSID caseload, it has become ever more important for States to exercise their right to designate nominees to the ICSID Panels. To this end, the Centre continues to encourage States to name qualified candidates where nominations have expired or the panels are otherwise incomplete.
During FY2010, thirteen ICSID Contracting States made designations to the ICSID Panels, namely, Belgium, China, Costa Rica, Georgia, Jordan, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, Spain, Sri Lanka, Syria, and Uganda. Fifty-one persons were designated or re-designated to the Panels. At the end of FY2010, there were 514 Members of the ICSID Panels of Conciliators and of Arbitrators.

Details about the designations to the ICSID Panels made in FY2010 are provided below.

**BELGIUM**
*Panel of Arbitrators*
Designations effective April 5, 2010: Bernard Hanotiau, Guy Keutgen, and Didier Matray

**CHINA**
*Panel of Conciliators*
Designations effective May 5, 2010: Wang Chuanli, Anthony Neoh, Shen Sibao, and Jingchun Shao
*Panel of Arbitrators*
Designations effective May 5, 2010: An Chen, Zhidong Chen, Jin Huang, and Yu Jinsong

**COSTA RICA**
*Panels of Conciliators and of Arbitrators*
Designations effective July 22, 2010: Rodrigo Oreamuno and Rodrigo Barahona Israel

**GEORGIA**
*Panels of Conciliators and of Arbitrators*
Designation effective March 9, 2010: Ana Palacio

**JORDAN**
*Panel of Conciliators*
Designations effective March 3, 2010: Salaheddin Al-Bashir, Hamzeh A. Haddad, Nabil Yacoub Rabah, and Ahmad Nouri Ziadat
*Panel of Arbitrators*
Designations effective March 3, 2010: Awn Shawkat Al-Khasawneh, Mohammad E. Bundukji, Taher Mustafa Hikmet, and Omar N. Nabulsi

**MAURITIUS**
*Panels of Conciliators and of Arbitrators*
Designations effective September 8, 2009: Urmila Boolell, Rajsoomer Lallah, and Salim Moollan

**MOROCCO**
*Panels of Conciliators and of Arbitrators*
Designations effective May 27, 2010: Abdelilah Barjani, Idriss Bouziane, El Hassan El Guassim, and Abdelkader Lahlou
NIGERIA
Panel of Conciliators
Designations effective October 20, 2009:
Folasade O. Adetiba, Mercy Uzoamaka Agbanuche, Fatima Kwaku, and Abdoullahi Ahmed Yola

Panel of Arbitrators
Designations effective August 3, 2009:
Bola A. Ajibola, Abubakar Balarabe Mahmoud, Onyeabo C. Obi, and Christopher Bayo Ojo

PANAMA
Panels of Conciliators and of Arbitrators
Designations effective January 26, 2010:
Cecilia Arosemena de González Ruiz, Eric Alexander Britton Gallardo, María Fábrega, and Esteban López Moreno

SPAIN
Panel of Conciliators
Designation effective March 21, 2010:
Evelio Verdera y Tuells

Panel of Arbitrators
Designation effective February 16, 2010:
Juan Fernández-Armesto

Panels of Conciliators and of Arbitrators
Designations effective July 14, 2010:
Bernardo M. Cremades and José Carlos Fernández Rozas

SRI LANKA
Panels of Conciliators and of Arbitrators
Designation effective June 7, 2010:
Srilal M. Perera

SYRIA
Panels of Conciliators and of Arbitrators
Designations effective April 8, 2010:
Mohammed Al-Ghafari, Humoud Altabban, Riad Daoudi, and Fouad Raji Dib

UGANDA
Panel of Arbitrators
Designation effective January 19, 2010:
Francis M. Ssekandi
Victor Ekpuk, Nigeria
*I Be You You Be Me*, 2007
CHAPTER 4
DISPUTES BEFORE THE CENTRE

The Centre’s caseload continued to increase in the past fiscal year. As of June 30, 2010, the number of cases registered by the Centre since its inception reached 319. Roughly half of those 319 cases were being administered by the Centre in FY2010, making it another dynamic year for the ICSID Secretariat.

In FY2010 the Centre registered 27 new proceedings. This represents a 12 percent increase from the previous fiscal year and indicates that ICSID continues to play a leadership role in institutional investor-State dispute settlement. The nationality of the parties involved in these new cases also suggests that the ICSID mechanism is invoked by investors from States at all levels of development. Increasingly, investors from developing economies initiate arbitration proceedings against host States. Twenty-five percent of the new cases registered during FY2010 were initiated by investors from the developing world. The new cases also demonstrate a noticeable geographic diversity. Twenty-four of the 27 new cases registered by ICSID were brought against 24 different respondent States, with only one State being involved in more than one new ICSID proceeding.
All of the new cases registered in FY2010 are arbitration proceedings. Twenty-five of these are conducted under the ICSID Convention and 2 under the ICSID Additional Facility Rules. The majority (19) of the new cases asserted ICSID jurisdiction on the basis of dispute settlement provisions contained in bilateral investment treaties (BITs), and 1 case was instituted on the basis of the Investment Chapter of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement (DR-CAFTA). In 9 cases, the parties invoked ICSID arbitration clauses contained in investment laws or in investment contracts between the investor and the host State. Two of the 9 cases also relied on BITs, in the alternative. The number of cases brought on the basis of investment contracts increased considerably compared to FY2009, during which only 3, i.e., half as many cases were initiated on a contractual basis.
The Centre further registered 4 proceedings in which the parties sought post-award remedies. These proceedings include 1 request for interpretation and correction of an award previously rendered under the ICSID Additional Facility Rules. Three applications for annulment under the ICSID Convention were also registered. This is a sharp decline compared to the 8 and 9 applications for annulment registered during FY2009 and FY2008, respectively, and indicates that fewer parties sought review of an ICSID award on the grounds of Article 52 of the ICSID Convention in the past year.

**Number of Annulment Applications Registered by ICSID in the Past Three Fiscal Years**

Thirty-four proceedings were concluded in the course of FY2010. Twenty-four arbitration proceedings, concluded in the past fiscal year. Twenty-one awards were rendered. Five tribunals declined ICSID jurisdiction, 7 awards dismissed all of the investor’s claims, and a further 7 awards partially upheld the claims. In 2 proceedings, the parties’ settlement agreement was embodied in an arbitral award. Three additional arbitration cases were discontinued at the request of one or both of the parties. Seven annulment proceedings were also concluded during the fiscal year, the highest number ever in the Centre’s history. In 4 cases, the respective *ad hoc* Committees rejected the application for annulment of the award. In 1 case, the *ad hoc* Committee annulled the award partially, 1 *ad hoc* Committee annulled the arbitral award in full, and 1 annulment proceeding was discontinued at the request of both parties. Two revision proceedings were also concluded during FY2010.
tribunal issued a decision on a party’s request for revision of the award, and another revision proceeding was discontinued at the request of both parties concerned. In a further case, a tribunal issued a decision on interpretation and correction of the award.

In the past fiscal year, the geographic location of State parties involved in ongoing ICSID proceedings remained largely steady; however, the Centre noticed a diversification of the respondent States in the new cases registered in FY2010. As mentioned above, 24 of the 27 new cases registered by ICSID involve 24 different respondent States, with only one State being named in more than one new ICSID case. During FY2010, the Centre registered 8 new cases involving States from South America, and 6 cases were commenced against States from Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Four further cases were brought against States from Sub-Saharan Africa and 3 cases involved respondent States from Central America and the Caribbean region. Respondent States from the Middle East and North Africa region were involved in 3 cases, and 2 proceedings were initiated against States from South and East Asia. One further arbitration was instituted against a North American State Party.

**Geographic Distribution of Cases Registered during FY2010, by State Party Involved**
During FY2010, more cases were brought to ICSID by investors from developing nations and against respondent States from the developing world than in previous fiscal years. In about 25 percent of the new cases, both parties to the dispute were from developing countries. In total, ICSID administered 22 such disputes during the past fiscal year, a sizeable increase compared to FY2009 during which the Secretariat administered 14 such cases. As in the previous fiscal year, the Centre continued to administer 2 arbitrations between parties from high-income economies.

The majority of the 154 cases pending before the Centre in the course of the past year continued to involve States from South and Central America and the Caribbean region (49 percent). The portion of cases from the Central American and Caribbean region increased from 6 percent in FY2009 to 9 percent in FY2010. A quarter (25 percent) of the cases administered during the year concerned respondent States located in Central Asia and Eastern Europe. The number of cases administered involving States from Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East and North Africa region, South and East Asia, North America and Western Europe remained largely unchanged.

As in the previous fiscal year, the majority of cases pending before the Centre was initiated by judicial persons; about 15 percent of the Centre’s caseload during FY2010 was commenced by natural persons against respondent States.

The investment disputes initiated in the course of FY2010 concerned a variety of economic sectors. Applying the World Bank’s industry sector codes to classify the newly registered ICSID cases, the oil, gas and mining sector was predominant (37 percent), followed by the transportation sector (11 percent). Twenty-one percent of the disputes concerned, in equal shares, electric power and other energy; tourism, and services and trade (7 percent each). The remaining cases related to agriculture, construction, information and communication, and water, sanitation and flood protection.
Of the total 154 cases administered by ICSID, about a quarter, or 27 percent, related to investments in the oil, gas or mining sector. A further 16 percent concerned electric power and other energy. The transportation sector was also prominent, being the subject of 12 percent of the disputes pending before the Centre in FY2010. A further 8 percent of the pending cases related to information and communication, and 7 percent involved the financial service industry. Tourism was the subject of 6 percent of the disputes, and a further 6 percent concerned water, sanitation and flood protection. Six percent of the disputes concerned agriculture, fishing and forestry, and the construction industry in equal shares (3 percent each). The remainder of the 154 pending cases related to a variety of other industries and services.
Thirty-seven tribunals and 3 ad hoc Committees were constituted or reconstituted in the course of FY2010. Sixty-two individuals from 28 different nationalities were appointed to serve as arbitrators or ad hoc Committee members. Seventy-five percent of the total 93 appointments were made by the parties or party-selected arbitrators, and the remaining 25 percent were made by the ICSID Secretary-General or the Chairman of the Administrative Council. This represents a considerable increase in party appointments, compared to the previous fiscal year, during which only about two-thirds of appointments were made by the parties or party-selected arbitrators. This trend may be attributable to the revised approach to arbitrator appointments adopted by the Secretariat in FY2010, where a preliminary effort is made to propose three candidates to the parties for their mutual agreement, failing which the nomination is made from the ICSID panels. This revised process will enhance the ability of parties to select a mutually agreeable arbitrator and increase their role in the proceedings. In total, the Centre acted 23 times as the appointing authority during FY2010, and appointed 21 different individuals representing 16 nationalities. Twenty-six percent of the Centre’s appointees were nationals from developing countries.

Over the past year, 88 hearings or sessions were held in the cases administered by ICSID, either at the seat of the Centre in Washington, D.C., or at other venues as agreed by the parties. Where suitable, first sessions, pre-hearing conferences or procedural meetings were held by telephone or video conference, mindful of cost and efficient use of time for all involved.

In 89 of the cases pending before ICSID during FY2010, the proceedings were conducted in 1 of the 3 official languages of ICSID (English, French and Spanish), with the vast majority conducted in English only. In 65 cases, the proceedings were conducted in 2 official languages, with the English-Spanish combination being the most prominent (i.e., in 59 of the cases).
Arbitral tribunals and ad hoc Committees issued a large number of decisions and procedural orders during FY2010. A noticeable development in the investment disputes before the Centre in FY2010 was an increase in proposals to disqualify tribunal members. In the course of the year, parties sought to disqualify 11 arbitrators, 1 in an UNCITRAL case and the remainder in ICSID Convention cases. Six of these proposals were declined, 3 arbitrators subsequently resigned, and 2 of the proposals are yet to be decided. In another ICSID case, a party filed a proposal for disqualification of the other party’s counsel.

In the past year, the ICSID Secretariat also provided administrative support to 3 investor-State arbitrations conducted under the UNCITRAL Rules. One of these proceedings, an arbitration conducted under Chapter 11 of the NAFTA, was concluded by an award in March 2010. The Centre’s administrative services in these proceedings range from support with the organization of hearings or assistance with financial matters, to full administrative services comparable to those rendered in proceedings conducted under the ICSID Rules. In 1 further UNCITRAL proceeding, the ICSID Secretary-General was requested to act as an appointing authority of an arbitrator.
The Annex to this report details selected procedural developments in each of the ICSID Convention and Additional Facility Rules proceedings administered by the Centre in FY2010. Such procedural details are also available on the ICSID website and are continuously updated over the year.

The chart below shows the basic steps in an ICSID arbitration.

**Conduct of ICSID Proceedings**

- Request for Arbitration
- Registration
- Refusal to Register
- Constitution of the Tribunal
- First Session
- Written Procedure
- Oral Procedure
- Deliberations
- Award
- Supplementary Decision and Rectification
- Post-Award Remedies: Annulment, Interpretation, Revision
Carlos Alfredo Runcie-Tanaka, Peru

*In a Line*
CHAPTER 5
OUTREACH

PUBLICATIONS UPDATE

ICSID REVIEW — During FY2010, the Centre published two issues of the ICSID Review — Foreign Investment Law Journal (Spring 2008 and Fall 2008). These featured articles on topics as diverse as the relationship between diplomatic protection and investment treaties, nationality requirements, and national court involvement in international arbitration. In addition, work was begun on the Spring 2009 and Fall 2009 issues.

ICSID also launched the ICSID Review Student Writing Competition. The author of the winning submission, to be chosen by a panel of experts in late summer 2010, will have his or her essay published in the ICSID Review. The Student Writing Competition supports an important component of the Centre’s mission by encouraging scholarship in the field of international investment law.
COLLECTIONS — The Centre continued to update its multi-volume collections of investment treaties and laws. One new release for the Investment Promotion and Protection Treaties collection was published in March 2010, containing the texts of 20 bilateral investment treaties. One release of Investment Laws of the World also issued this year including updates on investment legislation in Algeria, the Central African Republic, Malaysia, Niger and Turkmenistan.

NEWS FROM ICSID — The Centre published one issue of News from ICSID in FY2010 (Summer 2009). ICSID has decided to discontinue this publication and instead will communicate newsworthy items on its website.

THE ICSID CASELOAD — STATISTICS — The Centre published its first issue of The ICSID Caseload — Statistics (Issue 2010-1) during FY2010. This report complements ICSID’s efforts to increase understanding about the ICSID process. It is available in English, French and Spanish and profiles the ICSID caseload, historically and for 2009. The ICSID Secretariat will update this information on a bi-annual basis.

PUBLICATION INITIATIVE — In Spring 2010, the ICSID Secretariat initiated a project to provide access to as much ICSID case law as possible, including procedural and substantive rulings. To that end, the Secretariat is seeking authorization from parties to publish decisions, orders and awards not yet published by the Centre.

PUBLIC HEARING WEBCAST — On May 31 and June 1, 2010, ICSID transmitted a webcast of the hearing on preliminary objections in Pac Rim Cayman LLC v Republic of El Salvador (ICSID Case No. ARB/09/12) from Washington, D.C. This first live streaming of an ICSID case was accessed by numerous students, lawyers and academics, and further promotes understanding of investment dispute settlement under the ICSID Convention. Webcasting of proceedings is now available to all parties arbitrating at the Centre.
CONFERENCES

ICSID once again co-sponsored a Joint Colloquium on International Arbitration with the American Arbitration Association (AAA) and the International Court of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC). The theme was “Adapting Arbitration to a Changing World,” and the conference was hosted by the ICSID Secretariat in Washington, D.C. on November 20, 2009. Over 200 participants representing 24 countries attended the colloquium and the proceedings will be published in the ICSID Review. On November 21, 2009, ICSID co-sponsored a symposium with the London Court of International Arbitration.

On June 21, 2010, ICSID held a one-day primer course called ICSID 101. This took place at the headquarters of the World Bank. ICSID lawyers explained the workings of the ICSID system and gave advice on how to present a case as effectively as possible. The event was attended by over 60 individuals, including private practitioners, diplomats, policymakers and government officials.

In addition to the Joint Colloquium and ICSID 101, ICSID staff participated in over 50 speaking engagements in locations as diverse as Singapore, Tunis, Buenos Aires, Stockholm and New York.

ICSID STAFF PUBLICATIONS

During FY2010, ICSID staff published the following:


Amine Assouad, Introductory Note: Ahmonseto, Inc. and others v. Arab Republic of Egypt, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/15, Award (June 18, 2007), 23 ICSID Rev.—FILJ 352 (Fall 2008)


Milanka Kostadinova, Case Summary: *Desert Line Projects LLC v. Republic of Yemen*, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/17, Award (Feb. 6, 2008), 23 ICSID Rev.—FILJ 175 (Spring 2008)

Éloïse Obadia, Introductory Note: *Challenge Decisions*, 23 ICSID Rev.—FILJ 376 (Fall 2008)


Katia Yannaca-Small, Introductory Note: *Ares International S.r.l. and MetalGeo S.r.l. v. Georgia*, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/23, Award (Feb. 28, 2008), 23 ICSID Rev.—FILJ 186 (Spring 2008)


**ICSID DOCUMENTS AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS**

*List of Contracting States and Other Signatories of the Convention*, Doc. ICSID/3 (periodic updates) (English, French and Spanish)

*Contracting States and Measures Taken by Them for the Purpose of the Convention*, Doc. ICSID/8 (periodic updates) (English)

*Members of the Panels of Conciliators and of Arbitrators*, Doc. ICSID/10 (periodic updates) (English)


ICSID Model Clauses, Doc. ICSID/5/Rev. 1 (February 1, 1993) (English, French and Spanish) (Internet edition only)


Bilateral Investment Treaties 1959–2007: Chronological Country Data (Internet edition only)

ICSID Annual Report (1967—) (English, French and Spanish)

ICSID Review—Foreign Investment Law Journal (semi-annual) (available from Journals Publishing Division, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2715 North Charles Street, Baltimore, M.D. 21218–4363, U.S.A.; Ph: 410–516–6987; Fax: 410–516–6968; E-mail: jrnlcirc@press.jhu.edu; the publication can also be ordered online at http://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/icsid_review)
Documents Concerning the Origin and Formulation of the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (1967; 2001; 2006) (English, French and Spanish) (available from the Centre at US$250)

Investment Laws of the World (ten loose-leaf volumes) and Investment Treaties (ten loose-leaf volumes) (available from Oxford University Press, Order Department, 2001 Evans Road, Cary, N.C. 27513; Tel.: 800–624–0153; Fax: 919–677–8877; Email: library.sales@oup.com at US$2,330 for both sets, US$1,165 for the ten Investment Laws of the World volumes only and US$1,165 for the ten Investment Treaties volumes only)

The ICSID Caseload — Statistics, Issue 2010–1 (contains a profile of the ICSID caseload; the Secretariat will update this information on a bi-annual basis) (English, French and Spanish) (Internet edition only)
Maria Naita, Uganda
Agents of Peace
CHAPTER 6
FORTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL


The Administrative Council approved the Centre’s 2009 Annual Report and its administrative budget for FY2010 at that meeting. The Resolutions adopted at the Meeting are reproduced below.

**AC(43)/RES/115—Approval of the Annual Report**

The Administrative Council
RESOLVES
To approve the 2009 Annual Report on the operation of the Centre.

**AC(43)/RES/116—Adoption of Budget for Fiscal Year 2010**

The Administrative Council
RESOLVES
To adopt, for the period July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010, the budget set forth in paragraph 2 of the Report and Proposal of the Secretary-General on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2010.
Rudolf Sikora, Slovak Republic
Skice K "Rozbity Kriz", 1987
CHAPTER 7
FINANCE

ICSID’s administrative expenditures in FY2010 were covered by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) pursuant to the Memorandum of Administrative Arrangements concluded between IBRD and ICSID in February 1967, and also by fee income. It is therefore not necessary to assess any excess expenditures on Contracting States pursuant to Article 17 of the Convention.

Expenditures relating to pending arbitration proceedings are borne by the parties in accordance with ICSID’s Administrative and Financial Regulations.

The Financial Statements of the Centre for FY2010 are set forth in the following pages.
## FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

EXPRESSED IN UNITED STATES DOLLAR

### STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>June 30, 2010</th>
<th>June 30, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$2,021,451</td>
<td>$1,057,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of the cash and investments in the Pool (Notes 2 and 3)</td>
<td>18,540,904</td>
<td>18,403,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from parties to arbitration/conciliation proceedings (Note 2)</td>
<td>632,706</td>
<td>894,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other receivables</td>
<td>25,003</td>
<td>14,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets, net (Notes 2 and 4)</td>
<td>402,824</td>
<td>326,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,622,888</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,696,945</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</th>
<th>June 30, 2010</th>
<th>June 30, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payable to International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (Note 2)</td>
<td>$883,567</td>
<td>$204,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances from parties to arbitration/conciliation proceedings (Note 2)</td>
<td>13,905,955</td>
<td>15,076,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued expenses related to arbitration/conciliation proceedings</td>
<td>5,267,654</td>
<td>4,221,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue (Note 2)</td>
<td>1,025,000</td>
<td>832,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance from International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (Note 5)</td>
<td>540,712</td>
<td>361,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,622,888</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,696,945</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities and net assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,622,888</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,696,945</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STATEMENTS OF ACTIVITIES

For the year ended June 30, 2010 June 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support and revenues:</th>
<th>$27,384,001</th>
<th>$23,041,928</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues from arbitration/conciliation proceedings (Notes 2 and 7)</td>
<td>$25,768,558</td>
<td>$20,402,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind contributions (Notes 2 and 9)</td>
<td>1,521,393</td>
<td>2,371,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net investment income (Note 2)</td>
<td>63,139</td>
<td>250,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of publications (Note 9)</td>
<td>30,911</td>
<td>17,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total support and revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,384,001</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,041,928</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses related to arbitration/conciliation proceedings (Notes 2 and 8)</td>
<td>22,083,731</td>
<td>18,129,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses (Note 9)</td>
<td>5,134,203</td>
<td>4,626,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net investment income applied to arbitration/conciliation proceedings (Note 2)</td>
<td>63,139</td>
<td>250,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization expenses (Notes 2 and 4)</td>
<td>102,928</td>
<td>34,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,384,001</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,041,928</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change in net assets | $ — | $ — |
### STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS

For the year ended June 30, 2010 | June 30, 2009
--- | ---

**Cash flows from operating activities:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>June 30, 2010</th>
<th>June 30, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in net assets</td>
<td>$—</td>
<td>$—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to reconcile change in net assets to net cash provided by operating activities</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>102,928</td>
<td>34,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in due from parties to arbitration/conciliation proceedings</td>
<td>261,748</td>
<td>113,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in other receivables</td>
<td>(10,402)</td>
<td>(14,601)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in payable to International Bank for Reconstruction and Development</td>
<td>678,989</td>
<td>204,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Decrease)/Increase in advances from parties to arbitration/conciliation proceedings</td>
<td>(1,170,746)</td>
<td>3,460,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase/(Decrease) in accrued expenses related to arbitration/conciliation proceedings</td>
<td>1,046,026</td>
<td>(1,147,921)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in deferred revenue</td>
<td>192,434</td>
<td>832,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash provided by operating activities</strong></td>
<td>1,100,977</td>
<td>3,482,801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cash flows from investing activities:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>June 30, 2010</th>
<th>June 30, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in share in pooled investments</td>
<td>(137,029)</td>
<td>(2,425,298)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of other assets</td>
<td>(179,240)</td>
<td>(273,152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash used in investing activities</strong></td>
<td>(316,269)</td>
<td>(2,698,450)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cash flows from financing activities:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>June 30, 2010</th>
<th>June 30, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advance from International Bank for Reconstruction and Development</td>
<td>179,240</td>
<td>273,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash provided by financing activities</strong></td>
<td>179,240</td>
<td>273,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net increase in cash and cash equivalent</strong></td>
<td>963,948</td>
<td>1,057,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalent at beginning of the year</td>
<td>1,057,503</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash and cash equivalent end of the year</strong></td>
<td>$2,021,451</td>
<td>$1,057,503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
NOTE 1 — ORGANIZATION
The International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (the Centre), established on October 14, 1966, is a member of the World Bank Group which also includes the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Finance Corporation (IFC), the International Development Association (IDA) and the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA). The Centre provides facilities for the conciliation and arbitration of investment disputes between Contracting States and nationals of other Contracting States. The Centre provides such facilities for cases brought under the ICSID Convention, the ICSID Additional Facility Rules, or where parties involved so request, under the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. In order to process the cases, the Centre constitutes Conciliation Commissions, Arbitral Tribunals or ad hoc Committees, as necessary. On February 13, 1967, IBRD and the Centre entered into Administrative Arrangements, which were effective as of the date of the establishment of the Centre. The Memorandum of Administrative Arrangements (the Memorandum) provides that, except to the extent that ICSID, pursuant to its Administrative and Financial Regulations, collects funds from the parties to proceedings to cover the Centre’s administrative expenses, IBRD shall provide reasonable facilities and services to ICSID, as described in Notes 2 and 9 without charge.

NOTE 2 — SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES
*Basis of Accounting and Financial Statement Presentation*: The financial statements have been prepared in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (US GAAP) and with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB).

*Use of Estimates*: The preparation of financial statements in conformity with US GAAP and IFRS requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets, liabilities, revenues and expenses, together with the related disclosures as at the date of the financial statements.
Management estimates the amount of unbilled expenses incurred by arbitrators, and related revenues, for ongoing cases at each year end. The nature of arbitration/conciliation cases handled by the Centre requires the use of external arbitrators, who charge fees for their service based on time spent on the cases. The estimation process uses information received from the arbitrators about unbilled time spent on the cases through the end of the fiscal year. In some cases the determination of arbitrators’ fees and expenses incurred for ongoing cases is based on estimated time spent by the arbitrators in relation to the progress of the case and the number of proceedings through the end of the year. Actual results of arbitrator fees earned but unbilled, and arbitration/conciliation case expenses incurred for the year may differ materially from management’s estimates.

**Cash and Cash Equivalents:** Cash and cash equivalents consists of cash held in a bank account.

**Share of the Cash and Investments in the Pool:** The Centre’s share in the cash and investments in the Pool is held for trading and is reported at fair value. Resulting gains or losses are reported as an increase or reduction, respectively, in Net investment income in the Statement of Activities. All income earned is required to be applied to the parties to arbitration/conciliation proceedings.

**Due from Parties to the arbitration/conciliation proceedings:** Direct expenses incurred by arbitrators in excess of advance payments made by the parties to the ongoing arbitration/conciliation proceedings are recognized as due from parties to arbitration/conciliation proceedings and are payable in accordance with the Centre’s Administrative and Financial Regulations (Regulations).

**Other assets and amortization:** The Centre’s other assets comprise computer systems software and web site development costs which are capitalized at cost and amortized over four years using the straight line method. Amortization is charged from commencement of the use of the software.

The Centre evaluates the carrying value of software and web site annually, and whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate that impairment has occurred. Impairment is considered to have occurred if the carrying amount exceeds its recoverable amount, at which time, a write-down would be recorded.

**Payable to International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:** This represents the balance of outstanding expenses paid by IBRD on behalf of ICSID, which are incurred in the normal course of business.
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (CONTINUED)

Advances from parties to arbitration/conciliation proceedings: In accordance with the Regulations, the Centre periodically requests parties to arbitration/conciliation proceedings to make advance payments to cover administrative charges, and the fees and expenses of the Conciliation Commissions, Arbitral Tribunals or ad hoc Committees. These advances are recorded as liabilities.

Revenues from arbitration/conciliation proceedings: The Centre’s direct expenses attributable to arbitration/conciliation proceedings are borne by the parties in accordance with the Centre’s Regulations. These direct expenses, which include fees and travel expenses and the costs associated with meeting rooms and support services for conducting proceedings are paid out from Advances from parties (see Note 8). Accordingly, the Centre recognizes revenues from these transactions during the period to the extent expenses are incurred related to arbitration/conciliation proceedings.

Revenues from arbitration/conciliation proceedings also include the following (see Note 7):

Case registration fees: The Centre charges a non-refundable fee of $25,000 to parties wishing to institute an arbitration/conciliation proceeding or $10,000 for parties wishing to request a supplementary decision to, or the rectification, interpretation, revision or annulment of an arbitral award, or request resubmission of a dispute to a new Tribunal after the annulment of an arbitral award. The revenues are recognized upon receipt of payment from the parties to the case.

Administration fees: The Centre charges $20,000 following the constitution of the Conciliation Commission, Arbitral Tribunal or ad hoc Committee concerned and the same amount on an annual basis thereafter. The Centre collects administration fees from advance deposits from the parties to arbitration/conciliation proceedings. The revenues are recognized on a straight-line basis, over the twelve month period in which service is performed. The unearned revenue at year end is deferred and recognized in the subsequent fiscal year.

Case attendance fees: If the proceeding is held away from the seat of the Centre, the Centre charges case attendance fee of $1,500 per day of the meetings when the Secretary of the Commission, Tribunal, or Committee attends the meetings. The Centre collects these fees from advance deposits from the parties to the arbitration/conciliation proceedings. The fees are recognized as revenue when the service is rendered.
**Investment of undisbursed advances from parties and refund of surplus to the parties:** Net investment income earned on funds advanced from parties is recorded as revenue and expense in the Statement of Activities, and applied to Advances from parties to arbitration/conciliation proceedings, which can be used for expenses related to arbitration/conciliation proceedings. After the completion of an arbitration and conciliation proceeding, if it is determined that there is an excess of advances and investment income over expenditures for the proceedings, the surplus is refunded to the parties in proportion to the amounts advanced by each party to the Centre.

**Value of services provided by IBRD and in-kind contributions:**
IBRD provides support services and facilities to the Centre including the following:

1. the services of staff members and consultants; and
2. other administrative services and facilities, such as travel, communications, office accommodations, furniture, equipment, supplies and printing.

In accordance with FASB ASC 958 *Not-for-Profit Entities*, the value of services provided by IBRD is determined by the estimated fair value of these services, net of the Centre’s reimbursements to IBRD, and is recorded by the Centre as in-kind contributions and also as an expense of the Centre.

**Relevant accounting and reporting developments**

**Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB):** In June 2009 the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) issued Statement of Financial Accounting Standards (FAS) No. 168, *the FASB Accounting Standards Codification™ and the Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles* (FAS 168), which establishes the FASB Accounting Standards Codification (the ASC or Codification) as the single source of authoritative U.S. GAAP. FAS 168 later became Accounting Standards Update (ASU) 2009-1. The Codification was effective July 1, 2009, and did not change existing US GAAP, but changed the structure of and all references to authoritative accounting guidance.

In January 2010, the FASB issued ASU No. 2010-06, *Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures: Improving Disclosures about Fair Value Measurements (Topic 820)*. The ASU requires new disclosures about transfers in and out of Level 1 and 2 fair value measurements, and is effective for interim and annual periods beginning after December 15, 2009. The update does not have a material impact on the Centre’s financial reporting.
International Accounting Standards Board: In May 2010, as part of its improvements project, the IASB issued amendments to IFRS 7 Financial Instruments: Disclosures-Clarification of disclosures which is applicable for annual periods beginning on or after January 1, 2011. The amendment clarifies and amends the qualitative, quantitative and credit risk disclosures. The amendments center on improvement of qualitative disclosures in the context of quantitative and credit risk disclosures that would help users of the financial statements form an overall picture of the nature and extent of risk arising from financial instruments. The Centre is currently evaluating the impact of these amendments.

NOTE 3 — SHARE OF CASH AND INVESTMENT IN THE POOL AND FAIR VALUE MEASUREMENT

Amounts paid to the Centre, but not yet disbursed, are managed by IBRD, which maintains a single investment portfolio (the Pool) for all of the trust funds administered by the World Bank Group, and the funds of the Centre. IBRD maintains the Pool’s assets separate and apart from the funds of the World Bank Group.

The Pool is divided into sub-portfolios to which allocations are made based on fund specific investment horizons, risk tolerances and/or other eligibility requirements for trust funds with common characteristics as determined by IBRD as Administrator. Generally, the Pool is invested in cash and liquid financial instruments such as money market instruments, government and agency obligations, mortgage-backed securities and other high-grade bonds. The Pool may also include securities pledged as collateral under repurchase agreements with other counterparties and receivables from resale agreements for which it has accepted collateral. Additionally, the Pool also includes derivative contracts such as currency forward contracts, currency swaps and interest rates swaps. The Centre’s funds are invested in a sub-portfolio of the Pool which invests solely in cash and money market instruments such as overnight time deposits, time term deposits, certificate of deposits and commercial paper with terms of three months or less recorded at par value which approximates fair value.

Share in pooled cash and investments represents the Centre’s allocated share of the Pool’s fair value at the end of the reporting period. Net investment income consists of the Centre’s allocated share of: interest income earned by the Pool, realized gains/losses from sales of securities, and unrealized gains/losses resulting from recording the assets held by the Pool at fair value. As explained in Note 2, Net investment income is recorded as revenue and expense in the Statement of Activities, and applied to Advances from parties to arbitration/conciliation proceedings, which can be used for expenses related to arbitration/conciliation proceedings.
IBRD as Administrator, on behalf of ICSID, has an established and documented process of determining fair values of the financial instruments in the Pool. Fair value is based upon quoted market prices for identical and similar instruments, where available. Financial instruments for which quoted market prices are not readily available are valued based on discounted cash flow methods. These models primarily use market-based or independently-sourced market parameters such as yield curves, interest rates, volatilities, foreign exchange rates and credit curves.

ICSID’s financial instruments are categorized based on the priority of the inputs to the valuation technique. The fair value hierarchy gives the highest priority to quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities (Level 1), the next highest priority to observable market-based inputs or inputs that are corroborated by market data (Level 2) and the lowest priority to unobservable inputs that are not corroborated by market data (Level 3). When the inputs used to measure fair value fall within different levels of the hierarchy, the level within which the fair value measurement is categorized is based on the lowest level input that is significant to the fair value measurement of the instrument in its entirety. ICSID categorizes overnight time deposits as Level 1 and the other money market instruments as Level 2.

The following table presents the fair value hierarchy for ICSID’s financial instruments in its share of the cash and investments in the Pool measured at fair value on a recurring basis as of June 30, 2010 and 2009:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy level</th>
<th>June 30, 2010</th>
<th>June 30, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>$ 3,151,954</td>
<td>$ 1,956,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>15,388,950</td>
<td>16,446,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 18,540,904</td>
<td>$ 18,403,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of June 30, 2010 and 2009, ICSID does not have any financial instruments measured at fair value on a non-recurring basis.

All other financial assets and financial liabilities are carried at cost. Their carrying values are considered to be a reasonable estimate of fair value because none of the instruments are considered to be impaired.
NOTE 4 — OTHER ASSETS
Other assets comprise computer systems software and web site development costs. Amortization charges amounted to $102,928 for the year ended June 30, 2010 (2009: $34,960) and are reflected in the Statements of Activities.

NOTE 5 — ADVANCE FROM INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT
During the year ended June 30, 2008, the Bank agreed to lend up to $917,000 to the Centre to enable the Centre to acquire software and develop an information system. The loan bears no interest and is repayable in full within four years upon completion of the development of the information system. The information system is being developed in phases and some of the phases are still in progress. At June 30, 2010, the Centre had borrowed $540,712 (2009: $361,472).

NOTE 6 — RISK ARISING FROM FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS
The majority of the Centre’s assets consists of its share in the Pool. The Pool is actively managed and invested in accordance with the investment strategy established by IBRD for all trust funds administered by the World Bank Group. The objectives of the investment strategy are foremost to maintain adequate liquidity to meet foreseeable cash flow needs and preserve capital and then to maximize investment returns. The Centre also holds funds in a depository bank account.

The Centre is exposed to credit and liquidity risks. The risk management policies employed to manage these risks are discussed below:

Credit risk — The risk that one party to a financial instrument will fail to discharge an obligation and cause the other party to incur a financial loss. Of the Centre’s financial assets, Cash held in the depository bank account, is subject to US Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) insurance limits, and not subject to credit risk. Therefore, the Centre’s maximum credit exposure at June 30, 2010 is equivalent to the gross value of the remaining assets amounting to $20,970,064 (2009: $20,120,433).

IBRD invests the Centre’s share of Pooled Investments in money market instruments. The Centre’s share of the cash and investments in the Pool is not traded in any market; however, the assets within the Pool are traded in the market and are reported at fair value. IBRD’s policy is to only invest in
money market instruments issued or guaranteed by financial institutions whose senior debt securities are rated at least A-. At the reporting date, 100% of the Centre’s share of the investment portfolio is held in securities rated at least A (2009: 100%) and 73% is held in securities rated at least AA- (2009: 54%).

IBRD defines the concentration of credit risk as the extent to which the Pooled investments are held by an individual counterparty. The concentration of credit risk with respect to the Pool of investments is mitigated because IBRD has investment policies that limit the amount of credit exposure to any individual issuer.

Other receivables and amounts due from parties to arbitration/conciliation proceedings result from the ordinary course of business. The amounts are neither past due or impaired.

Liquidity risk — The risk that an entity will encounter difficulty in raising liquid funds to meet its commitments. ICSID regulations require parties to disputes to make advance deposits with the Centre to meet anticipated expenses of arbitration/conciliation proceedings. The Centre also invests funds in highly liquid money market instruments.

NOTE 7 — REVENUE FROM ARBITRATION/CONCILIATION PROCEEDINGS

Revenue from arbitration/conciliation proceedings comprise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown for direct expenses from advances for expenses related to arbitration/conciliation proceedings*</td>
<td>$22,083,731</td>
<td>$18,129,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative fees</td>
<td>2,410,961</td>
<td>1,199,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case registration fees</td>
<td>913,866</td>
<td>784,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case attendance fees</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>288,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,768,558</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,402,240</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Centre recognizes revenues to the extent expenses are incurred related to arbitration/conciliation proceedings. The details of the expenses are provided in Note 8.
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (CONTINUED)

NOTE 8 — EXPENSES RELATED TO ARBITRATION/CONCILIATION PROCEEDINGS
Direct expenses related to arbitration/conciliation proceedings are paid out of advances made by parties to arbitration/conciliation proceedings. The expenses comprise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arbitrators fees and expenses</td>
<td>$18,431,712</td>
<td>$15,963,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration/conciliation meeting costs</td>
<td>3,392,415</td>
<td>1,955,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel expenses</td>
<td>199,388</td>
<td>184,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs</td>
<td>60,216</td>
<td>26,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,083,731</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,129,913</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 9 — IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS
As described in Note 1, the Memorandum provides that, except to the extent that the Centre may charge the parties to proceedings for fees and expenses of members of Conciliation Commissions, Arbitral Tribunals or ad hoc Committees, the Bank shall provide facilities and services to the Centre. Therefore, in-kind contributions represent the value of services provided by IBRD less amounts reimbursed to IBRD using proceeds from non refundable fees and the sale of publications.

A summary is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recorded Value of services provided by IBRD</th>
<th>For the year ended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff services (including benefits)</td>
<td>$3,311,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative services and facilities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual services</td>
<td>791,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative services</td>
<td>555,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and information technology</td>
<td>50,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office accommodations</td>
<td>441,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>86,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total recorded value of services provided by IBRD</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,237,130</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: ICSID contribution</td>
<td>3,715,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-kind contributions</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,521,393</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 10 — APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
ICSID's management has evaluated subsequent events through August 27, 2010, the date the financial statements were approved and authorized for issue.
Independent Auditors’ Report

To: International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes

We have audited the accompanying statements of financial position of the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (“the Centre”) as of June 30, 2010 and 2009, and the related statements of activities and cash flows for the fiscal years then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the management of the Centre. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and International Standards on Auditing. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes consideration of internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Centre’s internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes as of June 30, 2010 and 2009, and the change in its net assets and its cash flows for the fiscal years then ended in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles and International Financial Reporting Standards as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board.

KPMG LLP

August 27, 2010
ANNEX
DISPUTES BEFORE THE CENTRE:
DEVELOPMENTS IN FISCAL YEAR 2010

(1) Compañía de Aguas del Aconcagua S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/97/3) — Second Annulment Proceeding

July 15–17, 2009—The ad hoc Committee holds a hearing on annulment in Paris.

September 30, 2009—The parties file statements of costs.

April 16, 2010—The ad hoc Committee declares the annulment proceeding closed.

(2) Víctor Pey Casado and President Allende Foundation v. Republic of Chile (Case No. ARB/98/2)

(a) Revision Proceeding

November 3, 2009—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

November 18, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision on the application for the revision of the award.

(b) Annulment Proceeding

July 6, 2009—The Secretary-General registers an application for annulment of the award.

December 22, 2009—The ad hoc Committee is constituted. Its members are: L. Yves Fortier (Canadian), President; Piero Bernardini (Italian); and Ahmed S. El-Kosheri (Egyptian).

January 15, 2010—The Republic of Chile files observations on its request for the stay of enforcement of the award.

January 25, 2010—The Republic of Chile files observations on the admissibility of the annulment application. Victor Pey Casado and President Allende Foundation file observations on the request for the stay of enforcement of the award.

January 29, 2010—The ad hoc Committee holds a first session in Paris.

May 6, 2010—The ad hoc Committee issues a decision on the admissibility of the application for annulment.

May 7, 2010—The ad hoc Committee issues a decision on the Republic of Chile’s application for the stay of enforcement of the award.

June 8, 2010—The ad hoc Committee issues a procedural order concerning the procedural calendar.

June 10, 2010—The Republic of Chile files a memorial on annulment.

(3) Tanzania Electric Supply Company Limited v. Independent Power Tanzania Limited (Case No. ARB/98/8) — Interpretation Proceeding

January 22, 2010—The Claimant files a proposal for the disqualification of an arbitrator; the proceeding is further suspended.
February 4, 2010—The arbitrator furnishes explanations in regard to the proposal for disqualification.

March 12, 2010—Following the resignation of Charles N. Brower, the Secretary-General notifies the parties of a vacancy on the Tribunal and of the further suspension of the proceeding.

April 23, 2010—The Tribunal is reconstituted. Its members are: Kenneth S. Rokison (British), President; Makhdoom Ali Khan (Pakistani); and Andrew Rogers (Australian).

June 25, 2010—Tanzania Electric Supply Company Limited files a proposal for the disqualification of an arbitrator; the proceeding is suspended.

(4) Antoine Goetz and others v. Republic of Burundi (Case No. ARB/01/2)

January 7, 2010—Following the resignation of Prosper Weil, the Centre notifies the parties of a vacancy on the Tribunal and of the suspension of the proceeding.

May 4, 2010—The Tribunal is reconstituted. Its members are: Gilbert Guillaume (French), President; Jean-Denis Bredin (French); and Ahmed S. El-Kosheri (Egyptian).

(5) Enron Creditors Recovery Corporation (formerly Enron Corporation) and Ponderosa Assets, L.P. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/01/3) — Annulment Proceeding

July 29–31, 2009—The ad hoc Committee holds a hearing on annulment in Washington, D.C.

August 21, 2009—The Argentine Republic files a submission on costs.

August 24, 2009—Enron Creditors Recovery Corporation and Ponderosa Assets, L.P file a submission on costs.

October 1, 2009—The parties file post-hearing briefs.

(6) Azurix Corp. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/01/12) — Annulment Proceeding

September 1, 2009—The ad hoc Committee issues a decision on annulment.

(7) LG&E Energy Corp., LG&E Capital Corp. and LG&E International Inc. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/02/1) — Annulment Proceeding

December 23, 2009—The proceeding is further suspended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

February 3, 2010—The proceeding is further suspended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.
May 3, 2010—The proceeding is further suspended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

(8) Siemens A.G. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/02/8)

(a) Annulment Proceeding

August 12, 2009—The parties file a request for the discontinuance of the proceeding pursuant to ICSID Arbitration Rule 43(1).

September 28, 2009—The ad hoc Committee issues an order taking note of the discontinuance of the proceeding pursuant to ICSID Arbitration Rule 43(1).

(b) Revision Proceeding

August 12, 2009—The parties file a request for the discontinuance of the proceeding pursuant to ICSID Arbitration Rule 43(1).

September 9, 2009—The Tribunal issues an order taking note of the discontinuance of the proceeding pursuant to ICSID Arbitration Rule 43(1).

(9) Ahmonseto, Inc. and others v. Arab Republic of Egypt (Case No. ARB/02/15) — Annulment Proceeding

January 28, 2010—The Secretary-General moves that the ad hoc Committee stay the proceeding, and the proceeding is stayed for lack of payment of the required advances pursuant to ICSID Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d) and (e).

(10) Sempra Energy International v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/02/16) — Annulment Proceeding

July 16, 2009—Sempra Energy International files a further request for termination of the stay of enforcement of the award.

July 17, 2009—The Argentine Republic files observations on the request for termination of the stay of enforcement of the award.

August 7, 2009—The ad hoc Committee issues a decision on Sempra Energy International’s request for the termination of the stay of enforcement of the award.

August 13, 2009—Sempra Energy International files a rejoinder on annulment.

September 1–3, 2009—The ad hoc Committee holds a hearing on annulment in Washington, D.C.

May 7, 2010—The ad hoc Committee declares the annulment proceeding closed.

June 29, 2010—The ad hoc Committee issues its decision on annulment.

(11) AES Corporation v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/02/17)

December 28, 2009—The suspension of the proceeding is further extended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

June 28, 2010—The suspension of the proceeding is further extended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.
(12) Camuzzi International S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/03/2)

September 30, 2009—The suspension of the proceeding is further extended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

April 13, 2010—The suspension of the proceeding is further extended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

(13) M.C.I. Power Group, L.C. and New Turbine, Inc. v. Republic of Ecuador (Case No. ARB/03/6) — Annulment Proceeding

September 17, 2009—The ad hoc Committee declares the proceeding closed.

October 19, 2009—The ad hoc Committee issues a decision on annulment.

(14) Continental Casualty Company v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/03/9) — Annulment Proceeding

July 16, 2009—Continental Casualty Company files observations on the Argentine Republic’s application for partial annulment of the award.


August 31, 2009—Continental Casualty Company files a request for disclosure of documents.

September 8, 2009—The Argentine Republic files observations on the request for disclosure of documents.


September 15, 2009—The ad hoc Committee decides on the request for disclosure of documents.

October 23, 2009—The ad hoc Committee issues a decision on the Argentine Republic’s application for the stay of enforcement of the award, and a decision on Continental Casualty Company’s preliminary objection to the Argentine Republic’s application for annulment.

October 30, 2009—Continental Casualty Company files a memorial with regard to its application for annulment.

December 22, 2009—The Argentine Republic files a memorial with regard to its application for partial annulment.

March 3, 2010—The Argentine Republic files a counter-memorial with regard to Continental Casualty Company’s application for annulment.

April 28, 2010—Continental Casualty Company files a counter-memorial with regard to the Argentine Republic’s application for partial annulment.
Continental Casualty Company files a reply with regard to its application for annulment.

Gas Natural SDG, S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/03/10)

There have been no new developments to report in this case since the publication of the 2009 ICSID Annual Report.

El Paso Energy International Company v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/03/15)

April 17, 2010—The Claimant files a request for production of documents.

April 26, 2010—The Respondent files observations on the Claimant's request for production of documents.

Suez, Sociedad General de Aguas de Barcelona S.A. and Interagua Servicios Integrales de Agua S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/03/17)

There have been no new developments to report in this case since the publication of the 2009 ICSID Annual Report.

Suez, Sociedad General de Aguas de Barcelona S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/03/19)

There have been no new developments to report in this case since the publication of the 2009 ICSID Annual Report.

Telefónica S.A v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/03/20)

September 24, 2009—The Tribunal issues an order taking note of the discontinuance of the proceeding pursuant to ICSID Arbitration Rule 43(1).

Enersis S.A. and others v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/03/21)

August 25, 2009—The suspension of the proceeding is further extended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

Electricidad Argentina S.A. and EDF International S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/03/22)

July 1, 2009—The suspension of the proceeding is further extended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

EDF International S.A., SAUR International S.A. and León Participaciones Argentinas S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/03/23)

July 27, 2009—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.

October 1–3, 2009—The Tribunal holds a hearing on the merits in Washington, D.C.
November 2–7, 2010—The Tribunal holds a further hearing on the merits in Washington, D.C.

December 14, 2009—The parties file post-hearing briefs.

January 8, 2010—The parties file reply post-hearing briefs.

(23) Fraport AG Frankfurt Airport Services Worldwide v. Republic of the Philippines (Case No. ARB/03/25) — Annulment Proceeding

July 15, 2009—The Republic of the Philippines files a rejoinder on annulment.

August 24–26, 2009—The ad hoc Committee holds a hearing on annulment in Washington, D.C.

October 15, 2009—The parties file statements of costs.

(24) Unisys Corporation v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/03/27)

There have been no new developments to report in this case since the publication of the 2009 ICSID Annual Report.

(25) Duke Energy International Peru Investments No. 1 Ltd. v. Republic of Peru (Case No. ARB/03/28) — Annulment Proceeding

July 31, 2009—The Republic of Peru files a memorial on annulment.

November 20, 2009—Duke Energy International Peru Investments No. 1 Ltd. files a counter-memorial on annulment.

January 22, 2010—The Republic of Peru files a reply on annulment.

March 20, 2010—Duke Energy International Peru Investments No. 1 Ltd. files a rejoinder on annulment.

April 12–13, 2010—The ad hoc Committee holds a hearing on annulment in Washington, D.C.

(26) Bayindir Insaat Turizm Ticaret Ve Sanayi A.S. v. Islamic Republic of Pakistan (Case No. ARB/03/29)

August 5, 2009—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

August 27, 2009—The Tribunal renders its award.

(27) Azurix Corp. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/03/30)

July 9, 2009—The Tribunal decides on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

September 1, 2009—The Respondent files a reply on jurisdiction.

December 17, 2009—The proceeding is suspended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.
April 16, 2010—The suspension of the proceeding is extended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

May 3, 2010—The suspension of the proceeding is further extended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

(28) Total S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/04/1)

There have been no new developments to report in this case since the publication of the 2009 ICSID Annual Report.

(29) Corn Products International, Inc. v. United Mexican States (Case No. ARB(AF)/04/1)

(a) Original Arbitration Proceeding

August 7, 2009—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

August 18, 2009—The Tribunal renders its award.

(b) Correction and Interpretation Proceeding

October 1, 2009—The Claimant files a request for correction and interpretation of the award.

November 25, 2009—The Respondent files a response to the Claimant’s request for correction and interpretation of the award.


December 14, 2009—The Respondent files a response to the Claimant’s observations of December 4, 2009.

March 23, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on correction and interpretation.

(30) SAUR International v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/04/4)

July 6, 2009—The suspension of the proceeding is further extended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

February 17, 2010—The suspension of the proceeding is further extended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

April 19, 2010—The suspension of the proceeding is further extended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

(31) Compagnie d’Exploitation du Chemin de Fer Transgabonais v. Gabonese Republic (Case No. ARB/04/5) — Annulment Proceeding

July 2–3, 2009—The ad hoc Committee holds a hearing on annulment in Paris.

July 10, 2009—The parties file answers to questions posed by the ad hoc Committee during the hearing on annulment.

April 13, 2010—Compagnie d’Exploitation du Chemin de Fer Transgabonais files a statement of costs.

April 15, 2010—The Gabonese Republic files a statement of costs.
April 23, 2010—The ad hoc Committee declares the proceeding closed.

May 11, 2010—The ad hoc Committee issues a decision on the application for annulment.

(32) Sociedad Anónima Eduardo Vieira v. Republic of Chile (Case No. ARB/04/7) — Annulment Proceeding

There have been no new developments to report in this case since the publication of the 2009 ICSID Annual Report.

(33) ABCI Investments N.V. v. Republic of Tunisia (Case No. ARB/04/12)

December 22, 2009—The proceeding is resumed following payment of the required advances. The Claimant reiterates its request for production of documents and files observations on the procedural calendar.

January 8, 2010—The Respondent files observations on the Claimant’s request for production of documents and on the procedural calendar.


January 20, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on the request for production of documents and on the procedural calendar.

March 10, 2010—The Claimant files a rejoinder on jurisdiction.


(34) Mobil Exploration and Development Inc. Suc. Argentina and Mobil Argentina S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/04/16)

July 31, 2009—The Claimants file a counter-memorial on jurisdiction.

August 11, 2009—The Respondent files a request for a further round of written pleadings on jurisdiction and concerning the procedural calendar.

August 24, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision on the Respondent’s request for a further round of written pleadings on jurisdiction and concerning the procedural calendar.

August 24, 2009—The Respondent files a request for disclosure of documents.

August 26, 2009—The Claimants file observations on the Respondent’s request for disclosure of documents.

September 15, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision on disclosure of documents.

September 23, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning confidentiality of documents.

September 25, 2009—The Respondent files a request for production of documents.
September 30, 2009—The Claimants file observations on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

October 5, 2009—The Tribunal decides on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

November 2, 2009—The Respondent files a further request for production of documents.

December 7, 2009—The Respondent files a counter-memorial on the merits.

December 30, 2009—The Claimants file a request for production of documents.

January 15, 2010—The Respondent files observations on the Claimants’ request for production of documents.


January 25, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning production and confidentiality of documents.

March 24, 2010—The Claimants file a further request for production of documents.

April 7, 2010—The Respondent files observations on the Claimants’ further request for production of documents.

April 12, 2010—The Claimants file a response to the Respondent’s observations of April 7, 2010.

April 14, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning confidentiality and production of documents.

April 27, 2010—The Claimants file a reply on the merits.

(35) Gemplus, S.A., SLP, S.A. and Gemplus Industrial, S.A. de C.V. v. United Mexican States (Case No. ARB(AF)/04/3)

November 30, 2009—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

March 24, 2010—The Claimants file a further request for production of documents.

April 12, 2010—The Claimants file a response to the Respondent’s observations of April 7, 2010.

April 14, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning confidentiality and production of documents.

April 27, 2010—The Claimants file a reply on the merits.

(35) Talsud, S.A. v. United Mexican States (Case No. ARB(AF)/04/4)

November 30, 2009—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

(37) Vannessa Ventures Ltd. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (Case No. ARB(AF)/04/6)

July 28, 2009—Following the resignation of Robert Briner (Swiss), the Centre notifies the parties of a vacancy on the Tribunal and of the suspension of the proceeding.
May 4, 2010—The Respondent files a request for the discontinuance of the proceeding pursuant to Article 50 of the ICSID Arbitration (Additional Facility) Rules. The Claimant informs the Centre that it objects to the Respondent’s request for the discontinuance of the proceeding.

May 7, 2010—The Secretary-General issues an order for the continuation of the proceeding.

June 25, 2010—The Tribunal is reconstituted. Its members are: Vaughan Lowe (British), President; Charles N. Brower (U.S.); and Brigitte Stern (French).

(38) Daimler Financial Services AG v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/05/1)

August 3, 2009—The Claimant files a reply on the merits.

October 27, 2009—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.

November 30–December 7, 2009—The Tribunal holds a hearing on jurisdiction and merits in Washington, D.C.

March 29, 2010—The Respondent files a post-hearing brief.

March 30, 2010—The Claimant files a post-hearing brief.

(39) Compañía General de Electricidad S.A. and CGE Argentina S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/05/2)

July 28, 2009—The Tribunal issues an order taking note of the discontinuance of the proceeding pursuant to ICSID Arbitration Rule 44.

(40) Asset Recovery Trust S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/05/11)

July 13, 2009—The Claimant files a counter-memorial on jurisdiction.

October 9, 2009—The Respondent files a reply on jurisdiction.

November 16, 2009—The Claimant files a rejoinder on jurisdiction.

(41) EDF (Services) Limited v. Romania (Case No. ARB/05/13)

July 23, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the Claimant’s request to reopen the proceeding.

July 27, 2009—The parties file amended statements of costs.

October 8, 2009—The Tribunal renders its award; attached to the award is a dissenting opinion by one of the arbitrators.
(42) RSM Production Corporation v. Grenada (Case No. ARB/05/14) — Annulment Proceeding

July 10, 2009 — The Secretary-General registers an application for the annulment of the award.

August 17, 2009 — The ad hoc Committee is constituted. Its members are: Gavan Griffith (Australian), President; Cecil W. M. Abraham (Malaysian); and Campbell McLachlan (New Zealand).

October 16, 2009 — The ad hoc Committee holds a first session in London.

October 29, 2009 — RSM Production Corporation files an application for a preliminary ruling.

November 16, 2009 — Grenada files observations on RSM Production Corporation’s application for a preliminary ruling. RSM Production Corporation files a memorial on annulment.

December 7, 2009 — The ad hoc Committee issues a decision on RSM Production Corporation’s application for a preliminary ruling.

December 31, 2009 — Grenada files a counter-memorial on annulment.

January 15, 2010 — RSM Production Corporation files a reply on annulment.

March 26, 2010 — The Secretary-General moves that the ad hoc Committee stay the proceeding pursuant to ICSID Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d) and (e).

March 29, 2010 — The proceeding is stayed for lack of payment of the required advances pursuant to ICSID Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d) and (e).

(43) Waguih Elie George Siag and Clorinda Vecchi v. Arab Republic of Egypt (Case No. ARB/05/15) — Annulment Proceeding

July 10, 2009 — The Secretary-General registers an application for annulment of the award, and notifies the parties of the provisional stay of enforcement of the award.

August 7, 2009 — The ad hoc Committee is constituted. Its members are: Stephen M. Schwebel (U.S.), President; Azzedine Kettani (Moroccan); and Peter Tomka (Slovak).

August 11, 2009 — The proceeding is suspended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

September 25, 2009 — The proceeding is resumed.

October 15, 2009 — Waguih Elie George Siag and Clorinda Vecchi file observations on the provisional stay of enforcement of the award.
December 10, 2009—The *ad hoc* Committee informs the parties that the provisional stay of enforcement of the award has lapsed.

June 21, 2010—The *ad hoc* Committee issues an order taking note of the discontinuance of the proceeding pursuant to ICSID Arbitration Rule 45.

(44) Cargill, Incorporated v. United Mexican States (Case No. ARB(AF)/05/2)

September 18, 2009—The Tribunal renders its award.

(45) Rumeli Telekom A.S. and Telsim Mobil Telekomunikasyon Hizmetleri A.S. v. Republic of Kazakhstan (Case No. ARB/05/16) — Annulment Proceeding

July 28, 2009—The Republic of Kazakhstan files a reply on annulment.


October 22–23, 2009—The *ad hoc* Committee holds a hearing on annulment in The Hague.


November 18, 2009—The Republic of Kazakhstan files a statement of costs.

March 25, 2010—The *ad hoc* Committee issues a decision on annulment.

(46) Ioannis Kardassopoulos v. Georgia (Case No. ARB/05/18)

September 30, 2009—The parties file submissions on costs.

October 19, 2009—The parties file reply submissions on costs.

February 8, 2010—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

March 3, 2010—The Tribunal renders its award.

(47) Helnan International Hotels A/S v. Arab Republic of Egypt (Case No. ARB/05/19) — Annulment Proceeding

July 22, 2009—Helnan International Hotels A/S files a reply on annulment.

October 19, 2009—The *ad hoc* Committee holds a hearing on annulment in The Hague.

June 14, 2010—The *ad hoc* Committee issues a decision on annulment.

(48) Ioan Micula, Viorel Micula and others v. Romania (Case No. ARB/05/20)

July 20, 2009—The non-disputing party files a written submission.
July 22, 2009—The Tribunal is reconstituted. Its members are: Laurent Lévy (Swiss/Brazilian), President; Stanimir A. Alexandrov (Bulgarian); and Georges Abi-Saab (Egyptian).

November 16, 2009—The parties file observations on the non-disputing party’s written submission. The Claimants file a request for production of documents.

December 16, 2009—The Respondent files observations on the Claimants’ request for production of documents.

December 22, 2009—The Claimants file a reply on the merits.

January 8, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of documents.

March 3, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning confidentiality.

April 9, 2010—The Respondent files a request for production of documents.

April 26–27, 2010—The Claimants file observations on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

April 27, 2010—The Respondent files a response to the Claimants’ observations of April 26 and 27, 2010.

April 29, 2010—The Claimants file further observations on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

May 27, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of documents.

June 11, 2010—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.

(49) Hrvatska Elektroprivreda d.d. v. Republic of Slovenia (Case No. ARB/05/24)

July 7, 2009—The President of the Tribunal holds a pre-hearing conference with the parties by telephone.


October 5, 2009—The parties file post-hearing briefs.

November 6, 2009—The parties file reply post-hearing briefs.

November 13, 2009—The parties file statements of costs.

November 20, 2009—The Claimant files a reply statement of costs.

November 24, 2009—The Respondent files a reply statement of costs.

(50) Spyridon Roussalis v. Romania (Case No. ARB/06/1)

July 2, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision on provisional measures.
July 13, 2009 — The Respondent files a rejoinder on jurisdiction and the merits.

July 24, 2009 — The Respondent files a response to the Claimant’s observations on the Respondent’s requests for provisional measures and for production of documents.

July 29, 2009 — Following the resignation of Robert Briner (Swiss), the Centre notifies the parties of the vacancy on the Tribunal; the proceeding is suspended.

September 3, 2009 — The Tribunal is reconstituted. Its members are: Bernard Hanotiau (Belgian), President; Andrea Giardina (Italian); and W. Michael Reisman (U.S.).


October 14, 2009 — The Tribunal issues a decision on production of documents and preservation of evidence.

November 13, 2009 — The Claimant files a rejoinder to the Respondent’s counter-claim.

September 14, 2009 — The Claimants file a memorial on the merits.

September 15, 2009 — The Claimants file a request for provisional measures.

October 2, 2009 — The Claimants file a further request for provisional measures.

October 5, 2009 — The Respondent files observations on the Claimants’ further request for provisional measures. The Tribunal issues a decision on the Claimants’ further request for provisional measures.

October 14, 2009 — The Respondent files further observations on the Claimants’ further request for provisional measures.


October 29, 2009 — The Respondent files further observations on the Claimants’ further request for provisional measures.

November 24, 2009 — The Tribunal holds a hearing on provisional measures by telephone conference.

February 26, 2010 — The Tribunal issues a decision on provisional measures.

April 7, 2010 — The Respondent files a proposal for disqualification of the three members of the Tribunal. The proceeding is suspended.

Quiborax S.A., Non-Metallic Minerals S.A. & Allan Fosk Kaplún v. Plurinational State of Bolivia (Case No. ARB/06/2)

August 31, 2009 — Química e Industrial del Bórax Ltda informs the Tribunal of a change in its corporate name to Quiborax S.A.
April 19, 2010—The Claimants file observations on the Respondent’s proposal for disqualification of the three members of the Tribunal.


The Rompetrol Group N.V. v. Romania
(Case No. ARB/06/3)

July 24, 2009—The Respondent files a counter-memorial on the merits.

August 17, 2009—The Claimant files a request for production of documents.

August 21, 2009—The Respondent files a proposal for disqualification of a counsel.

August 31, 2009—The Claimant files observations on the proposal for disqualification of a counsel. The Respondent files observations on the Claimant’s request for production of documents.


September 15, 2009—The Respondent files further observations on the Claimant’s request for production of documents.

October 8, 2009—The Claimant files further observations on its request for production of documents.

November 3, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order on production of documents.

November 12, 2009—The Claimant files a reply on the merits.

November 17, 2009—The Tribunal issues a further decision on production of documents.

December 4, 2009—The Claimant files a further request for production of documents.


January 14, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on the Respondent’s proposal for disqualification of a counsel.

January 21, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order on production of documents.

March 31, 2010—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.

April 14, 2010—The Tribunal holds a pre-hearing conference with the parties by telephone.

(53) Vestey Group Ltd v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (Case No. ARB/06/4)

There have been no new developments to report in this case since the publication of the 2009 ICSID Annual Report.

(54) Togo Electricité and GDF-Suez Energie Services v. Republic of Togo (Case No. ARB/06/7)

July 15, 2009—The Claimants file a submission on costs.

July 27, 2009—The Respondent files a submission on costs.

(55) Sistem Muhendislik Insaat Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. v. Kyrgyz Republic (Case No. ARB(AF)/06/1)

August 12, 2009—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

September 9, 2009—The Tribunal renders its award.

(56) Libananco Holdings Co. Limited v. Republic of Turkey (Case No. ARB/06/8)

July 8, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning (i) the Respondent’s request for modification of the Tribunal’s procedural order of December 17, 2008, (ii) production of documents, (iii) the procedural calendar, and (iv) the hearing on preliminary objections to jurisdiction.

July 10, 2009—The Respondent files a further request for production of documents.

July 13, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of evidence.

July 23, 2009—The Claimant files observations on the Respondent’s further request for production of documents.


August 3, 2009—The Claimant files a request concerning examination of witnesses.

August 4, 2009—The Claimant files a rejoinder on preliminary objections to jurisdiction and a request for modification of two procedural orders.

August 6, 2009—The Tribunal issues a further procedural order concerning the production of documents.


August 31, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning examination of witnesses.

October 12, 2009—The Claimant files a rejoinder to the Respondent’s supplement to its counter-memorial of March 3, 2009.

October 14, 2009—The President of the Tribunal holds a pre-hearing conference with the parties by telephone.


October 22, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning examination of witnesses and a decision concerning production of documents.

October 30, 2009—The Tribunal issues a further procedural order concerning examination of witnesses.

November 2–7, 2009—The Tribunal holds a hearing on preliminary jurisdictional objections in Washington, D.C.

March 23–25, 2010—The Tribunal holds a further hearing on preliminary jurisdictional objections in Paris.

(57) Chevron Bangladesh Block Twelve, Ltd. and Chevron Bangladesh Blocks Thirteen and Fourteen, Ltd. v. People’s Republic of Bangladesh (Case No. ARB/06/10)

September 30, 2009—The parties file submissions on costs.

April 15, 2010—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

May 17, 2010—The Tribunal renders its award.

(58) Occidental Petroleum Corporation and Occidental Exploration and Production Company v. Republic of Ecuador (Case No. ARB/06/11)

July 23, 2009—The Claimants file a memorial on liability.

August 11, 2009—The Respondent files objections to the admissibility of certain claims.


August 28, 2009—The Claimants file a reply on admissibility of certain claims.
August 31, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the admissibility of certain claims.

September 8, 2009—The Respondent files a rejoinder on quantum and a reply on counter-claim damages.

October 15, 2009—The Claimants file a rejoinder on counter-claim damages.


December 18, 2009—The parties file post-hearing briefs on quantum and counter-claim damages.

January 22, 2010—The parties file reply post-hearing briefs on quantum and counter-claim damages.

February 4, 2010—The Tribunal holds a hearing on quantum in Washington, D.C.

(59) Azpetrol International Holdings B.V., Azpetrol Group B.V. and Azpetrol Oil Services Group B.V. v. Republic of Azerbaijan (Case No. ARB/06/15)

September 8, 2009—The Tribunal renders its award.

(60) Barmek Holding A.S. v. Republic of Azerbaijan (Case No. ARB/06/16)

September 28, 2009—The Tribunal renders its award embodying the parties’ settlement agreement.

(61) Cementownia “Nowa Huta” S.A. v. Republic of Turkey (Case No. ARB(AF)/06/2)

July 7, 2009—The Tribunal decides on the admissibility of documents.

September 1, 2009—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

September 17, 2009—The Tribunal renders its award.

(62) Joseph C. Lemire v. Ukraine (Case No. ARB/06/18)

January 21, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on jurisdiction and liability.

April 16, 2010—The Claimant files a memorial on remaining issues.

June 21, 2010—The Respondent files a counter-memorial on remaining issues.

(63) Nations Energy, Inc. and others v. Republic of Panama (Case No. ARB/06/19)

July 2, 2009—The Respondent files a request for production of documents.

July 7, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of documents and the procedural calendar.

July 8, 2009—The Respondent files a request concerning the admissibility of certain documents produced by the Claimants.

July 27, 2009 — The Tribunal decides on the admissibility of certain documents produced by the Claimants.

August 31, 2009 — The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.

October 19, 2009 — The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the examination of witnesses.

December 17, 2009 — The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the rules of procedure and the procedural calendar.

March 11, 2010 — The Claimants file a request for production of documents.


March 23, 2010 — The Tribunal decides on the Claimants’ request for production of documents.

March 24, 2010 — The Tribunal holds a pre-hearing conference with the parties by telephone.

April 14–21, 2010 — The Tribunal holds a hearing on the merits in Washington, D.C.

June 28, 2010 — The parties file post-hearing briefs.

(64) Piero Foresti, Laura de Carli and others v. Republic of South Africa (Case No. ARB(AF)/07/1)

July 13, 2009 — Following the Respondent’s consent to the Claimants’ request of July 31, 2008, the Secretary-General approves access to the Additional Facility for three additional Claimants and notifies the parties and the Tribunal thereof.

July 17, 2009 — Non-disputing parties file an application pursuant to Article 41(3) of the ICSID Arbitration (Additional Facility) Rules.

July 31, 2009 — The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning procedural matters.

August 17, 2009 — The parties file observations on the application of the non-disputing parties.

August 20, 2009 — An additional non-disputing party files an application pursuant to Article 41(3) of the ICSID Arbitration (Additional Facility) Rules.

August 21, 2009 — The parties file further observations on the application of the non-disputing parties.

September 10, 2009 — The parties file observations on the application of the additional non-disputing party.
September 11, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision concerning the procedural calendar and the applications of the non-disputing parties.

September 25, 2009—The Tribunal issues a further decision concerning the applications of the non-disputing parties.

November 2, 2009—The Claimants file a request for the discontinuance of the proceeding pursuant to Article 50 of the ICSID Arbitration (Additional Facility) Rules.

November 4, 2009—The Tribunal issues an order inviting the Respondent to state whether it opposes the Claimants’ request for the discontinuance of the proceeding.

November 20, 2009—The Respondent informs the Centre that it objects to the Claimants’ request for the discontinuance of the proceeding, and files an application for a default award.


March 31, 2010—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the application for default award. The parties file statements of costs.

April 12–14, 2010—The Tribunal holds a hearing in The Hague.

June 28, 2010—The parties file updated statements of costs.

(65) RSM Production Corporation v. Central African Republic (Case No. ARB/07/2)

September 21, 2009—The Claimant files a reply on jurisdiction and the merits.

January 25, 2010—The Respondent files a rejoinder on jurisdiction and the merits.

February 24–26, 2010—The Tribunal holds a hearing on jurisdiction and the merits in Paris.

April 1, 2010—The parties file post-hearing briefs.

June 15, 2010—The Claimant files a statement of costs.

(66) Government of the Province of East Kalimantan v. PT Kaltim Prima Coal and others (Case No. ARB/07/3)

December 4, 2009—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

December 28, 2009—The Tribunal renders its award.

(67) Giovanna a Beccara and others v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/07/5)

July 27, 2009—Following the resignation of Robert Briner (Swiss), the Centre notifies the parties of a vacancy on the Tribunal and of the suspension of the proceeding.
September 2, 2009—The Tribunal is reconstituted. Its members are: Pierre Tercier (Swiss), President; Georges Abi-Saab (Egyptian); and Albert Jan van den Berg (Dutch).

October 14, 2009—The Tribunal holds a telephone conference with the parties concerning procedural matters.

December 1, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the organization of the hearing on jurisdiction and admissibility.

January 27, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning confidentiality.

April 2, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning admissibility of documents and attendance of hearing.

April 6, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning examination of witnesses.

April 7–14, 2010—The Tribunal holds a hearing on jurisdiction in Washington, D.C.

May 20, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning admissibility of new documents.

June 22, 2010—The parties file post-hearing briefs.

(68) Tza Yap Shum v. Republic of Peru (Case No. ARB/07/6)

July 6, 2009—The Claimant files observations on the Respondent’s request for correction of the decision on jurisdiction.

July 17, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision on the request for correction of the decision on jurisdiction.

September 21, 2009—The Claimant files a request for production of documents.

September 22, 2009—The Respondent files observations on the Claimant’s request for production of documents.

September 24, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision on the production of documents.

November 30, 2009—The Claimant files a memorial on the merits.

February 5, 2010—The Respondent files a request for production of documents.

February 9, 2010—The Claimant files observations on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

March 5, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of documents.

March 8, 2010—The Respondent files observations on the Tribunal’s procedural order of March 5, 2010.
March 10, 2010—The Claimant files a response to the Respondent’s observations of March 8, 2010.

March 11, 2010—The Tribunal decides on the production of documents.

March 16, 2010—The Tribunal decides on the production of documents and the procedural calendar.

April 12, 2010—The Respondent files a counter-memorial on the merits.

April 30, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning witnesses and experts statements.

May 3–June 4, 2010—The Tribunal holds a pre-hearing conference with the parties by telephone.

May 31–June 4, 2010—The Tribunal holds a hearing on the merits in Washington, D.C.

(69) Europe Cement Investment and Trade S.A. v. Republic of Turkey (Case No. ARB(AF)/07/2)

July 12, 2009—The Claimant files a submission on costs.

July 13, 2009—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

August 13, 2009—The Tribunal renders its award.

(70) Alasdair Ross Anderson and others v. Republic of Costa Rica (Case No. ARB(AF)/07/3)

August 3–6, 2009—The Tribunal holds a hearing on jurisdiction in Washington, D.C.

May 19, 2010—The Tribunal renders its award.

(71) Giovanni Alemanni and others v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/07/8)

November 5, 2009—The Claimants file a counter-memorial on jurisdiction and admissibility.

November 16, 2009—The Respondent files a request for production of documents.

November 23, 2009—The Claimants file objections to the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

February 5, 2010—The Respondent files a reply on jurisdiction and admissibility.

February 15, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision concerning the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

May 4, 2010—The proceeding is suspended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.
(72) Bureau Veritas, Inspection, Valuation, Assessment and Control, BIVAC B.V. v. Republic of Paraguay (Case No. ARB/07/9)

November 27, 2009—The Claimants file a memorial on the merits.

March 12, 2010—The Respondent files a counter-memorial on the merits.

May 14, 2010—The proceeding is suspended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

(73) M. Meerapfel Söhne AG v. Central African Republic (Case No. ARB/07/10)

July 9, 2009—The Respondent files a reply on jurisdiction and a rejoinder on the merits.

August 2, 2009—The Claimant files a rejoinder on jurisdiction.


February 12, 2010—The Claimant files post-hearing briefs.

February 13, 2010—The Respondent files post-hearing briefs.

(74) Toto Costruzioni Generali S.p.A. v. Republic of Lebanon (Case No. ARB/07/12)

September 11, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision on jurisdiction.

January 29, 2010—The Claimant files a memorial on the merits.

May 3, 2010—The Respondent files a counter-memorial on the merits.

(75) S&T Oil Equipment & Machinery Ltd. v. Romania (Case No. ARB/07/13)

July 16, 2009—The Claimant files observations on certain documents produced by the Respondent.

July 24, 2009—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits. A non-disputing party applies to file a written submission pursuant to ICSID Arbitration Rule 37(2).

July 27, 2009—The Tribunal invites the parties to file observations on the non-disputing party’s application.

October 21, 2009—The Secretary-General moves that the Tribunal stay the proceeding, pursuant to ICSID Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d).

November 4, 2009—The proceeding is stayed for non-payment of the required advances, pursuant to ICSID Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d).
(76) Liman Caspian Oil BV and NCL Dutch Investment BV v. Republic of Kazakhstan (Case No. ARB/07/14)

July 13, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the admissibility of evidence.

December 8–12, 2009—The Tribunal holds a hearing on the merits in London.

January 15, 2010—The parties file post-hearing briefs.

January 28, 2010—The Respondent files a statement of costs.

January 29, 2010—The Claimants file a statement of costs.

February 4, 2010—Each party files observations on the other party’s statement of costs.

June 22, 2010—The Tribunal renders its award.

(77) Ron Fuchs v. Georgia (Case No. ARB/07/15)

February 8, 2010—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

March 3, 2010—The Tribunal renders its award.

(78) Alpha Projektholding GmbH v. Ukraine (Case No. ARB/07/16)

February 5, 2010—The Respondent files a proposal for disqualification of an arbitrator; the proceeding is suspended.

February 18, 2010—The Claimant files observations on the Respondent’s proposal for disqualification of an arbitrator.

February 19, 2010—The Respondent files a response to the Claimant’s observations.

March 19, 2010—The proposal for disqualification of an arbitrator is declined; the proceeding is resumed.

(79) Impregilo S.p.A. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/07/17)

August 18, 2009—The Respondent files a counter-memorial on the merits.

November 2, 2009—The Claimant files a reply on the merits.

January 22, 2010—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.

March 9–18, 2010—The Tribunal holds a hearing on the merits in Paris.

May 10, 2010—The parties file statements of costs.
(80) Shell Nigeria Ultra Deep Limited v. Federal Republic of Nigeria (Case No. ARB/07/18)

August 27, 2009—The Respondent files a counter-memorial on the merits.

October 22, 2009—The Claimant files a reply on the merits.

January 11, 2010—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.


May 17, 2010—The Claimant files a post-hearing brief.

May 19, 2010—The Respondent files a post-hearing brief.

(81) Electrabel S.A. v. Republic of Hungary (Case No. ARB/07/19)

July 31, 2009—The parties file requests for production of documents.

August 18, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of documents.

September 11, 2009—The Claimant files a request for production of documents.

September 16, 2009—The Claimant files a reply on the merits.

September 18, 2009—The Respondent files observations on the Claimant’s request for production of documents.

October 2, 2009—The Claimant files a response to the Respondent’s observations of September 18, 2009.

October 5, 2009—The Respondent files a reply to the Claimant’s response of October 2, 2009.

November 11, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of documents.

December 4, 2009—The Tribunal holds a procedural session by telephone conference.

December 10, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning procedural matters. The Respondent files a request for production of documents.

December 14, 2009—The Claimant files observations on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

December 16, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision concerning the production of documents.

December 22, 2009—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.

February 9–17, 2010—The Tribunal holds a hearing on the merits in Washington, D.C.
May 7, 2010—The parties file post-hearing briefs.

May 24, 2010—The Respondent files observations on the Claimant's post-hearing brief.


May 31, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning new documentation.

(82) Saba Fakes v. Republic of Turkey
(Case No. ARB/07/20)

August 31, 2009—The Respondent files a rejoinder on jurisdiction.

September 8, 2009—The Tribunal holds a pre-hearing conference with the parties by telephone.

October 5–6, 2009—The Tribunal holds a hearing on jurisdiction in Paris.

November 18, 2009—The parties file post-hearing briefs.

December 2, 2009—The parties file submissions on costs.

(83) Pantechniki S.A. Contractors & Engineers v. Republic of Albania
(Case No. ARB/07/21)

July 6, 2009—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

July 30, 2009—The Sole Arbitrator renders its award.

(84) AES Summit Generation Limited and AES-Tisza Erőmű Kft. v. Republic of Hungary (Case No. ARB/07/22)

December 24, 2009—The Claimants file a request for the admissibility of new evidence.


February 4, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the admissibility of new evidence.

June 4, 2010—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

June 25, 2010—The parties file statements of costs.

(85) Railroad Development Corporation v. Republic of Guatemala
(Case No. ARB/07/23)

July 24, 2009—The Respondent files a request to address the objections to jurisdiction as a preliminary question.

August 24, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the Respondent’s request to address the objections to jurisdiction as a preliminary question; the proceeding on the merits is suspended.

September 24, 2009—The Respondent files a memorial on jurisdiction.

October 26, 2009—The Claimant files a counter-memorial on jurisdiction.

March 1–3, 2010—The Tribunal holds a further hearing on the Respondent’s preliminary objections to jurisdiction in Washington, D.C.

March 19, 2010—The Republic of El Salvador files a written submission as a non-disputing Party pursuant to CAFTA Article 10.20.2.

March 31, 2010—The parties file post-hearing briefs and observations on the submission of the non-disputing party.

(86) Gustav F W Hamester GmbH & Co KG v. Republic of Ghana (Case No. ARB/07/24)

August 17, 2009—The parties file post-hearing briefs.

August 31, 2009—The parties file statements of costs.

June 2, 2010—The Tribunal declares the proceeding closed.

June 18, 2010—The Tribunal renders its award.

(87) Urbaser S.A. and Consorcio de Aguas Bilbao Biskia, Bilbao Biskaia Ur Partzuergoa v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/07/26)

October 16, 2009—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Andreas Bucher (Swiss), President; Ian Brownlie (British); and Pedro J. Martínez-Fraga (U.S.).

January 4, 2010—Following the passing away of Ian Brownlie, the Centre notifies the parties of a vacancy on the Tribunal and of the suspension of the proceeding.

March 8, 2010—The Tribunal is reconstituted. Its members are Andreas Bucher (Swiss), President; Pedro J. Martínez-Fraga (U.S.); and Campbell McLachlan (New Zealand).

March 18, 2010—The Claimants file a proposal for disqualification of an arbitrator; the proceeding is suspended.

April 16, 2010—The Respondent files a response to the Claimants’ proposal for disqualification of an arbitrator.

May 5, 2010—The arbitrator furnishes explanations in regard to the proposal for disqualification.
(88) Mobil Corporation and others v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (Case No. ARB/07/27)

August 17, 2009—The Claimants file a rejoinder on jurisdiction.

September 9, 2009—The Tribunal holds a pre-hearing conference with the parties by telephone.

September 23–24, 2009—The Tribunal holds a hearing on jurisdiction in Paris.

June 10, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on jurisdiction.

(89) E.T.I. Euro Telecom International N.V. v. Plurinational State of Bolivia (Case No. ARB/07/28)

October 20–21, 2009—The Tribunal holds a hearing on procedural issues in Washington, D.C.

October 21, 2009—The Tribunal issues an order taking note of the discontinuance of the proceeding pursuant to ICSID Arbitration Rule 44.

(90) SGS Société Générale de Surveillance S.A. v. Republic of Paraguay (Case No. ARB/07/29)


July 23, 2009—The Claimant files a reply post-hearing brief.

February 12, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on jurisdiction.

May 31, 2010—The Claimant files a memorial on the merits.

(91) ConocoPhillips Company and others v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (Case No. ARB/07/30)


August 24, 2009—The Claimants file a request for production of documents.

September 14, 2009—The Respondent files observations on the Claimants’ request for production of documents.

November 2, 2009—The Claimants file a reply on the merits.

January 4, 2010—Following the passing away of Ian Brownlie, the Centre notifies the parties of a vacancy on the Tribunal and of the suspension of the proceeding.

February 1, 2010—The Tribunal is reconstituted. Its members are: Kenneth Keith (New Zealand), President; Georges Abi-Saab (Egyptian); and L. Yves Fortier (Canadian). The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.

March 11, 2010—The Tribunal holds a pre-hearing conference with the parties by telephone.
March 19, 2010—The Claimants file a further request for production of documents.

March 26, 2010—The Respondent files observations on the Claimants’ request for production of documents.

March 31, 2010—The Claimants file a response to the Respondent’s observations of March 26, 2010.


(92) HOCHTIEF Aktiengesellschaft v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/07/31

April 16, 2010—The Tribunal holds a telephone conference with the parties.

April 30, 2010—The Claimant files a memorial on the merits.

(93) Mobil Investments Canada Inc. and Murphy Oil Corporation v. Canada (Case No. ARB(AF)/07/4)

August 3, 2009—The Claimants file a memorial on the merits.

October 6, 2009—The Respondent files a request for production of documents.

October 7, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the place of arbitration.

October 15, 2009—The Claimants file observations on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

October 28, 2009—The Claimants file further observations on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

October 29, 2009—The Respondent files a response to the Claimants’ observations of October 15 and 28, 2009.

November 5, 2009—The Tribunal issues a further procedural order concerning the place of arbitration.

November 30, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision on the production of documents.

December 1, 2009—The Respondent files a counter-memorial on the merits.

March 15, 2010—The Claimants file a request for production of documents. The Respondent files observations on the Claimants’ request for production of documents.

March 27, 2010—The Tribunal decides on the Claimants’ request for production of documents.

April 8, 2010—The Claimants file a reply on the merits.

May 12, 2010—The Respondent files a further request for production of documents.

May 14, 2010—The Claimants file
observations on the Respondent’s further request for production of documents.

May 24, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on the Respondent’s further request for production of documents.

June 9, 2010—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.

(94) Astaldi S.p.A. v. Republic of Honduras (Case No. ARB/07/32)

August 28, 2009—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.

February 3, 2010—The parties file concluding briefs.

April 28, 2010—The parties file statements on costs.

May 27, 2010—The Sole Arbitrator declares the proceeding closed.

(95) Marion Unglaube v. Republic of Costa Rica (Case No. ARB/08/1)

April 30, 2010—The Claimant files a memorial on liability and damages.

(96) ATA Construction, Industrial and Trading Company v. Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (Case No. ARB/08/2)

July 3, 2009—The Claimant files a rejoinder on jurisdiction.

August 20, 2009—The Tribunal holds a pre-hearing conference with the parties by telephone.

October 5–9, 2009—The Tribunal holds a hearing on jurisdiction and the merits in Washington, D.C.

December 3, 2009—The parties file post-hearing briefs.

February 5, 2010—The parties file submissions on costs.

February 26, 2010—The parties file reply submissions on costs.

May 18, 2010—The Tribunal renders its award.

(97) Quadrant Pacific Growth Fund L.P. and Canasco Holdings Inc. v. Republic of Costa Rica (Case No. ARB(AF)/08/1)

August 21, 2009—The Claimants file a reply on the merits.

October 27, 2009—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.

January 25, 2010—The Secretary-General moves that the Tribunal stay the proceeding, and the proceeding is stayed for non-payment of the required advances, pursuant to ICSID Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d).
(98) Brandes Investment Partners, LP v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (Case No. ARB/08/3)

July 28, 2009—Following the resignation of Robert Briner (Swiss), the Centre notifies the parties of a vacancy on the Tribunal and the suspension of the proceeding.

September 1, 2009—The Respondent files a reply on jurisdiction.

October 15, 2009—The Claimant files a rejoinder on jurisdiction.

December 23, 2009—The Tribunal is reconstituted. Its members are: Rodrigo Oreamuno (Costa Rican), President; Karl-Heinz Böckstiegel (German); and Brigitte Stern (French).

June 7, 2010—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.

(100) Burlington Resources, Inc. v. Republic of Ecuador (Case No. ARB/08/5)

July 20, 2009—The Respondent files a memorial on jurisdiction.

October 29, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the withdrawal of certain claims and the revocation of its procedural order of June 29, 2009.

January 22, 2010—The Tribunal holds a hearing on jurisdiction in Paris.

June 2, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on jurisdiction.

(101) Perenco Ecuador Limited v. Republic of Ecuador and Empresa Estatal Petróleos del Ecuador (Petroecuador) (Case No. ARB/08/6)

July 17, 2009—The Respondents file a memorial on jurisdiction.

September 17, 2009—The Claimant files a counter-memorial on jurisdiction.

November 17, 2009—The Respondents file a reply on jurisdiction.

December 16, 2009—Following the resignation of Charles N. Brower, the Secretary-General notifies the parties of a vacancy on the Tribunal and of the suspension of the proceeding.

April 5–6, 2010—The Tribunal holds a hearing on jurisdiction in Washington, D.C.
January 13, 2010—The Tribunal is reconstituted. Its members are: Thomas Bingham (British), President; Neil Kaplan (British); and J. Christopher Thomas (Canadian).

January 15, 2010—The Claimant files a rejoinder on jurisdiction.

February 17, 2010—Following the resignation of Thomas Bingham, the Secretary-General notifies the parties of a vacancy on the Tribunal and of the suspension of the proceeding.

May 6, 2010—The Tribunal is reconstituted. Its members are: Peter Tomka (Slovak), President; Neil Kaplan (British); and J. Christopher Thomas (Canadian).

(102) Itera International Energy LLC and Itera Group NV v. Georgia (Case No. ARB/08/7)

July 1, 2009—The Respondent files observations on the Claimants’ request for production of documents.

July 6, 2009—The Tribunal decides on the Claimants’ request for the production of documents.

September 15, 2009—The Respondent files a request for production of documents.

September 24, 2009—The Claimants file observations on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

September 30, 2009—The Respondent files a response to the Claimants’ observations of September 24, 2009.

October 6, 2009—The Claimants file further observations on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

October 15, 2009—The Tribunal holds a hearing on an ancillary claim in Washington, D.C.

October 21, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision on the production of documents.

December 4, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision on the admissibility of ancillary claims.

December 18, 2009—The Claimants file a request for production of documents.

January 14, 2010—The Respondent files observations on the Claimants’ request for production of documents.

January 29, 2010—The Respondent files a counter-memorial on the merits and jurisdiction.

March 11, 2010—The proceeding is suspended pursuant to the parties’ agreement.
(103) Inmaris Perestroika Sailing Maritime Services GmbH and others v. Ukraine (Case No. ARB/08/8)

July 10, 2009—The President of the Tribunal holds a pre-hearing conference with the parties by telephone.

July 20–21, 2009—The Tribunal holds a hearing on jurisdiction in The Hague.

September 1, 2009—The parties file post-hearing briefs.

March 8, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on jurisdiction.

(104) Giordano Alpi and others v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/08/9)

July 20, 2009—The Claimants file a request for production of documents.

July 23, 2009—The Respondent files a response to the Claimants’ request for production of documents.

September 18, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision on production of documents.

November 26, 2009—The Claimants file a counter-memorial on jurisdiction and admissibility.

December 15, 2009—The Respondent files a request for production of documents.


February 2, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on the production of documents.

March 12, 2010—The Respondent files a reply on jurisdiction and admissibility.

March 22, 2010—The Claimants file a further request for production of documents.


May 5, 2010—The proceeding is suspended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

(105) Repsol YPF Ecuador, S.A. and others v. Republic of Ecuador and Empresa Estatal Petróleos del Ecuador (PetroEcuador) (Case No. ARB/08/10)

December 17, 2009—The Claimants file a memorial on the merits.

(106) Bosh International, Inc. and B&P, LTD Foreign Investments Enterprise v. Ukraine (Case No. ARB/08/11)

July 29, 2009—The Tribunal holds a first session in Washington, D.C.

November 30, 2009—The Claimants file a memorial on the merits.

April 29, 2010—The Respondent files a counter-memorial on the merits.
(107) Caratube International Oil Company LLP v. Republic of Kazakhstan (Case No. ARB/08/12)

July 31, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision on provisional measures.

September 2, 2009—The Respondent files a request for production of documents.

October 16, 2009—The Claimant files observations on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.


December 22, 2009—The Respondent files a counter-memorial on jurisdiction and the merits.

February 26, 2010—The parties file requests for production of documents.

March 8, 2010—Each party files observations on the other party’s request for production of documents.

March 15, 2010—Each party files a response to the other party’s observations of March 8, 2010.

May 3, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of documents.

May 26, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the procedural calendar and the production of documents.

(108) Alapli Elektrik B.V. v. Republic of Turkey (Case No. ARB/08/13)

September 26, 2009—The Claimant files a memorial on the merits.

October 2, 2009—The Respondent files a request for production of documents.

October 9, 2009—The Claimant files observations on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

October 12, 2009—The Respondent files a response to the Claimant’s observations of October 9, 2009.


October 21, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of documents.

January 12, 2010—The Respondent files a further request for production of documents.

January 19, 2010—The Claimant files observations on the Respondent’s further request for production of documents. The Respondent files a response to the Claimant’s observations.

January 21, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of documents.

March 15, 2010—The Respondent files a memorial on jurisdiction and a counter-memorial on the merits.

April 25, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order on bifurcation.

May 28, 2010—The Claimant files a request for production of documents.

June 8, 2010—The Respondent files observations on the Claimant’s request for production of documents.

September 1, 2009—The Claimants file a request for provisional measures.

October 26, 2009—The Respondent files observations on the Claimants’ request for provisional measures. The Respondent files a proposal for disqualification of an arbitrator; the proceeding is suspended.

October 28, 2009—The arbitrator furnishes explanations in regard to the proposal for disqualification of an arbitrator.

November 2, 2009—The parties file observations on the proposal for disqualification of an arbitrator.

November 4, 2009—The parties file further observations on the proposal for disqualification of an arbitrator.

November 6, 2009—The proposal for disqualification of an arbitrator is declined; the proceeding is resumed.

November 16, 2009—The Tribunal holds a first session and a hearing on provisional measures in Paris.

January 15, 2010—The Respondent files a memorial on jurisdiction.

March 3, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on provisional measures.

March 15, 2010—The Claimants file a counter-memorial on jurisdiction.

(109) Impregilo S.p.A. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/08/14)

August 13, 2009—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Hans Danielius (Swedish), President; Charles N. Brower (U.S.), and Kamal Hossain (Bangladeshi).

(110) CEMEX Caracas Investments B.V. and CEMEX Caracas II Investments B.V. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (Case No. ARB/08/15)

July 6, 2009—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Gilbert Guillaume (French), President; Georges Abi-Saab (Egyptian); and Robert von Mehren (U.S.).
May 17, 2010—The Respondent files a reply on jurisdiction.

June 25, 2010—The Claimants file a rejoinder on jurisdiction.

(111) GEA Group Aktiengesellschaft v. Ukraine (Case No. ARB/08/16)

July 1, 2009—The Claimant files a memorial on the merits.

January 11, 2010—The Respondent files a counter-memorial on the merits.

January 22, 2010—The parties file requests for production of documents.

February 5, 2010—Each party files observations on the other party’s request for production of documents.

February 12, 2010—Each party files a response to the other party’s observations of February 5, 2010.

February 19, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of documents.

February 23, 2010—The Claimant files a request for clarification of the Tribunal’s procedural order of February 19, 2010.

February 24, 2010—The Respondent files observations on the Claimant’s request for clarification. The Tribunal issues a procedural order clarifying its procedural order of February 19, 2010.

April 15, 2010—The Claimant files a reply on the merits.

June 15, 2010—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.

June 22, 2010—The Tribunal holds a pre-hearing conference with the parties by telephone.

(112) Participaciones Inversiones Portuarias SARL v. Gabonese Republic (Case No. ARB/08/17)

July 25, 2009—The Tribunal holds a first session in Paris. The Claimant files a proposal for disqualification of an arbitrator; the proceeding is suspended.

August 14, 2009—The Respondent files observations on the Claimant’s proposal for disqualification of an arbitrator.

September 7, 2009—The Claimant files observations on the proposal for disqualification of an arbitrator.

September 14, 2009—The Respondent files a response to the Claimant’s observations of September 7, 2009.

September 22, 2009—The arbitrator furnishes explanations in regard to the proposal for disqualification.

November 12, 2009—The proposal for disqualification of an arbitrator is declined; the proceeding is resumed.
January 23, 2010—The Claimant files a memorial on the merits.

March 15, 2010—The Respondent informs the Tribunal of its intent to file preliminary objections to jurisdiction and files a request to deal with the objections to jurisdiction as a preliminary matter. The Respondent files a request for production of documents.

March 26, 2010—The Claimant files observations on the Respondent’s request to deal with the objections to jurisdiction as a preliminary matter.

April 2, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on the Respondent’s request to deal with the objections to jurisdiction as a preliminary matter.

April 5, 2010—The Claimant files observations on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

April 15, 2010—The Secretary-General moves that the Tribunal stay the proceeding, pursuant to ICSID Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d).

April 16, 2010—The proceeding is stayed for lack of payment of the required advances, pursuant to ICSID Administrative and Financial Regulation 14(3)(d).

(113) Malicorp Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt (Case No. ARB/08/18)

July 1, 2009—The Respondent files objections to jurisdiction.

July 23, 2009—The Claimant files a counter-memorial on jurisdiction.

July 31, 2009—The Tribunal holds a first session in Paris.

October 23, 2009—The Claimant files a counter-memorial on jurisdiction and a memorial on the merits.

January 8, 2010—The Respondent files a reply on jurisdiction and a counter-memorial on the merits.

February 5, 2010—The Claimant files a rejoinder on jurisdiction and a reply on the merits.

March 5, 2010—The Respondent files a rejoinder on the merits.

March 29, 2010—The Tribunal holds a pre-hearing conference with the parties by telephone.

April 19–20, 2010—The Tribunal holds a hearing on jurisdiction and liability in Paris.
(114) Karmer Marble Tourism Construction Industry and Commerce Limited Liability Company v. Georgia (Case No. ARB/08/19)

September 18, 2009—The Tribunal holds a first session in Geneva.

October 20, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order on confidentiality.

December 15, 2009—The Claimants file a memorial on the merits.

January 8, 2010—The Claimants file a request for provisional measures.

January 25, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on provisional measures.

March 17, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of documents.

March 30, 2010—The Tribunal issues a further procedural order concerning the production of documents.

April 30, 2010—The Respondent files its counter-memorial on the merits.

(115) Millicom International Operations B.V. and Sentel GSM S.A. v. Republic of Senegal (Case No. ARB/08/20)

August 24, 2009—The Claimants file a request for provisional measures.

September 7, 2009—The Tribunal holds a first session in Paris.

September 14, 2009—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning various procedural matters.

October 5, 2009—The Respondent files observations on the Claimants’ request for provisional measures.

October 29, 2009—The Respondent files a memorial on jurisdiction.

November 9, 2009—The Tribunal holds a hearing on provisional measures in Paris.

December 9, 2009—The Tribunal issues a decision on provisional measures.

December 14, 2009—The Claimants file a counter-memorial on jurisdiction.

January 15, 2010—The Respondent files a reply on jurisdiction.

February 12, 2010—The Claimants file a rejoinder on jurisdiction.

March 3, 2010—The Tribunal holds a pre-hearing conference with the parties by telephone.

April 1, 2010—The Tribunal holds a hearing on jurisdiction in Paris.
(116) Teinver S.A., Transportes de Cercanías S.A. and Autobuses Urbanos del Sur S.A. v. Argentine Republic (Case No. ARB/09/1)

January 4, 2010—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Thomas Buergenthal (U.S.), President; Henri C. Álvarez (Canadian); and Kamal Hossain (Bangladeshi).

March 22, 2010—The Tribunal holds a first session in Paris.

(117) Deutsche Bank AG v. Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka (Case No. ARB/09/2)

July 6, 2009—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Bernard Hanotiau (Belgian), President; Makhdoom Ali Khan (Pakistani); and David A.R. Williams (New Zealand).

September 9, 2009—The Tribunal holds a first session by telephone conference.

September 25, 2009—The Claimant files a memorial on the merits.

December 14, 2009—The Respondent files objections to jurisdiction and reiterates its request to address the objections to jurisdiction as a preliminary matter.

January 14, 2010—The Claimant files observations on the Respondent’s objections to jurisdiction and on the request to address the objections to jurisdiction as a preliminary matter.


February 25, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the Respondent’s request to deal with the objections to jurisdiction as a preliminary matter.

April 1, 2010—The Claimant files a request for production of documents. The Respondent files a counter-memorial on the merits.

April 9, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of documents.

May 17, 2010—The Claimant files a reply on the merits and a counter-memorial on jurisdiction.

June 3, 2010—The Respondent files a request for production of documents and an application for adjournment of the hearing.

June 3, 2010—The Claimant files observations on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.

June 10, 2010—The Tribunal partially decides on the Respondent’s request for production of documents.
June 23, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of documents.

June 24, 2010—The Respondent files a further request for production of documents.

June 25, 2010—The Tribunal holds a pre-hearing conference with the parties by telephone.

June 26, 2010—The Claimant files observations on the Respondent’s further request for production of documents.

(118) Holcim Limited, Holderfin B.V. and Caricement B.V. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (Case No. ARB/09/3)

December 10, 2009—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Juan Fernández-Armesto (Spanish), President; Georges Abi-Saab (Egyptian), and Charles N. Brower (U.S.).

February 26, 2010—The Tribunal holds a first session in Paris.

March 31, 2010—The Claimants file a memorial on jurisdiction and the merits.

(119) Elsamex, S.A. v. Republic of Honduras (Case No. ARB/09/4)

August 18, 2009—The Tribunal is constituted. The Sole Arbitrator is Enrique Gómez-Pinzón (Colombian).

October 15, 2009—The Tribunal holds a first session by telephone conference.

November 11, 2009—The Respondent files a memorial on jurisdiction.

December 22, 2009—The Claimant files a counter-memorial on jurisdiction.

June 4, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on jurisdiction.

June 22, 2010—The Claimant files a request for production of documents.

(120) Iberdrola Energía, S.A. v. Republic of Guatemala (Case No. ARB/09/5)

July 20, 2009—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Eduardo Zuleta (Colombian), President; Yves Derains (French); and Rodrigo Oreamuno (Costa Rican).

September 18, 2009—The Tribunal holds a first session in Washington, D.C.

November 26, 2009—The Claimant files a memorial on the merits.

January 25, 2010—The Respondent files a memorial on jurisdiction and admissibility.

February 25, 2010—The Claimant files a counter-memorial on jurisdiction and admissibility.

March 24, 2010—The Tribunal issues a decision on bifurcation.
(121) Vattenfall AB, Vattenfall Europe AG, Vattenfall Europe Generation AG v. Federal Republic of Germany (Case No. ARB/09/6)

September 17, 2009—The Tribunal holds a first session in Paris.

March 15, 2010—The proceeding is suspended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

(122) MTN (Dubai) Limited and MTN Yemen for Mobile Telephones v. Republic of Yemen (Case No. ARB/09/7)

September 24, 2009—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Marc Lalonde (Canadian), President; Barton Legum (U.S.); and Daniel M. Price (U.S.).

December 4, 2009—The Tribunal holds a first session in Frankfurt.

June 25, 2010—The Tribunal renders its award embodying the parties’ settlement agreement, pursuant to ICSID Arbitration Rule 43(2).

(123) KT Asia Investment Group B.V. v. Republic of Kazakhstan (Case No. ARB/09/8)

March 18, 2010—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler (Swiss), President; Ian Glick (British); and J. Christopher Thomas (Canadian).

May 7, 2010—The Tribunal holds a first session in London.

(124) Adem Dogan v. Turkmenistan (Case No. ARB/09/9)

December 8, 2009—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Jan Paulsson (French), President; Philippe Sands (British/French); Markus Wirth (Swiss).

March 29, 2010—The Tribunal holds a first session by telephone conference.

(125) EVN AG v. Macedonia, former Yugoslav Republic of (Case No. ARB/09/10)

July 24, 2009—The Respondent files observations on the Claimant’s request for provisional measures.


September 9, 2009—The Claimant withdraws its request for provisional measures.

September 14, 2009—The Respondent files a response to the Claimant’s observations of August 17, 2009.

October 9, 2009—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Piero Bernadini (Italian), President; Vaughan Lowe (British); and Francisco Orrego Vicuña (Chilean).
December 4, 2009—The Tribunal holds a first session in The Hague.

Global Trading Resource Corp. and Globex International, Inc. v. Ukraine (Case No. ARB/09/11)

December 9, 2009—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Franklin Berman (British), President; Emmanuel Gaillard (French), and J. Christopher Thomas (Canadian).

January 5, 2010—The Respondent files preliminary objections pursuant to ICSID Arbitration Rule 41(5).

February 3, 2010—The Tribunal holds a telephone conference concerning various procedural matters.

March 15, 2010—The Claimants file observations on the Respondent’s preliminary objections.

March 26, 2010—The Respondent files a reply to the Claimants’ observations of March 15, 2010.

April 9, 2010—The Claimants file a rejoinder to the Respondent’s reply of March 26, 2010.

Pac Rim Cayman LLC v. Republic of El Salvador (Case No. ARB/09/12)

November 18, 2009—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: V.V. Veeder (British), President; Brigitte Stern (French); and Guido Santiago Tawil (Argentine).

January 4, 2010—The Respondent files preliminary objections.

February 26, 2010—The Claimant files a response on preliminary objections.

March 31, 2010—The Respondent files a reply on preliminary objections.

May 13, 2010—The Claimant files a rejoinder on preliminary objections.

May 31–June 1, 2010—The Tribunal holds a hearing on the Respondent’s preliminary objections in Washington, D.C.

June 10, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning amicus curiae submissions on preliminary objections.

International Company for Railway Systems (ICRS) v. Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (Case No. ARB/09/13)

July 16, 2009—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

December 28, 2009—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Patrick L. Robinson (Jamaican), President; Stanimir A. Alexandrov (Bulgarian); and Bernard Audit (French).

February 26, 2010—Following the request by one of the Claimants, Privatization Holding Company (PHC), the Tribunal issues a procedural order for the discontinuance of the proceeding with respect to PHC. The Tribunal holds a first session in Paris.
April 30, 2010—The Claimant files a memorial on the merits.

June 4, 2010—The Respondent files a request to stay the proceedings.

June 21, 2010—The Claimant files observations on the Respondent’s request to stay the proceedings.

June 30, 2010—The Respondent files a memorial on jurisdiction.

(129) Mærsk Olie, Algeriet A/S v. People’s Democratic Republic of Algeria (Case No. ARB/09/14)

July 29, 2009—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

March 10, 2010—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler (Swiss), President; Kamal Hossain (Bangladeshi); and David A.R. Williams (New Zealand).

April 22, 2010—The Tribunal holds a first session in Paris.

June 21, 2010—The Claimant files a memorial on the merits.

(130) H&H Enterprises Investments, Inc. v. Arab Republic of Egypt (Case No. ARB/09/15)

August 11, 2009—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

February 2, 2010—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Bernardo M. Cremades (Spanish), President; Hamid G. Gharavi (Iranian/French); and Veijo Heiskanen (Finnish).

March 18, 2010—The Tribunal holds a first session in Paris.

March 28, 2010—The Claimant files a request for production of documents.

May 7, 2010—The Respondent files observations on the Claimant’s request for production of documents.

June 17, 2010—The Tribunal issues a procedural order concerning the production of documents.

(131) Swisslion DOO Skopje v. Macedonia, former Yugoslav Republic of (Case No. ARB/09/16)

August 21, 2009—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

March 18, 2010—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Gilbert Guillaume (French), President; Daniel M. Price (U.S.); and J. Christopher Thomas (Canadian).

May 11, 2010—The Tribunal holds a first session in Paris.

June 26, 2010—The Claimant files a request for production of documents.
(132) Commerce Group Corp. and San Sebastian Gold Mines, Inc. v. Republic of El Salvador (Case No. ARB/09/17)

August 21, 2009—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

(133) Cambodia Power Company v. Kingdom of Cambodia and Electricité du Cambodge (Case No. ARB/09/18)

September 16, 2009—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

January 8, 2010—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Neil Kaplan (British), President; John Beechey (British), and Toby Landau (British).

April 9, 2010—The Tribunal holds a first session in The Hague.


October 23, 2009—The Deputy Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

March 3, 2010—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Donald F. Donovan (U.S.), President; Jean Kalicki (U.S.); and Philippe Pinsolle (French).

April 27, 2010—The Tribunal holds a first session in Washington, D.C.

(135) Gold Reserve Inc. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (Case No. ARB(AF)/09/1)

November 9, 2009—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

March 9, 2010—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Piero Bernardini (Italian), President; Pierre-Marie Dupuy (French); and David A.R. Williams (New Zealand).

April 23, 2010—The Tribunal holds a first session by telephone conference.

(136) Reinhard Hans Unglaube v. Republic of Costa Rica (Case No. ARB/09/20)

November 11, 2009—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

December 29, 2009—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Judd L. Kessler (U.S.), President; Franklin Berman (British); and Bernardo M. Cremades (Spanish).

February 4, 2010—The Tribunal holds a first session by telephone conference.

April 30, 2010—The Claimant files a memorial on liability and damages.
(137) Abengoa, S.A. y COFIDES, S.A. v. United Mexican States (Case No. ARB(AF)/09/2)

December 11, 2009—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

(138) UAB “ARVI” ir ko and UAB “SANITEX” v. Republic of Serbia (Case No. ARB/09/21)

December 18, 2009—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

June 29, 2010—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Thomas Buergenthal (U.S.), President; Charles N. Brower (U.S.); and Tibor Varady (Serbian).

(139) Itera International Energy LLC and Itera Group NV v. Georgia (Case No. ARB/09/22)

December 29, 2009—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

March 24, 2010—The proceeding is suspended, pursuant to the parties’ agreement.

(140) Corporación Quiport S.A. and others v. Republic of Ecuador (Case No. ARB/09/23)

December 30, 2009—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

January 13, 2010—The constitution of the Tribunal is suspended following the agreement of the parties.

(141) Kilic Insaat Ihracat Sanayi ve Ticaret Anonim Sirketi v. Turkmenistan (Case No. ARB/10/1)

January 19, 2010—The Deputy Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

(142) Convial Callao S.A. and CCI — Compañía de Concesiones de Infraestructura S.A. v. Republic of Peru (Case No. ARB/10/2)

February 2, 2010—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

(143) Metal-Tech Ltd. v. Republic of Uzbekistan (Case No. ARB/10/3)

February 4, 2010—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

June 28, 2010—The Tribunal is constituted. Its members are: Gabrielle Kaufmann-Kohler (Swiss), President; John Townsend (U.S.); and Claus von Wobeser (Mexican).
(144) Antoine Abou Lahoud and Leila Bounafeh-Abou Lahoud v. Democratic Republic of the Congo (Case No. ARB/10/4)

March 4, 2010—The Deputy Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

(145) Tidewater Inc. and others v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (Case No. ARB/10/5)

March 5, 2010—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

(146) RSM Production Corporation and others v. Grenada (Case No. ARB/10/6)

March 16, 2010—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

(147) FTR Holding S.A. (Switzerland), Philip Morris Products S.A. (Switzerland) and Abal Hermanos S.A. (Uruguay) v. Oriental Republic of Uruguay (Case No. ARB/10/7)

March 26, 2010—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

(148) Pan American Energy LLC v. Plurinational State of Bolivia (Case No. ARB/10/8)

April 12, 2010—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

(149) Universal Compression International Holdings, S.L.U. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (Case No. ARB/10/9)

April 12, 2010—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

(150) Olyana Holdings LLC v. Republic of Rwanda (Case No. ARB/10/10)

April 16, 2010—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

May 14, 2010—The Claimant files a request for provisional measures.

(151) Niko Resources (Bangladesh) Ltd. v. People’s Republic of Bangladesh, Bangladesh Petroleum Exploration & Production Company Limited (“Bapex”) and Bangladesh Oil Gas and Mineral Corporation (“Petrobangla”) (Case No. ARB/10/11)

May 27, 2010—The Deputy Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

(152) Standard Chartered Bank v. The United Republic of Tanzania (Case No. ARB/10/12)

June 11, 2010—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.
(153) Mr. Hassan Awdi, Enterprise Business Consultants, Inc. and Alfa El Corporation v. Romania (Case No. ARB/10/13)

June 16, 2010—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.

(154) Opic Karimum Corporation v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (Case No. ARB/10/14)

June 16, 2010—The Secretary-General registers a request for the institution of arbitration proceedings.