5th Annual Arbitration and Investment Summit – Caribbean, Latin America and Other Emerging Markets and Other Emerging Markets

Factors driving choice of <u>ARBITRATION</u> in <u>ADVERSERIAL</u> Energy Sector context

Litigation

Judge or jury - court issues binding decision **PROS**

- Formal. Evidence / time to support argument.
- Verdict is final and binding. Winner / loser.
- Open and transparent process.
- Enforceable in same jurisdiction.
- Creates precedent for similar disputes.

<u>CONS</u>

- National Courts no neutral ground
- Judges (or jurors), are **'foreign' parties** to the dispute. **No detailed expertise**.
- Lack awareness of oil industry technicalities.
- Very high cost and time consumption.
- Open to appeal, added **cost and time**
- Open to the public Oil industry closely knit demanding confidentiality.
- Detrimental to the **relationship** business divorce
- Binding decision –no middle ground / mutual consensus.

Arbitration

Binding - mutually agreed third-party / institution. Neutral.

<u>PROS</u>

- Select arbitrator or institution based on expertise. (40%)
- Private confidentiality is maintained often crucial. (33%)
- Outcome has global enforceability. New York Convention.
- Finality. Relationship maintained. (65%)
- Lower **cost** likely consumes less **time**.
- Flexible / Customised. choose venue / platform. Neutral ground

<u>CONS</u>

- One party can prolong the proceedings. Increasing cost.
- Potential to be as formal as litigation in case of adverse parties.
- Limited scope of appeal.

Expert determination

Expert or umpire vast knowledge. Technical / financial claims.

<u>PROS</u>

- Expert well aware and knowledgeable. Confidence.
- Confidentiality maintained. The business relations maintained.
- Potentially binding.
- Faster and cheaper. Less formal set of rules and regulations.

<u>CONS</u>

- Not easily challenged.
- No interpretation of law. Expert rules no natural justice.
- Not easily enforceable.

ARBITRATION in Energy Sector

• Fundamentally <u>HAS</u> to be attractive Proposition

1. Cost and Time - Efficient

- Institutional
- Ad Hoc

2. Integrity - Certainty

- Expertise Technical
- Track Record / Reputation
- Confidential
- Enforceable

3. Practical

- Infrastructure
 - > Human





- Size of market, Sector Capital Flows
- Reputation / Track Record
 Routinely enforced





→ Knowledge

MAP SHOWING PREVIOUS PETROLEUM EXPLORATION LICENCES

IN THE BAHAMAS

Source: The Commonwealth of The Bahamas

→ Knowledge Regional Hydrocarbon Distribution Map ... shows & production

Gravity Data from Sandwell et al. (2013); image processing courtesy of Stephen Leslie

Local Activity

→ Knowledge / Financials

What Would The Project Benefits Be?

→ Financials

Dividing the Pie

Exploration and Development Costs: \$40 Billion

Bahamas Government Revenue: \$20 Billion BPC Return on Investment: \$20 Billion

No financial risk, No cost to Government

Projected revenue assumes 1 billion bbls developed at \$80/bbl oil price

- → Supply contracts: Rigs
- → Education: Opportunity
- → Training: Jobs; International options
- → Royalties: Long term revenues
- → Debt burden: Relief
- → Development: Growth
- → Fuel and Power: Cheaper, lower costs
- → Wealth Fund: Generations to come

	~ 5 - 10+ years	~ 1 year	- 1 - 3 years	~ 3 - 6 years	- 20 - 40 years
Phase	Seismic & Geologic Studies	Exploratory Drilling	Appraisal Drilling	Development Planning & Construction	Development and Production
BPC	\$50 million	\$60 - 160 million	\$400 - 600 million	\$multiple billion USD	
Gov.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	~ \$ tens billion revenue
	Completed	In Progress	Estimated Typical Costs Based upon Exploration Success		

Licence / Oil Field Boundary Disputes - Unitisation

- → Oil price long term contracts
 - Cancelled projects
- → Increasing level of trade and competing projects
 - Falling demand in context of excess supply
- → Complex value chain
- → Long term relationships

Commercial disputes

- Complexity
- Contractual, Financial, Technical
- → Expert Determination

Licence / Oil Field Boundary Disputes - Unitisation

- → Geology / Nature deciding factor
- → Maximise economic realisation
 - Efficient operations
 - Single field operator
 - Common reservoirs
 - Well locations
- → Global relationships

Unitisation disputes

- Legal, Technical, Tenure
- Dominant partner
- → Litigation

International Boundary Disputes - Determination

- → Changing nation status / Government
- → International relationships
- → Sovereign Wealth Fund
- → International precedent
- \rightarrow Other examples
 - China Spratly Islands
 - Nigeria Sao Tome
 - Caspian Sea

International disputes

- Fairness?? Reputation
- → Arbitration

Oil Exploration – Oil Develompent Potential in The Bahamas? → Possibility

- Attractive to BPC
 - Size of fields
 - Low cost environment
 - Legislative and fiscal stability
 - Technology application

- Licences 2007- renewed 2013
 - Drilling to commence 2015
- +\$80 million spent to date
- Nassau based office & staff 1

1. Specialist knowledge

- Centre of expertise Technical, Legal and Financial
- Demonstrated industry activity and capital investment

2. Specialist knowledge

- Centre of expertise Technical, Legal and Financial
- Demonstrated industry activity and capital investment

3. Specialist knowledge

- Centre of expertise Technical, Legal and Financial
- Demonstrated industry activity and capital investment

4. Conventions

- National signatory
- Global enforceability

5. Confidentiality / Confidence

• Integrity of institutions / system

5th Annual Arbitration and Investment Summit – Caribbean, Latin America and Other Emerging Markets and Other Emerging Markets