



# Arbitrator Intelligence Questionnaire (AIQ)

Arbitrator Intelligence aims to promote fairness, transparency, and accountability in the arbitrator selection process, and to facilitate increased diversity in arbitrator appointments.

PLEASE NOTE: The following is a “static” version of the AIQ for informational purposes only.



### Arbitrator Intelligence Questionnaire: Phase I\*

The questions that follow constitute Phase I of the Arbitrator Intelligence Questionnaire

(AIQ). They seek certain factual information about the case, such as the arbitrators' names and key dates. This information should be readily identifiable from the arbitral award or case file.

Your responses in Phase I will prefill key information into Phase II questions of the AIQ. This information will make Phase II quicker and easier to complete.

At the end of Phase I, you will be invited to continue on to take Phase II, or nominate another member or members of your legal team to take Phase II.

Phase I questions should generally take less than 15 minutes to complete.

You may save and resume your AIQ at any point.

\* \* \*

Thank you for taking part in Phase I of the AIQ!

\* None of the questions in the AIQ requests confidential information, such as the identity of the parties. AIQ responses will be treated as anonymous and not be attributed to individual responders, except and unless you contribute an award and request to be acknowledged as the contributor.



## BACKGROUND OF RESPONDER

Which party to the arbitration are you associated with?

- Claimant
- Respondent
- Intervenor
- Other (please specify):

What is your association with that party?

- Outside or external lawyer
- Principal or manager
- In-house lawyer
- Government lawyer
- Third-party funder, insurer, or guarantor
- Other (please specify):

How many lawyers comprised the core legal team working on your side of the arbitration?

- 1-3 lawyers
- 4-6 lawyers
- 7-10 lawyers
- More than 10 lawyers

In how many international arbitration cases would you estimate the most senior member of the legal team on your side of the arbitration has participated during his or her career?

Please indicate the main jurisdictions where most lawyers working on your side of the arbitration are physically located:

City:

Country:

City:

Country:

City:

Country:



## BACKGROUND OF THE DISPUTE

Please indicate the nature of the arbitration:

- Investment
- Commercial
- Maritime
- Sports
- Reinsurance
- Public international law/State-to-State
- Other

Please indicate the industry, economic sector, or nature of dispute (please select all that apply):

- Banking and finance
- Construction
- Corporate transactions
- Energy (other than oil & gas)
- Information services
- Insurance
- Intellectual property
- Mining
- Manufacturing
- Oil and gas
- Real estate
- Shipping and transportation
- Sports
- Telecommunications
- Trade in goods
- Other (please specify)

Was the arbitration ad hoc (please indicate) or administered (please identify the arbitral institution)?

Which arbitral rules governed the arbitration?

Please indicate the legal seat (sometimes called the "place of arbitration" or where the award was "made").  
Do not indicate the physical location of hearings, if different from the legal seat.

City, country.

Please indicate the language of arbitration:



## CONSTITUTION OF THE TRIBUNAL

How many arbitrators were on the tribunal?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- Other (please indicate)

To answer the AIQ with more than 3 arbitrators, we need to send you a special version of the questionnaire. Please email us at [info@arbitratorintelligence.com](mailto:info@arbitratorintelligence.com) and we will send you that version.

Please provide the full name (LAST NAME, First Name, Middle Initial) of the presiding arbitrator:

Presiding arbitrator					
	Name	Party- Agreement	Co- arbitrators	Arbitral institution, appointing authority	National court
Presiding	<input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide the full names (LAST NAME, First Name, Middle Initial) of the co-arbitrators:

Arbitrators					
	Name	Party- Agreement	Co- arbitrators	Arbitral institution, appointing authority	National court
Co- Arbitrator	<input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Co- Arbitrator	<input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



## THE ARBITRAL PROCEEDINGS

Please indicate the date of filing of the Request for Arbitration or Notice of Arbitration:  
(enter date as DD/MM/YYYY)

Please indicate the total amount of any specified monetary relief sought by the Claimant (do not add together amounts sought for alternative claims or alternative theories):

Please indicate the currency in which the request for monetary relief was quantified:

- US Dollars
- Great Britain Pounds
- Euros
- Singapore Dollars
- Japanese Yen
- Chinese Yuan
- Swiss Francs
- Canadian Dollars
- Other currency

Did the Respondent assert any counterclaims seeking affirmative relief (as opposed to asserting defenses to claims)?

- Yes
- No

Please indicate the total amount of any specified monetary relief sought by the Respondent (do not add together amounts sought for alternative claims or alternative theories):

How was the arbitration resolved?

- Final award
- Settlement
- Voluntary withdrawal of claims
- Dismissal by arbitral institution
- Other (please specify)



Which of the following best describes the final award?

- The award resolved the case on issues of jurisdiction or admissibility
- The award resolved the case on the merits

Please indicate the date when the parties' submissions were completed (the final date of last hearing or date of last post-hearing written submission, whichever is later):

Please enter date as (DD/MM/YYYY)

Date not available:

Please indicate the date the award was signed by the tribunal  
(please enter date as DD/MM/YYYY):

If any separate or dissenting opinion was rendered, please indicate which arbitrator(s) authored the opinion(s) (please select all that apply):

- Arbitrator A
- Arbitrator B
- Arbitrator C



## RELIEF GRANTED

Please indicate specific monetary amounts awarded (if any) (please use [currency specified above will appear] as the currency):

- Amount awarded on claims:
- Amount awarded on counterclaims (if any)
- Total costs and fees awarded:


With respect to the base monetary amounts awarded for claims or counterclaims (i.e., the principal amounts on which interest, if any, was calculated), which of the following is true regarding the tribunal's quantification of those amounts?

- The awarded amount was calculated as of the date of the harm (i.e., the date of the breach of contract or the expropriation)
- The awarded amount was calculated as of the date of the award
- It is uncertain or impossible to determine from the award the date on which the award amount was calculated valued

Please specify nonmonetary relief granted (if any) or any notes regarding amounts specified above:

--





## INTEREST RATES

Did the tribunal award interest?

- Yes, pre-award interest was awarded
- Yes, post-award interest was awarded
- No

Please indicate the rate of pre-award interest:

Please indicate the rate of post-award interest:

What was the basis for pre-award interest?

- Interbank rate
- Risk free rate
- Cost of debt
- Bank deposit rate
- Cost of capital
- Rate imposed by applicable law
- Party agreement
- Uncertain or not specified
- Other (please specify):

What was the basis for post-award interest?

- Interbank rate
- Risk free rate
- Cost of debt
- Bank deposit rate
- Cost of capital
- Rate imposed by applicable law
- Party agreement
- Uncertain or not specified
- Other (please specify):

The pre-award interest was:

- Simple
- Compound
- Uncertain or not specified

The post-award interest was:

- Simple
- Compound
- Uncertain or not specified

What was the frequency of compounding of pre-award interest?

- Daily
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Annually
- Uncertain or not specified
- Other (please specify)

What was the frequency of compounding of post-award interest?

- Daily
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Annually
- Uncertain or not specified
- Other (please specify)



## ALLOCATION OF COSTS & FEES

Excluding lawyers' fees, which of the following describe(s) the award of arbitration costs (please select all that apply)?

- The tribunal awarded all costs to the Claimant
- The tribunal awarded all costs to the Respondent/Counterclaimant
- The tribunal allocated costs evenly between the Claimant and Respondent
- The tribunal awarded costs in accordance with the parties' agreement
- The tribunal allocated costs based on an assessment of the relative merit of each parties' arguments (if indicated)
- The tribunal allocated costs to take account of other considerations, such as alleged misconduct during the proceedings (if indicated)
- Other (please specify)

Which of the following describe(s) the award of lawyers' fees (please select all that apply)?

- The tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay the Claimant's lawyers' fees
- The tribunal ordered the Claimant to pay the Respondent's lawyers' fees
- The tribunal awarded lawyers' fees in accordance with the parties' agreement
- The tribunal left each party to bear its own lawyers' fees
- The tribunal awarded lawyers' fees based on an assessment of the relative merit of each parties' arguments (if indicated)
- The tribunal awarded lawyers' fees to take account of other considerations, such as alleged misconduct during the proceedings (if indicated)
- Other (please specify)

Are there any special circumstances in this case that affect your answers to the questions above? If so, please explain:



## THE AWARD

If it is not subject to any confidentiality obligations (imposed by party agreement or applicable law), please provide a copy of the award (redacted or unredacted):\*

\* By uploading an award, you are certifying that the attached document is authentic and its submission does not knowingly violate any confidentiality obligations or applicable law.

Would you like us to indicate your name as the contributor of the award?\*

\* If you answer in the affirmative, your name will be indicated as the contributor of the award, but your name will not be published with respect to your response to this AIQ.

- Yes (please indicate how you would like your name to appear):

- No

If you do not have a copy of the award, but know where AI might obtain a copy, please indicate below:

Thank you for completing Phase I of the AIQ!



Welcome!

to Phase II of the

Arbitrator Intelligence Questionnaire (AIQ)\*

The questions that follow seek objective information and your detached and professional judgment regarding certain aspects of the proceedings in the arbitration for which you have been nominated. Some factual information (such as dates and arbitrator names) has been prefilled by the person who completed Phase I.

Phase II should take less than 15 minutes to complete.

You may save and resume your AIQ at any point, but there are certain junctures at which you will not be able to go back to earlier responses. If you need to change any of your answers, please write to us at [info@arbitratorintelligence.com](mailto:info@arbitratorintelligence.com).

\* \* \*

Thank you for taking part in Phase II of the AIQ!

\* None of the questions in the AIQ requests confidential information, such as the identity of the parties. AIQ responses will be treated as anonymous and not be attributed to individual responders.



## BACKGROUND ABOUT RESPONDER\*

\*Please note that some general background information about your legal team has already been provided in Phase I of the AIQ.

What is your association with the Responder of Part I?

In approximately how many international arbitrations have you participated (in any capacity)?

In approximately how many international arbitrations have you been appointed to serve as an arbitrator?

- I do not sit or have never been appointed as an arbitrator
- I do sit and/or have sat as an arbitrator (estimated number of arbitrator appointments):

## BACKGROUND OF DISPUTE

Please indicate the date when parties' submissions were completed (the final date of last hearing or date of last post-hearing submissions, whichever is later):

(enter date as DD/MM/YYYY)

Based on the parties' final submissions regarding monetary recovery sought, please estimate the following (do not add together amounts sought for alternative claims or alternative theories):

- Amount sought by Claimant in [currency auto-filled in Phase I]:

- Amount sought by Respondent in [currency auto-filled in Phase I]:

Overall, which statement best characterizes how you regard the outcome of the case?

- The award was more favorable to me or my client than expected
- The award was less favorable to me or my client than expected
- The award was roughly what was expected by me or my client



## CHALLENGES TO ARBITRATORS

Were any arbitrators who signed the final award challenged based on alleged conflicts of interest or other alleged misconduct (please select all that apply)?

- No, none of the arbitrators was challenged
- Yes, Arbitrator A as challenged
- Yes, Arbitrator B was challenged
- Yes, Arbitrator C was challenged

The challenge to Arbitrator A was based on which of the following (please select all that apply)?

- Initial disclosures during the selection and appointment process
- Subsequent disclosures during the proceedings based on new developments or newly discovered facts
- Facts discovered independently by the parties
- Circumstances that arose in the arbitral proceedings
- Other (please specify):

The challenge to Arbitrator B was based on which of the following (please select all that apply)?

- Initial disclosures during the selection and appointment process
- Subsequent disclosures during the proceedings based on new developments or newly discovered facts
- Facts discovered independently by the parties
- Circumstances that arose in the arbitral proceedings
- Other (please specify)

The challenge to Arbitrator C was based on which of the following (please select all that apply)?

- Initial disclosures during the selection and appointment process
- Subsequent disclosures during the proceedings based on new developments or newly discovered facts
- Facts discovered independently by the parties
- Circumstances that arose in the arbitral proceedings
- Other (please specify):

Which of the following statements describes the outcome of the challenge to Arbitrator?

- The challenge was rejected as insufficient to warrant removal or disqualification, and the objecting party subsequently waived any future objection
- The challenge was rejected as insufficient to warrant removal or disqualification, and the objecting party preserved its objection



## INTERIM MEASURES

Were interim measures granted by the tribunal (please select all that apply)?

- No, none of the parties requested interim measures
- No, the tribunal denied a request for interim measures
- Yes, in favor of the Claimant
- Yes, in favor of the Respondent
- Other (please specify):

What was the primary subject of the grant of interim measures requested by the Claimant?

- Security for costs
- Preservation of assets, resources, or rights
- Preservation of evidence
- Protection of intellectual property Protection of confidential information
- Other (please specify):

What was the primary subject of the grant of interim measures requested by the Respondent?

- Security for costs
- Preservation of assets, resources, or rights
- Preservation of evidence
- Protection of intellectual property
- Protection of confidential information
- Other (please specify):

What was the primary subject of the grant of interim measures?

- Security for costs
- Preservation of assets, resources, or rights
- Preservation of evidence
- Protection of intellectual property
- Protection of confidential information
- Other (please specify):





## JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES

Did any party challenge the tribunal's jurisdiction or the admissibility of claims?

- Yes
- No

What was the nature of the jurisdictional or admissibility challenge (please select all that apply)?

- Pathological or invalid arbitration clause
- Failure of a condition precedent
- Application of the arbitration agreement to a non-signatory
- Dispute outside the scope of the arbitration agreement
- Corruption alleged in the underlying contract or transaction
- Dispute involves matters not capable of settlement by arbitration
- Other (please specify):

Were allegations of corruption raised?

- Yes
- No

Which of the following is accurate regarding the allegations of corruption (please select all that apply)?

- Corruption was alleged with respect to jurisdiction or admissibility of claims
- Corruption was alleged as a substantive affirmative defense against claims
- Corruption was alleged with respect to affirmative claims
- Corruption was alleged with respect to the arbitrators
- Corruption was alleged with respect to the arbitral process

Which of the following is accurate regarding the allegations of corruption (please select all that apply)?

- Allegations of corruption were based only on general assertions
- Allegations of corruption were based on specific factual allegations
- The issue of corruption was raised *sua sponte* by the tribunal

Which of the following best describes the tribunal's treatment of the standard of proof for allegations of corruption?

- The tribunal did not expressly address the standard of proof applicable to allegations of corruption
- The tribunal applied to allegations of corruption a higher burden of proof than it applied to other claims or defenses
- The tribunal applied a more relaxed standard of proof to allegations of corruption than it applied to other claims or defenses
- The tribunal applied to allegations of corruption the same standard of proof that it applied to other claims or defenses
- Other (please describe):



Which of the following best describes the tribunal's rulings regarding document production or other evidentiary requests that pertained to allegations of corruption?

- No party made any specific document production or other requests for evidentiary measures with respect to allegations of corruption
- The tribunal granted document production or other requests for evidentiary measures to facilitate investigation of allegations of corruption
- The tribunal refused document production or other requests for evidentiary measures to facilitate investigation of allegations of corruption
- The tribunal *sua sponte* undertook efforts to investigate allegations of corruption

On the substance of the jurisdictional or admissibility challenge(s), the tribunal ruled that:

- Jurisdiction was not present
- Jurisdiction was present over the entire dispute
- Jurisdiction was present over part of the dispute



## TRIBUNAL SECRETARY OR ASSISTANT

Did the tribunal appoint a secretary or assistant in the arbitration (if only the institution appointed, please answer "no")?

- Yes
- No

Please provide the name(s) of tribunal secretary or assistant (optional):

Which of the following is true about the appointment of the tribunal secretary or Which of the following is true about the appointment of the tribunal secretary or assistant (please select all that apply)?

- The tribunal solicited party input before appointing the secretary or assistant
- The tribunal announced the appointment of the secretary or assistant early in the proceedings
- The tribunal secretary or assistant appeared to contribute to the orderly functioning of the proceedings
- The tribunal secretary or assistant did not appear to serve a significant role during the proceedings
- The tribunal secretary or assistant engaged in functions that I/my client believe were inappropriate

Please provide any additional comments regarding the appointment and role of the tribunal secretary or assistant (optional):



## CASE MANAGEMENT & PROCEDURAL RULINGS

In managing the proceedings, which of the following were requested by a party and/or ordered by the arbitral tribunal (please select all that apply)?

	Requested by a party or parties	Ordered by tribunal
Bifurcation of proceedings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Early resolution of particular issues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Early-neutral evaluation of the parties' cases	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Early identification by parties of issues, arguments, and documents on which they intended to rely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Referral of the parties to mediation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other significant case management orders (please describe): <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Did the tribunal encourage or facilitate settlement or mediation of the dispute?

- Yes
- No

In your professional judgment, which of the following statements do you believe are most accurate (please select all that apply)?

- The tribunal's procedural rulings generally promoted the fairness of the proceedings
- The tribunal's procedural rulings generally undermined the fairness of the proceedings
- The tribunal's procedural rulings generally promoted the efficiency of the proceedings
- The tribunal's procedural rulings generally undermined the efficiency of the proceedings

Please provide any additional comments on the tribunal's case management and procedural rulings (optional):



## INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Did any party request document production (please select all that apply)?

- Yes, the Claimant requested document production
- Yes, the Respondent requested document production
- No, neither party requested document production

Which of the following describe(s) any order(s) by the tribunal regarding document production (please select all that apply)?

- Both parties were ordered to produce all documents requested
- Claimant was ordered to produce all documents requested
- Respondent was ordered to produce all documents requested
- Claimant was ordered to produce some but not all documents requested
- Respondent was ordered to produce some but not all documents requested
- The tribunal denied all requests for document production

Which of the following describe(s) the document production ordered by the tribunal (please select all that apply)?\*

\*Descriptions of document categories are based on art. 3(3) of the IBA Rules on the Taking of Evidence in International Arbitration (2010)

- Production was ordered in accordance with the agreement of the parties
- Production was ordered of a limited number of individually identified documents
- Production was ordered of “narrow and specific requested category[ies] of Documents that are reasonably believed to exist”
- Production was ordered of documents maintained in electronic form based on identification of “specific files, search terms, individuals or other means of searching for such Documents in an efficient and economical manner”
- Production was ordered of broad categories of documents based on general statements of materiality and relevance

Document production request was denied because:

- The documents were not specifically identified
- The document request was deemed to be too broad or likely to require production of too many documents
- The documents were deemed to be not relevant or not material
- The document request was deemed untimely
- The tribunal denied document production without explanation

In your professional judgment, which of the following best describe(s) the extent of the document production ordered by the tribunal in this case?

- Much too extensive
- Somewhat too extensive
- Just right
- Somewhat too limited
- Much too limited

Please provide any additional comments on information exchange in the arbitration (optional):



## CONDUCTION OF HEARINGS

Did the arbitration involve oral hearings and, if so, approximately how long were the hearings?

- No, there were no oral hearings
- Yes, there were oral hearings (please indicate number of hearing days):

Which of the following accurately describe(s) the length of the hearings (please select all that apply)?

- Appropriate for the case
- Inadequate because the parties requested too little time
- Inadequate because the tribunal determined time requested was not necessary
- Inadequate because the tribunal was not able to schedule more time
- Inadequate because parties or lawyers were not able to schedule more time
- Inadequate because hearing time was not used efficiently
- Excessive because hearing time was not used efficiently
- Other (please specify):

Please provide any additional comments on the conduct of the hearings (optional):

Did the opposing party or lawyers engage in conduct during the arbitration that you consider improper, unethical, or intentionally disruptive?

- Yes
- No

Please provide a brief, general description of the nature of the allegedly improper conduct (optional). Do not indicate the names of any individual lawyers or law firms.

Which of the following best describe(s) the tribunal's response to the allegedly improper conduct (please select all that apply)?

- The tribunal declined to address directly allegations of improper conduct
- The tribunal issued general admonitions to dissuade further instances of allegedly improper conduct
- The tribunal made specific findings regarding the allegedly improper conduct
- The tribunal issued effective procedural rulings to prevent continuation of allegedly improper conduct
- The tribunal expressly referenced allegedly improper conduct in making a final determination on the merits or allocation of costs
- Other (please specify):

Other comments regarding the tribunal's response to the allegedly improper conduct (optional):



## QUESTIONS FROM ARBITRATORS

In your professional judgment, which of the following describe(s) the questions posed by Arbitrator A during the hearing(s) (please select all that apply)?

- No questions were asked
- Questions demonstrated familiarity with the record and legal issues
- Questions helped clarify factual or legal issues
- Questions were fair and respectful
- Questions were unduly partisan
- Questions were poorly articulated, confusing, or otherwise distracted from the parties' presentations
- Questions demonstrated a lack of fluency with the language of the arbitration
- No opinion

In your professional judgment, which of the following describe(s) the questions posed by Arbitrator B during the hearing(s) (please select all that apply)?

- No questions were asked
- Questions demonstrated familiarity with the record and legal issues
- Questions helped clarify factual or legal issues
- Questions were fair and respectful
- Questions were unduly partisan
- Questions were poorly articulated, confusing, or otherwise distracted from the parties' presentations
- Questions demonstrated a lack of fluency with the language of the arbitration
- No opinion

In your professional judgment, which of the following describe(s) the questions posed by Arbitrator C during the hearing(s) (please select all that apply)?

- No questions were asked
- Questions demonstrated familiarity with the record and legal issues
- Questions helped clarify factual or legal issues
- Questions were fair and respectful
- Questions were unduly partisan
- Questions were poorly articulated, confusing, or otherwise distracted from the parties' presentations
- Questions demonstrated a lack of fluency with the language of the arbitration
- No opinion

Did the opposing party or lawyers engage in conduct during the arbitration that you consider improper, unethical, or intentionally disruptive?

- Yes
- No





## THE AWARD

The parties completed their submissions on [date entered in Phase I] and the award was rendered on [date entered in Phase I]. Was this period reasonable given the record and complexity of the case (please select all that apply)?

- Yes, it was reasonable in light of the size of the record and complexity of the factual issues
- Yes, it was reasonable in light of the complexity of the legal issues
- No, it was not reasonable in light of the size of the record and complexity of the factual issues
- No, it was not reasonable in light of the complexity of the legal issues

To the best of your knowledge, could any of the following events or circumstances have delayed the rendering of the award (please select all that apply)?

- Force majeure
- Unavailability of an arbitrator (please identify individual arbitrator, if you know)
- Substantive disagreements among the arbitrators
- Post-hearing developments or motions by parties
- Issuance of a separate or dissenting award
- Other (please specify):

What substantive law(s) applied to the dispute at issue in the arbitration?

Did the dispute involve any of the following issues (please select all that apply)?

- Issues of contract interpretation
- Issues of statutory interpretation
- Issues of treaty interpretation
- Issues of trade usages

In your professional judgment, which of the following describe(s) the tribunal's contract interpretation (please select all that apply)?

- The award reflects a plain meaning analysis of the specific words of the contract
- The award considers the negotiation and drafting history of the contract
- The award relies primarily on precedents in relevant cases
- The award reflects a flexible interpretation of the specific words of the contract in order to give the contract its common sense or commercial sense meaning
- The award reflects a flexible interpretation of the specific words of the contract in order to achieve fairness and equity in the outcome of the dispute
- Other (please specify):



In your professional judgment, which of the following describe(s) the tribunal's interpretation based on trade usages (please select all that apply)?

- The existence or content of a trade usage was decisive in the award's determination of one or more legal issues
- The award reflects a clear understanding of applicable trade usages
- The award demonstrates a confused or inaccurate understanding of applicable trade usages
- The award gives appropriate weight to applicable trade usages
- The award refers to trade usages that were not raised by the parties
- The award refers to evidence submitted by a party as to the existence and content of applicable trade usages
- The award is based on the tribunal's own knowledge of applicable trade usages
- The award uses trade usages to fill a gap in the contract
- Other (please specify):

In your professional judgment, which of the following describe(s) the tribunal's analysis of issues related to and calculation of damages (please select all that apply)?

- The tribunal did not award any damages
- The evidentiary burden to prove the amount of damages was clearly imposed on the party/parties seeking damages
- The award provides the calculations used to determine the amount of damages
- The amount of damages appears to be more of an estimate than a calculation using specific figures
- The calculation of damages takes into account the evidence submitted by damages expert(s)
- The amount of damages appears to be based on a compromise between the positions taken by the parties
- The amount of damages was valued as of the date of the harm (not the date of the award)

In your professional judgment, which of the following describe(s) your overall reaction to the award (please select all that apply)?

- The award presented a balanced evaluation of the parties' arguments
- The award was well reasoned
- The award was persuasively written
- The final disposition was unexpected
- The award failed to address all issues raised by the parties
- The award contained insufficient reasoning to justify the outcome
- The award contained typos or clerical errors

## CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

I would feel comfortable having Arbitrator A as the sole arbitrator in a future unrelated case.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I would feel comfortable having Arbitrator B as the sole arbitrator in a future unrelated case.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I would feel comfortable having Arbitrator C as the sole arbitrator in a future unrelated case.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree