



APPEAL PANEL DECISION FORM

I. CLAIMANT AND CLAIM INFORMATION

Claimant Name	Last/Name of Business	First	Middle
	[REDACTED]		
Claimant ID	[REDACTED]	Claim ID	[REDACTED]
Claim Type	Business Economic Loss		
Law Firm	[REDACTED]		

II. DECISION

Select the Compensation Amount set forth in either BP's Final Proposal or the Claimant's Final Proposal as the final outcome on the claim and check the appropriate box to signify your decision.

<input type="checkbox"/> BP's Final Proposal	Compensation Amount	\$0
	Risk Transfer Premium	.25
	Prior Payment Offset	\$0
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claimant's Final Proposal	Compensation Amount	\$504,694.86
	Risk Transfer Premium	.25
	Prior Payment Offset	\$0

III. PRIMARY BASIS FOR PANELIST DECISION

Please select the primary basis for your decision. You may also write a comment describing the basis for your decision.

- Error in documentation review.**
- Error in calculation.**
- Error in RTP multiplier.**
- Error in Prior Spill-Related Payment Amount.**
- No error.**

Comment (optional):

BP appeals the BEL award to claimant, a supplier of paper products located in [REDACTED] Louisiana. BP asserts the Claims Administrator failed to investigate sufficiently whether claimant was an excluded defense contractor under Section 2.2.4.6 of the Settlement Agreement. BP points to entries in the Federal Procurement Data System and other sources that show claimant received governmental payments for its products in the following

amounts:\$1.54 million in 2006;\$4.18 million in 2007;\$2.3 million in 2008;and \$3.1 million in 2009.Claimant used the period of 2007 through 2009 as its benchmark period.During that time its total revenues were:\$14.2 million for 2007; \$12.8 million for 2008;and \$10.57 million for 2009.In the BEL form submitted by claimant it avowed under penalty of perjury in Section B.1. it was not an excluded defense contractor.In its opposing memorandum response claimant represented its revenues received from DOD affiliates were less than 50% of its total annual revenues.The record supports this contention.It is noted claimant is a supplier of simple paper products and not of expensive,sophisticated devices.The Claims Administrator acted reasonably and properly in assessing this claim and no error is present.Remand is not warranted.The award is affirmed and the appeal of BP is denied.