PCA Case No. 2023-01

IN THE MATTER OF AN ARBITRATION

-before-

THE COURT OF ARBITRATION CONSTITUTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE INDUS WATERS TREATY 1960

-between-

THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN

-and-

THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA

CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT (HEARING FOR THE FIRST PHASE ON THE MERITS)

COURT OF ARBITRATION:

Professor Sean D. Murphy (Chairman)
Professor Wouter Buytaert
Mr. Jeffrey P. Minear
Judge Awn Shawkat Al-Khasawneh
Dr. Donald Blackmore

SECRETARIAT:

The Permanent Court of Arbitration

ON BEHALF OF THE COURT OF ARBITRATION:

CERTIFIED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 19 OF ANNEXURE G

8 July 2024

Professor Sean D. Murphy

Chairman

In the matter of an arbitration pursuant to Article IX and Annexure G of the Indus Waters Treaty 1960 PCA Case No. 2023-01

Permanent Court of Arbitration
Peace Palace
The Hague
The Netherlands

Day 1

Monday, 8 July 2024

Hearing of the First Phase on the Merits

Before:

PROFESSOR SEAN D MURPHY
HE JUDGE AWN AL-KHASAWNEH
DR DON BLACKMORE
MR JEFFREY P MINEAR
PROFESSOR WOUTER BUYTAERT

BETWEEN:

THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN
-andTHE REPUBLIC OF INDIA

Transcript produced by Trevor McGowan Georgina Vaughn and Lisa Gulland

APPEARANCES

FOR THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN

MR RAJA NAEEM AKBAR, Secretary, Ministry of Law & Justice (Deputy Agent)

MR SYED MUHAMMAD MEHAR ALI SHAH, Commissioner for Indus Waters, Ministry of Water Resources
MR ASAD KHAN BURKI, Legal Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

MR ZOHAIR WAHEED, Office of the Attorney General H.E. MR SULJUK MUSTANSAR TARAR, Ambassador of Pakistan to the Kingdom of The Netherlands

MS FATIMA HAMDIA TANWEER, First Secretary, Embassy of Pakistan to the Kingdom of The Netherlands

MR JAMAL NASIR, First Secretary, Embassy of Pakistan to the Kingdom of The Netherlands

SIR DANIEL BETHLEHEM KC, Twenty Essex, London
PROFESSOR PHILIPPA WEBB, Twenty Essex, London
DR CAMERON MILES, 3 Verulam Buildings, London
PROFESSOR ATTILA TANZI, 3 Verulam Buildings, London
MR STEPHEN FIETTA KC, Fietta LLP, London
MS LAURA REES-EVANS, Fietta LLP, London

MR ABDULLAH TARIQ, Fietta LLP, London

MS MEGAN RIPPIN, Fietta LLP, London

DR GREGORY L MORRIS, Technical Advisor

MR PETER J RAE, Technical Advisor

THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA WAS NOT REPRESENTED

FOR THE PERMANENT COURT OF ARBITRATION

MR GARTH SCHOFIELD, Deputy Secretary General MR BRYCE WILLIAMS, Legal Counsel MR SEBASTIAN KING, Assistant Legal Counsel MS VILMANTE BLINK, Senior Case Manager

08:56 1	Monday, 8 July 2024	09:36 1	a counter-memorial in this phase of the proceedings, but
2	(9.33 am)	2	the Court received no response. Similarly, India was
3	THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome to everyone. It's good to see you.	3	invited to confirm its appearance at this hearing by
4	This is a proceeding of the Court of Arbitration	4	22 May 2024, but again no response was received.
5	constituted in accordance with the Indus Waters Treaty	5	Even so, we have kept both parties equally apprised
6	1960 between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and the	6	of all the developments in this case, including access
7	Republic of India.	7	to all relevant materials and evidence. Moreover, the
8	I take note of the presence of the delegation	8	Court hopes that India will reconsider its
9	representing Pakistan. In particular, I take note of	9	non-participation in this case. The door remains open
10	the presence of Mr Raja Naeem Akbar, the Pakistan Deputy	10	for it to do so.
11	Agent, who is also Secretary of the Ministry of Law and	11	India's non-participation has not and will not
12	Justice. Mr Akbar, it's a great pleasure to see you	12	preclude the work of this Court. Indeed, the Court
13	here. While I see many familiar faces in your	13	issued an Award on the Competence of the Court on
14	delegation, I invite you at this time to introduce your	14	6 July 2023. Among other things, that Award explained
15	delegation, if that's convenient.	15	why non-participation by a party in a case before
16	MR AKBAR: Thank you very much.	16	an international court cannot, by itself, preclude the
17	Mr Syed Mehar Ali Shah: he is a commissioner,	17	court from acting within the scope of its competence.
18	Indus Waters. And then our lead counsel, Daniel	18	That Award also systematically addressed points
19	Bethlehem. And then we have our ambassador,	19	conveyed by India to Pakistan and to the World Bank on
20	Mr Ambassador Tarar. And then Mr Zohair Waheed: he is	20	why India did not regard the Court as possessing
21	the Office of Attorney General legal representative.	20	competence in this arbitration. The Court analysed
22	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, perhaps I will introduce the rest	22	
23	of the team, with your permission.		India's position, weighed it against Pakistan's
		23	position, and reached the conclusion that the Court
24	We've got Professor Attila Tanzi, who is sitting on	24	possesses compétence de la compétence; and further, that
25	the end of the row. Immediately behind me, we've got	25	the Court was competent under the Treaty to consider and
	Page 1		Page 3
09:35 1	Mr Stephen Fietta KC, then Laura Rees-Evans,	09:38 1	determine the disputes set forth in Pakistan's Request
2	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've	09:38 1 2	for Arbitration.
	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of		for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court
2 3 4	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki.	2	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case
2 3 4 5	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin,	2 3	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in
2 3 4	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae,	2 3 4	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather,
2 3 4 5	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row.	2 3 4 5	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental
2 3 4 5 6	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia	2 3 4 5 6	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather,
2 3 4 5 6 7	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague.	2 3 4 5 6 7	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who are here, and of our court reporter, so I won't take the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that the Court asks questions in this hearing designed to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who are here, and of our court reporter, so I won't take the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that the Court asks questions in this hearing designed to draw out points that might have been made by India, were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who are here, and of our court reporter, so I won't take the time introducing them. (9.36 am) Introductory remarks	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that the Court asks questions in this hearing designed to draw out points that might have been made by India, were it present, Pakistan should not assume from such
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who are here, and of our court reporter, so I won't take the time introducing them. (9.36 am) Introductory remarks THE CHAIRMAN: I note with regret the absence of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that the Court asks questions in this hearing designed to draw out points that might have been made by India, were it present, Pakistan should not assume from such questions that the Court has made up its mind on any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who are here, and of our court reporter, so I won't take the time introducing them. (9.36 am) Introductory remarks THE CHAIRMAN: I note with regret the absence of a delegation representing India. India has been kept	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that the Court asks questions in this hearing designed to draw out points that might have been made by India, were it present, Pakistan should not assume from such questions that the Court has made up its mind on any particular issue, as the Court has not reached any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who are here, and of our court reporter, so I won't take the time introducing them. (9.36 am) Introductory remarks THE CHAIRMAN: I note with regret the absence of a delegation representing India. India has been kept informed of all aspects of this proceeding, including	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that the Court asks questions in this hearing designed to draw out points that might have been made by India, were it present, Pakistan should not assume from such questions that the Court has made up its mind on any particular issue, as the Court has not reached any conclusions as to the issues before it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who are here, and of our court reporter, so I won't take the time introducing them. (9.36 am) Introductory remarks THE CHAIRMAN: I note with regret the absence of a delegation representing India. India has been kept informed of all aspects of this proceeding, including an invitation to submit written pleadings and to attend	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that the Court asks questions in this hearing designed to draw out points that might have been made by India, were it present, Pakistan should not assume from such questions that the Court has made up its mind on any particular issue, as the Court has not reached any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who are here, and of our court reporter, so I won't take the time introducing them. (9.36 am) Introductory remarks THE CHAIRMAN: I note with regret the absence of a delegation representing India. India has been kept informed of all aspects of this proceeding, including	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that the Court asks questions in this hearing designed to draw out points that might have been made by India, were it present, Pakistan should not assume from such questions that the Court has made up its mind on any particular issue, as the Court has not reached any conclusions as to the issues before it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who are here, and of our court reporter, so I won't take the time introducing them. (9.36 am) Introductory remarks THE CHAIRMAN: I note with regret the absence of a delegation representing India. India has been kept informed of all aspects of this proceeding, including an invitation to submit written pleadings and to attend this hearing, but has declined to engage with the Court in that respect.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that the Court asks questions in this hearing designed to draw out points that might have been made by India, were it present, Pakistan should not assume from such questions that the Court has made up its mind on any particular issue, as the Court has not reached any conclusions as to the issues before it. In conjunction with deciding in July 2023 that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who are here, and of our court reporter, so I won't take the time introducing them. (9.36 am) Introductory remarks THE CHAIRMAN: I note with regret the absence of a delegation representing India. India has been kept informed of all aspects of this proceeding, including an invitation to submit written pleadings and to attend this hearing, but has declined to engage with the Court	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that the Court asks questions in this hearing designed to draw out points that might have been made by India, were it present, Pakistan should not assume from such questions that the Court has made up its mind on any particular issue, as the Court has not reached any conclusions as to the issues before it. In conjunction with deciding in July 2023 that the Court was competent in this arbitration, the Court also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who are here, and of our court reporter, so I won't take the time introducing them. (9.36 am) Introductory remarks THE CHAIRMAN: I note with regret the absence of a delegation representing India. India has been kept informed of all aspects of this proceeding, including an invitation to submit written pleadings and to attend this hearing, but has declined to engage with the Court in that respect.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that the Court asks questions in this hearing designed to draw out points that might have been made by India, were it present, Pakistan should not assume from such questions that the Court has made up its mind on any particular issue, as the Court has not reached any conclusions as to the issues before it. In conjunction with deciding in July 2023 that the Court was competent in this arbitration, the Court also decided, in Procedural Order No. 6, to address the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who are here, and of our court reporter, so I won't take the time introducing them. (9.36 am) Introductory remarks THE CHAIRMAN: I note with regret the absence of a delegation representing India. India has been kept informed of all aspects of this proceeding, including an invitation to submit written pleadings and to attend this hearing, but has declined to engage with the Court in that respect. I particular, I note that India was invited, within	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that the Court asks questions in this hearing designed to draw out points that might have been made by India, were it present, Pakistan should not assume from such questions that the Court has made up its mind on any particular issue, as the Court has not reached any conclusions as to the issues before it. In conjunction with deciding in July 2023 that the Court was competent in this arbitration, the Court also decided, in Procedural Order No. 6, to address the merits of this case in phases.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who are here, and of our court reporter, so I won't take the time introducing them. (9.36 am) Introductory remarks THE CHAIRMAN: I note with regret the absence of a delegation representing India. India has been kept informed of all aspects of this proceeding, including an invitation to submit written pleadings and to attend this hearing, but has declined to engage with the Court in that respect. I particular, I note that India was invited, within two weeks after the submission of Pakistan's Memorial of 22 March 2024, to indicate whether it intended to submit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that the Court asks questions in this hearing designed to draw out points that might have been made by India, were it present, Pakistan should not assume from such questions that the Court has made up its mind on any particular issue, as the Court has not reached any conclusions as to the issues before it. In conjunction with deciding in July 2023 that the Court was competent in this arbitration, the Court also decided, in Procedural Order No. 6, to address the merits of this case in phases. The first phase, which is the subject of this hearing, seeks to address questions of systemic
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Professor Philippa Webb, Dr Cameron Miles. Then we've got the legal advisor of the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Asad Khan Burki. Looking to the back row, we've got Ms Megan Rippin, we've got Mr Abdullah Tariq, Mr Peter Rae, Dr Gregory Morris. I'm just looking at the back row. Then we've got Mr Jamal Nasir and Ms Fatima Hamdia Tanweer from the Pakistan Embassy here in The Hague. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much for that. I believe that everyone is familiar with the members of the Court and also the members of our Registry who are here, and of our court reporter, so I won't take the time introducing them. (9.36 am) Introductory remarks THE CHAIRMAN: I note with regret the absence of a delegation representing India. India has been kept informed of all aspects of this proceeding, including an invitation to submit written pleadings and to attend this hearing, but has declined to engage with the Court in that respect. I particular, I note that India was invited, within two weeks after the submission of Pakistan's Memorial of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	for Arbitration. While India's absence does not preclude the Court from proceeding with its work, it is equally the case that India's non-participation does not result in decisions by default in favour of Pakistan. Rather, consistent with the Treaty and with our Supplemental Rules of Procedure, the Court will closely scrutinise the claims before it so as to determine whether Pakistan's claims are well founded or not, and will only find in Pakistan's favour with respect to claims that are well founded. I might add in this regard that to the extent that the Court asks questions in this hearing designed to draw out points that might have been made by India, were it present, Pakistan should not assume from such questions that the Court has made up its mind on any particular issue, as the Court has not reached any conclusions as to the issues before it. In conjunction with deciding in July 2023 that the Court was competent in this arbitration, the Court also decided, in Procedural Order No. 6, to address the merits of this case in phases. The first phase, which is the subject of this

4 (Pages 1 to 4)

09:40 1	interpretation and application of Article III and Part 3	09:43 1	Commission, before the Baglihar Neutral Expert and
2	of Annexure D of the Treaty. In particular, the Court	2	before the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration on the
3	identified seven questions as the focus of this phase,	3	proper interpretation of the Indus Waters Treaty.
4	which are set forth at paragraph 35 of Procedural	4	On 29 June 2024, the Court issued Procedural
5	Order No. 6.	5	Order No. 12, which addressed the organisation of this
6	After issuance of the Award on Competence and	6	hearing, including a basic outline of how the hearing
7	Procedural Order No. 6, Pakistan requested leave to	7	will proceed.
8	amend its Request for Arbitration. That request was	8	Further, on 5 July 2024, Pakistan requested leave to
9	granted, and the Amended Request for Arbitration was	9	submit additional documents into the record, which the
10	filed on 28 July 2023. India made no objection to the	10	Court granted on 6 July 2024. India will be given
11	Amended Request for Arbitration.	11	an opportunity to submit written comments with respect
12	Pakistan suggested, during the summer of 2023, that	12	to those records after the conclusion of this hearing.
13	the Court engage in a site visit to the region so as to	13	That concludes my opening remarks. Are there any
14	learn about the basic design and operation of	14	matters that need to be addressed at this point, either
15	run-of-river hydroelectric plants. The Court indicated	15	Mr Akbar or Sir Daniel?
16	an interest in doing so, and invited both parties to	16	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, no, I don't think so. I think we
17	propose visits to such plants under their	17	are ready to proceed, under your control.
18	administration.	18	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. If that's the case, then I invite
19	Pakistan proposed a visit to the Neelum-Jhelum	19	to the podium Mr Akbar, the Deputy Agent, to make
20	Hydroelectric Power Plant, while India did not respond.	20	Pakistan's opening statement. (9.45 am)
21 22	As such, the Court proceeded with plans for a visit to	21 22	Opening statement on behalf of
23	the Neelum-Jhelum Hydroelectric Power Plant. In January 2024, however, by letter to the Court's	23	the Islamic Republic of Pakistan
23	registrar, India expressed opposition to such a site	23	MR AKBAR: Mr Chairman, members of the Court of Arbitration,
25	visit.	25	members of the Secretariat, good morning. My name is
23	V151t.	25	memoers of the secretaria, good morning. Wy mane is
	Page 5		Page 7
09:41 1	After corefully considering India's chiestions and	09:45 1	Daio Nogam Althor Jam Endard Sagratary at the
	After carefully considering India's objections and Pakistan's response thereto, the Court decided, in	09.43 1	Raja Naeem Akbar. I am Federal Secretary at the Ministry of Law and Justice, Islamic Republic of
2 3	Procedural Order No. 9, to reject India's objections and	3	Pakistan, and Deputy Agent of Pakistan in these
4	to proceed with the site visit. That site visit	4	proceedings.
5	occurred from 23 April to 29 April 2024, and was	5	We met two months ago, when I had the honour of
6	undertaken pursuant to a Site Visit Protocol issued as	6	welcoming you at the start of the Court's site visit to
7	Procedural Order No. 10. India did not participate in	7	the Neelum-Jhelum Hydroelectric Power Plant in Pakistan.
8	the site visit.	8	Mr Chairman, it is my honour to appear before you today
9	An independent observer, Mr Stephen Pomper,	9	at the opening of this hearing on the first phase on the
10	accompanied the site visit and observed all of the	10	merits of the Court's proceedings. Pakistan's Agent,
11	interactions of the Court with the representatives of	11	
12	Pakistan and with the technical site experts. At the	12	
13	end of the site visit, Mr Pomper certified that the Site	13	•
14	Visit Protocol was followed.	14	• •
15	As previously noted, on 22 March 2024, Pakistan	15	* *
16	filed its Memorial for the First Phase on the Merits,	16	•
17	which included appendices and exhibits. India did not	17	** *
18	file a counter-memorial. On 27 May 2024, the court ordered Policitan to	18	
19 20	On 27 May 2024, the court ordered Pakistan to produce certain papers and other evidence, which	19 20	
20	Pakistan, with the leave of the Court, has done in part	20	
22	prior to this hearing, and will complete after the	22	**
23	hearing. The objective of the Court in ordering such	23	
24	production was, in large part, to understand fully the	24	**
25	positions advanced by India before the Permanent Indus	25	

5 (Pages 5 to 8)

Trevor McGowan

09:47 1	Arbitration was initially made to India on	09:50 1	scope of the first phase on the merits is set out in the
2	19 August 2016.	2	Court's Procedural Order No. 6, but the Court's
3	The pause imposed by the World Bank since	3	engagement does not end here. In its Award on
4	12 December 2016 was deeply damaging to Pakistan. One	4	Competence, the Court confirmed its competence in
5	of the hydroelectric plants that was addressed in the	5	respect of Pakistan's entire case.
6	Request for Arbitration, the Kishenganga plant, is now	6	The Court, in Procedural Order No. 6, discussed "the
7	long built and has been operational for more than	7	general duty of mutual respect and comity". This duty
8	six years. Pakistan's request for interim measures to	8	applies to both how the Court handles its own proceeding
9	restrain the construction of Kishenganga Hydroelectric	9	and how the Neutral Expert manages the proceeding within
10	Plant, which had been included in its Request for	10	his authority. Unlike the competence of the Court, the
11	Arbitration, was swept aside and left irrelevant by the	11	competence of the Neutral Expert under the Treaty is
12	World Bank's pause. The second hydroelectric plant	12	limited. And our lead counsel, Sir Daniel, will address
13	addressed in the Request for Arbitration, the Ratle	13	more fully the competence of the Neutral Expert in the
14	plant, is now well advanced in its construction. The	14	parallel proceedings.
15	situation now is very different from where we should	15	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, there are three
16	have been in late 2016 or early 2017.	16	main points that I must mention briefly, both to provide
17	As is well known, the proceedings before you are	17	a foundation for our lead counsel's submission and to
18	moving forward in parallel with a proceeding before	18	underline that these submissions on these issues are not
19	a Neutral Expert. In its Competence Award, the Court	19	simply the submissions by the counsel, but reflect the
20	affirmed that parallel proceedings are not, per se,	20	deep-held view of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.
21	excluded by the Treaty. Having regard to Pakistan's	21	The first point concerns the cornerstone status of
22	position that it is "resolved to participate in the	22	the Indus Waters Treaty in relation between Pakistan and
23	Neutral Expert process", subject to the caveat in	23	India. The second point is the deep concern in Pakistan
24	respect of the limited competence of the Neutral Expert,	24	about what we perceive to be the very real risk of the
25	the Court resolved to proceed with the first phase on	25	weaponisation of water by India. The third point
	Page 9		Page 11
09:48 1	the merits.	09:52 1	concerns the waters of the Eastern Rivers. Mr Chairman,
2	Mr Chairman, in the first phase, the Court has	09.32 1	starting with the last of these issues.
3	directed that seven questions should be addressed, going	3	While the flow of the waters of the Eastern Rivers
4	to the application of Article III [and] Part 3 of	4	is not before you in this dispute, the bargain that was
5	Annexure D of the Indus Waters Treaty, in addition to	5	struck between Pakistan and India in 1960, agreed in the
6	the weight and binding authority of the decisions by	6	Treaty, was a bargain pertaining to the rights and
7	other Article IX settlement mechanisms under the Treaty.	7	obligations over the waters of both the Western and
8	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan feels	8	Eastern Rivers. The Treaty provides the balance of
9	that India's absence from these proceedings is	9	rights and obligations in which India was given let-flow
10	intentional, in order to frustrate the mutually agreed	10	rights and right of use over the water of the Eastern
11	Treaty provisions. Hence, India's absence is against	11	Rivers; and Pakistan was given let-flow rights and right
12	the cooperative spirit with which both parties committed	12	of use over the water of the Western Rivers. India has
13	themselves when signing the Treaty. It is important to	13	both used and abused the rights over the Eastern Rivers.
14	point out that India cannot strengthen its case by being	13	As regards the Western Rivers, through its approach
15	absent from these proceedings. Therefore, you have	15	to design, construction and operation of its
16	a difficult task to perform in India's absence in these	16	run-of-river hydroelectric plant on these rivers, India
17	proceedings, but it is a task that must be performed	17	is, we say, abusing the tightly constrained exceptions
18	nonetheless.	18	afforded with regard to the use of water of those
19	Pakistan is committed to make the Treaty work, which	19	rivers. India is therefore, in respect of both the
20	provides a well-defined platform for both countries to	20	Western and the Eastern Rivers, proceeding in a manner
20	address issues emanating from the Treaty. But the	21	that is against the very much spirit of the Treaty.
22	future will need a clear affirmation of the rights and	22	Pakistan is acutely concerned about this.
23	duties to which the parties committed themselves in the	23	Mr Chairman, this brings me to the cornerstone
24	past.	24	status of the Treaty and issues of weaponisation of
25	Another important point I wish to make is that the	25	water. Our lead counsel will develop both points
23	. moder important point I wish to make is that the		our teas counser develop cour points
	Page 10		Page 12

09:53 1	through the lens of law and the provisions of the	09:56 1	preemptively tender my apologies for my absence from the
2	mutually agreed Indus Waters Treaty.	2	hearing room over the coming days, as I am required
3	Speaking as a senior official of the Government of	3	urgently back in Pakistan. Thank you very much for
4	Pakistan, I must say that since the independence of the	4	affording this opportunity.
5	Islamic Republic of Pakistan in 1947, Pakistan, being	5	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Akbar. Before you leave the
6	the lower riparian, has lived in insecurity. India, as	6	podium, let me just check to be sure there are no
7	upper riparian, has the power to use water as a leverage	7	questions that we have for you. But let me assure you
8	point against Pakistan. The flow of the Eastern Rivers	8	that your need to not be here [for] the entire course of
9	has [been] almost completely cut off by India, in	9	the hearing is fully understood by the Court, and please
10	a manner that we consider to be a violation of the	10	have no concerns in that regard.
11	provisions of the bilateral Treaty.	11	Any questions from this side?
12	The Indus Waters Treaty resulted directly from the	12	(9.57 am)
13	efforts made in response to the earlier water dispute	13	Questions from THE COURT
14	between the two countries following the events of 1948.	14	THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question for you, Mr Akbar,
15	The Treaty aimed to regulate the divisions and use of	15	and feel free to answer as you wish or to deflect the
16	water resources in accordance with the 1947 boundary	16	question to those that are to follow. But at you said
17	delimitation. As [Sir] Daniel will explain, the Treaty	17	at the outset, having a Pakistani voice to speak to
18	effectively served both as a boundary agreement and	18	these issues is of some importance.
19	a peace treaty in all but name. It stands as	19	You mentioned the real risk of weaponisation of the
20	a cornerstone of Pakistan's relations with India.	20	Western Rivers. And my question is whether Pakistan's
21	As the upper riparian, India has the ability to	21	concern in that regard is a generalised concern that
22	restrict the flow of water, to affect the flow	22	India has control, or could have control, over the
23	timing of the release of stored water, and thereby to	23	Western Rivers, or whether there are specific types of
24	impact the lives of hundreds of millions of Pakistanis	24	actions that you are concerned about that India might
25	living downstream, and leading to the negative	25	take, in its position as the upper riparian.
			D 45
	Page 13		Page 15
09:55 1	environmental impact in Pakistan.	09:58 1	MR AKBAR: There are two aspects.
09:55 1 2	environmental impact in Pakistan. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings	09:58 1 2	MR AKBAR: There are two aspects. Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly
	_		<u>-</u>
2	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings	2	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly
2 3	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They	2 3	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would
2 3 4	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation	2 3 4	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement
2 3 4 5	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the	2 3 4 5	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no
2 3 4 5 6	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river	2 3 4 5 6	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the
2 3 4 5 6 7	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design criteria for new run-of-river hydroelectric plants on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So that's why we are saying they are using it as a weapon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design criteria for new run-of-river hydroelectric plants on the Western Rivers cannot be separated from the overall balance established by the Treaty. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I will conclude	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So that's why we are saying they are using it as a weapon. So indirectly they are controlling the Western Rivers as well. THE CHAIRMAN: So the concern is that at a certain point in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design criteria for new run-of-river hydroelectric plants on the Western Rivers cannot be separated from the overall balance established by the Treaty. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I will conclude there. Pakistan's counsel will develop Pakistan's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So that's why we are saying they are using it as a weapon. So indirectly they are controlling the Western Rivers as well. THE CHAIRMAN: So the concern is that at a certain point in time, they might cut offer that flow or decrease that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design criteria for new run-of-river hydroelectric plants on the Western Rivers cannot be separated from the overall balance established by the Treaty. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I will conclude there. Pakistan's counsel will develop Pakistan's substantive case by reference to the black-letter law of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So that's why we are saying they are using it as a weapon. So indirectly they are controlling the Western Rivers as well. THE CHAIRMAN: So the concern is that at a certain point in time, they might cut offer that flow or decrease that flow in a significant way in order to achieve
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design criteria for new run-of-river hydroelectric plants on the Western Rivers cannot be separated from the overall balance established by the Treaty. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I will conclude there. Pakistan's counsel will develop Pakistan's substantive case by reference to the black-letter law of the Treaty. The decisions which you are called upon to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So that's why we are saying they are using it as a weapon. So indirectly they are controlling the Western Rivers as well. THE CHAIRMAN: So the concern is that at a certain point in time, they might cut offer that flow or decrease that flow in a significant way in order to achieve a political objective? I'm just trying to understand,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design criteria for new run-of-river hydroelectric plants on the Western Rivers cannot be separated from the overall balance established by the Treaty. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I will conclude there. Pakistan's counsel will develop Pakistan's substantive case by reference to the black-letter law of the Treaty. The decisions which you are called upon to make are not decisions of political appreciation; these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So that's why we are saying they are using it as a weapon. So indirectly they are controlling the Western Rivers as well. THE CHAIRMAN: So the concern is that at a certain point in time, they might cut offer that flow or decrease that flow in a significant way in order to achieve a political objective? I'm just trying to understand, as much as you're comfortable saying, what the specific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design criteria for new run-of-river hydroelectric plants on the Western Rivers cannot be separated from the overall balance established by the Treaty. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I will conclude there. Pakistan's counsel will develop Pakistan's substantive case by reference to the black-letter law of the Treaty. The decisions which you are called upon to make are not decisions of political appreciation; these are the decisions of law rooted in an international	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So that's why we are saying they are using it as a weapon. So indirectly they are controlling the Western Rivers as well. THE CHAIRMAN: So the concern is that at a certain point in time, they might cut offer that flow or decrease that flow in a significant way in order to achieve a political objective? I'm just trying to understand, as much as you're comfortable saying, what the specific concerns are.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design criteria for new run-of-river hydroelectric plants on the Western Rivers cannot be separated from the overall balance established by the Treaty. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I will conclude there. Pakistan's counsel will develop Pakistan's substantive case by reference to the black-letter law of the Treaty. The decisions which you are called upon to make are not decisions of political appreciation; these are the decisions of law rooted in an international instrument that stands as a cornerstone of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So that's why we are saying they are using it as a weapon. So indirectly they are controlling the Western Rivers as well. THE CHAIRMAN: So the concern is that at a certain point in time, they might cut offer that flow or decrease that flow in a significant way in order to achieve a political objective? I'm just trying to understand, as much as you're comfortable saying, what the specific concerns are. MR AKBAR: Thank you very much for providing this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design criteria for new run-of-river hydroelectric plants on the Western Rivers cannot be separated from the overall balance established by the Treaty. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I will conclude there. Pakistan's counsel will develop Pakistan's substantive case by reference to the black-letter law of the Treaty. The decisions which you are called upon to make are not decisions of political appreciation; these are the decisions of law rooted in an international instrument that stands as a cornerstone of Pakistan-India relations. Pakistan wishes you wisdom in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So that's why we are saying they are using it as a weapon. So indirectly they are controlling the Western Rivers as well. THE CHAIRMAN: So the concern is that at a certain point in time, they might cut offer that flow or decrease that flow in a significant way in order to achieve a political objective? I'm just trying to understand, as much as you're comfortable saying, what the specific concerns are. MR AKBAR: Thank you very much for providing this opportunity. I think our lead counsel is in a better
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design criteria for new run-of-river hydroelectric plants on the Western Rivers cannot be separated from the overall balance established by the Treaty. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I will conclude there. Pakistan's counsel will develop Pakistan's substantive case by reference to the black-letter law of the Treaty. The decisions which you are called upon to make are not decisions of political appreciation; these are the decisions of law rooted in an international instrument that stands as a cornerstone of Pakistan-India relations. Pakistan wishes you wisdom in your task.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So that's why we are saying they are using it as a weapon. So indirectly they are controlling the Western Rivers as well. THE CHAIRMAN: So the concern is that at a certain point in time, they might cut offer that flow or decrease that flow in a significant way in order to achieve a political objective? I'm just trying to understand, as much as you're comfortable saying, what the specific concerns are. MR AKBAR: Thank you very much for providing this opportunity. I think our lead counsel is in a better position to take the position.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design criteria for new run-of-river hydroelectric plants on the Western Rivers cannot be separated from the overall balance established by the Treaty. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I will conclude there. Pakistan's counsel will develop Pakistan's substantive case by reference to the black-letter law of the Treaty. The decisions which you are called upon to make are not decisions of political appreciation; these are the decisions of law rooted in an international instrument that stands as a cornerstone of Pakistan-India relations. Pakistan wishes you wisdom in your task. Mr Chairman, with that, may I ask you to call our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So that's why we are saying they are using it as a weapon. So indirectly they are controlling the Western Rivers as well. THE CHAIRMAN: So the concern is that at a certain point in time, they might cut offer that flow or decrease that flow in a significant way in order to achieve a political objective? I'm just trying to understand, as much as you're comfortable saying, what the specific concerns are. MR AKBAR: Thank you very much for providing this opportunity. I think our lead counsel is in a better position to take the position. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, we will let you go, Mr Akbar.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design criteria for new run-of-river hydroelectric plants on the Western Rivers cannot be separated from the overall balance established by the Treaty. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I will conclude there. Pakistan's counsel will develop Pakistan's substantive case by reference to the black-letter law of the Treaty. The decisions which you are called upon to make are not decisions of political appreciation; these are the decisions of law rooted in an international instrument that stands as a cornerstone of Pakistan-India relations. Pakistan wishes you wisdom in your task. Mr Chairman, with that, may I ask you to call our lead counsel to the podium to address Pakistan's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So that's why we are saying they are using it as a weapon. So indirectly they are controlling the Western Rivers as well. THE CHAIRMAN: So the concern is that at a certain point in time, they might cut offer that flow or decrease that flow in a significant way in order to achieve a political objective? I'm just trying to understand, as much as you're comfortable saying, what the specific concerns are. MR AKBAR: Thank you very much for providing this opportunity. I think our lead counsel is in a better position to take the position. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, we will let you go, Mr Akbar. I appreciate very much your presentation. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design criteria for new run-of-river hydroelectric plants on the Western Rivers cannot be separated from the overall balance established by the Treaty. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I will conclude there. Pakistan's counsel will develop Pakistan's substantive case by reference to the black-letter law of the Treaty. The decisions which you are called upon to make are not decisions of political appreciation; these are the decisions of law rooted in an international instrument that stands as a cornerstone of Pakistan-India relations. Pakistan wishes you wisdom in your task. Mr Chairman, with that, may I ask you to call our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So that's why we are saying they are using it as a weapon. So indirectly they are controlling the Western Rivers as well. THE CHAIRMAN: So the concern is that at a certain point in time, they might cut offer that flow or decrease that flow in a significant way in order to achieve a political objective? I'm just trying to understand, as much as you're comfortable saying, what the specific concerns are. MR AKBAR: Thank you very much for providing this opportunity. I think our lead counsel is in a better position to take the position. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, we will let you go, Mr Akbar.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, these proceedings are not directly about the weaponisation of water. They are about the seemingly narrow issue of interpretation and application of the technical provisions of the Treaty concerning the design of new run-of-river hydroelectric plants by India on the Western Rivers. This is the dispute [before] you, in which respect of which Pakistan is seeking guidance. But the interpretation and application of the technical design criteria for new run-of-river hydroelectric plants on the Western Rivers cannot be separated from the overall balance established by the Treaty. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I will conclude there. Pakistan's counsel will develop Pakistan's substantive case by reference to the black-letter law of the Treaty. The decisions which you are called upon to make are not decisions of political appreciation; these are the decisions of law rooted in an international instrument that stands as a cornerstone of Pakistan-India relations. Pakistan wishes you wisdom in your task. Mr Chairman, with that, may I ask you to call our lead counsel to the podium to address Pakistan's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Because under the Treaty, sir, it was clearly decided that the Eastern Rivers will Pakistan would get water and everything. I mentioned in my statement as well, these three rivers are almost there is no water. Very little water is coming, and only in the rainy season. On the Western Rivers, when we say they are using water as a weapon, they are smartly constructing dams and they are controlling the flow of the water. So that's why we are saying they are using it as a weapon. So indirectly they are controlling the Western Rivers as well. THE CHAIRMAN: So the concern is that at a certain point in time, they might cut offer that flow or decrease that flow in a significant way in order to achieve a political objective? I'm just trying to understand, as much as you're comfortable saying, what the specific concerns are. MR AKBAR: Thank you very much for providing this opportunity. I think our lead counsel is in a better position to take the position. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, we will let you go, Mr Akbar. I appreciate very much your presentation. And

7 (Pages 13 to 16)

09:59	1	presentation. So thank you very much.	10:03 1		nefty core bundles; they are rather bigger than we had
	2	MR AKBAR: I'm grateful for providing this opportunity.	2		anticipated. I think you should also have from us
	3	Thank you, sir.	3		hyperlinked electronic version of those bundles;
	4	THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, you have the floor.	4		n number of us will be referring you to the documents
	5	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. (Pause)	5		here. You should also have available the electronic
	6	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to	6		record of the entire docket of the Court, and we may be
	7	appear before you again in these proceedings.	7	С	calling up additional documents.
	8	The cadence of the proceedings brings both familiarity and exhaustion, and we have an intensive	8	1_	I will, for purposes of my proceedings, I think only be taking you principally to one document there may
	10	period before us. There is a special challenge	10		be one or two other references to be made and that
	11	associated with appearing as counsel in proceedings in	10		will be to the Treaty. We will call it up on the
	12	which the Respondent is absent, as there is both nothing	12		screen. But if you would like to have a hard copy
	13	to aim for there is no agreed circumference of the	13		available to you in due course to mark up, that may be
	14	dispute on the basis of an exchange of written	14		convenient.
	15	pleadings and there is also an appreciation that the	15		One last point of housekeeping. Mr Chairman,
	16	tribunal in this case, the Court will properly	16		perhaps just before, in due course, you rise for the
	17	take as its responsibility the close examination of	17	_	coffee break, there will be a brief point of
	18	counsel I might even say the cross-examination of	18		clarification and application to you regarding documents
	19	counsel on their arguments, but in circumstances in	19		pefore you, which I propose to make in the two minutes
	20	which counsel will not have had the benefit of any prior	20	b	pefore you rise for the coffee break, so that you will
	21	airing of views. We hope that we will rise to the	21	h	nave a chance to deliberate on those.
	22	challenge.	22		Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Pakistan is here
	23	We appreciate also that the Court is faced with	23		n these proceedings requesting from you clear, full and
	24	hurdles of its own, particularly having regard to the	24		pinding guidance on the interpretation of the key
	25	nature of the enquiry that is required by this first	25	p	provisions of paragraph 8 of Annexure D of the Indus
		Page 17			Page 19
10:01	1	phase of the merits. While Pakistan and India are	10:05 1		Waters Treaty, read together with Article III of the
	2	clearly opposed on the key questions that you will be	2		Treaty and other relevant provisions. The
	3	required to address, both the nature of the enquiry and	3		nterpretative guidance is not requested in this phase
	4	India's absence will properly require that special care is taken in addressing these issues.	5		of the proceedings in respect of any particular run-of-river hydroelectric plant but rather with regard
	5 6	Mr Chairman, I pause here from my scripted remarks	6		o the practical application of the provisions in
	7	just to pick up a point that you made in your opening,	7		question to the design of any and all Indian
	8	where you said very rightly and properly and we are	8		run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers of the
	9	happy to hear that, as it's certainly the position that	9		indus Basin.
	10	we take that India's absence does not result in	10		It is a big task, we appreciate, but it is necessary
	11	decisions by default. And we are here to present our	11		n the context of the deeply rooted systemic dispute
	12	case and to invite the closest of scrutiny.	12		between Pakistan and India on these issues, the scale of
	13	As Pakistan's Deputy Agent has said though, I must	13		ndia's Western Rivers HEP construction programme, and
	14	underline that India cannot strengthen what we regard to	14		he sense that it would be incomprehensible for these
	15	be a weak case simply by a failure to present it. So	15	is	ssues to be left to be addressed on a plant-by-plant
	16	the fact that it is not in the room cannot somehow be	16	b	pasis in the absence of overarching interpretative
	17	taken to strengthen that case. We have endeavoured	17		guidance.
	18	as per our, as it were, self-imposed mandate, but also	18		As will have been evident from the length and detail
	19	with regard to the questions that the Court put to us in	19		of Pakistan's Memorial, we consider that the
	20	advance of the hearing to set out as fully as we can	20		nterpretative exercise of which you are seised cannot
	21	what we understand to be India's position, and we will	21	_	properly be undertaken as a narrow task that is focused
	22	address India's position carefully.	22		simply on construing the relevant subparagraphs of
	23	Mr Chairman, let me perhaps also add one or two	23	_	paragraph 8 of Annexure D.
	2425	points of housekeeping before I go back to my script. You should have, I believe, in front of you two rather	24 25		We did consider carefully, before we presented you with the 600-plus pages of the Memorial and the
	<i>د</i> ے	Tou should have, I believe, in front of you two fauler	23	V	with the 600-plus pages of the Memorial and the
		Page 18			Page 20

8 (Pages 17 to 20)

2 confined in effect to the three chapters that make up pural I/o of the Memorial, that deal just with the difference of the three chapters that make up apart I/o of the Memorial, that deal just with the difference of the content albaparagnsh of paragnsph 8. (i.e.), (i.), (i.), (i.) and (f) of Amount I/O of Procedural Order No. 6. But we conscluded that that approach would not suffice. The provisions in question in prangraph 8. (ii.) and (ii.) of Article III — stand at the core of the bragains that II were struck by the pursies in 1903, and they can only properly be construed in the context of the Treaty as a whole. 14 Now this appreciation will not be a novelty for iterative by the substance of the content of the Treaty as a whole of the content of the Treaty of the without the content of the Treaty and the core of the experimentary means of interpretation which are applicable in these interpretation of readies, based on the general mile of treaty in the content of the Treaty, to the wither context of the purpose of the Treaty, to the wither context of the purpose of the Treaty, to the wither context of the purpose of the Treaty, to the wither context of the purpose of the Treaty, and that the proper construction Page 21 1008 1 of the terms of paragnaph 8 of Annexure D requires a unappreciation of the well-content, the origins and 3 the purpose of the Treaty, and that she reason for the length symmissions that well be make well the making this week. 10 Mr Chairman, members of the Count, before proceeding for further, there give you as little bit not of the breach of the purpose of the Treaty, and that she reason for the length symmissions that well be maked to the terms of the count between the purpose of the Treaty, and that she reason for the length symmissions that well be maked to the terms of the Count, before proceeding for further, there give you as little bit not of the second to the count of the second to the purpose of the Treaty, and the treaty of the particular questions that will be maked to t				
4 interpretation of the elevant subparagnibs of American [1] A control [2] and the proper of the Peragnia (March (10:06 1	**	10:09 1	
4 interpretation of the relevant subparagraphs of 6 American [10] — corresponding to the questions at 7 paragraph 3.6 — (As SA), (2), (4), (6), (6) and (7) of 6 American [10] — corresponding to the questions at 8 paragraph 3.6(1) to (g) of Procedural Order No. 6. But 8 we concluded that that approach would not suffice. The 9 provisions in question in paragraph 3.6(1) to (g) of Procedural Order No. 6. But 8 we concluded that that approach would not suffice. The 9 provisions in question in paragraph 3.6(1) and they can only 12 peoperly be construed in the context of the Treaty as a whole. 14 Now this appreciation will not be a novelty for 15 international lawyser, as the interpretation of 16 treaty in 17 interpretation which are applicable in these 18 interpretation which are applicable in these 19 provisions in dispute — that's the Treaty as a whole—20 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the 19 provisions in dispute— that's the Treaty as a whole—21 to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Freaty 2 and to the Treaty, to the wider context of the 19 provisions in dispute— that's the Treaty as a whole—22 to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Freaty 3 and to the Treaty, to the wider context of the 19 provisions in dispute— that's the Treaty as a whole—22 to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Freaty 3 and to the Treaty 3 preparatory works. Professor Webb will address you on these issues more fully formorow. 25 But the bottom line is that the proper construction Page 21 1008 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and the the 603-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 19 provisions in dispute— that's the reason for the 19 provisions in dispute— that's the reason for the 19 provisions in dispute— that's the reason for the 19 provision of the wider context, the origins and the the 603-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 19 provision of the wider context, the origins and the proper of the Treaty 2 and to the Treaty 3	2		2	
5 panagraph 8 - hash 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of 6 Ameryme (FI) — corresponding to the questions at 7 panagraph 35(c) to (g) of Procedural Order No. 6. But 8 we concluded that that approach would not suffice. The 9 provisions in question in panagraph 8 - and incleed in 10 Article III — stand at the core of the bargains that 11 were struck by the parties in 1960, and they can only 12 properly be construed in the context of the Treaty as 13 a whole. 14 Now this approciation will not be a novelty for 15 interpretation and the supplementary means of 16 treaties, based on the general rule of treaty 17 interpretation and the supplementary means of 18 interpretation and the applicable in the parties of the context of the 19 circumstances, mandate reference to the object and 20 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the Treaty as a whole — 21 to the circumstances, mandate reference to the object and 22 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the 19 provisions in dispate — that's the Treaty as a whole — 23 and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow. 24 But the bottom line is that the proper construction 25 But the bottom line is that the proper construction 26 provisions in dispate — that's the reason for the 19 provisions in dispate of the Creaty. And that's the reason for the 19 provisions will also be the swill also refer to other drouments. 3 the papose of the Treaty, and that's the reason for the 19 provisions will also be the swill make the reason for the 19 provisions will also be the swill more of a roadmap 3 the papose of the Treaty and that's the reason for the 19 provisions in dispate — that swill be proper construction 4 the 600 plus pages, and that's the reason for the 19 provisions of the 19 provisions will also be the proper construction 4 the 600 plus pages, and that's the reason for the 19 provisions in the swill be proper to other freety. Proper page 21 10.08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexuse D requires 4 the 600	3	part IV of the Memorial, that deal just with the	3	regard to the Western Rivers. So we will come to your
6 Aunexume [D] — corresponding to the questions at paragraph 35(c) to [go Pfrocedural Order No. 6. But we concluded that that approach would not suffice. The provisions in question in paragraph 8.— and indeed in 10 Article III— stand at the core of the burgains that 11 were struck by the parties in 1960, and they can only 12 properly be constructed in the context of the Treaty as a whole. 14 Now this appreciation will not be a novelty for international lawyers, as the interpretation of 16 treaties, based on the general rule of treaty in interpretation which are applicable in these 19 circumstances, muntate reference to the object and 20 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the 21 provisions in dispute – that's the Treaty as a whole— 22 to the circumstances of the conduction of the Treaty and that we'll be making this week. 24 and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow. 25 But the bottom line is that the proper construction Figg 21 10318 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 19 purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for the 20 purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for the 21 purpose of the propose of the Treaty and whole and provided the 19 purpose of the proper construction 20 of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the weed and on the engineering submissions will take us through to the launch book and provided the 21 purpose of the second from the 22 purpose of the press of the conductors of Fakistan's concerns as regards both the weed and on the engineering submissions shit but the treaty of the provided the 22 purpose of the press of the conductors of Fakistan's concerns as regards bath the weed to the provided the 22 purpose of the press of the conductors of Fakistan's concerns as regards better the proper of 19 purpose o	4		4	question rather fully, shortly.
the issues with a relatively broad brush. My function is over concluded that that approach would not suffice. The provisions in question in prangraph 8 – and indeed in 10 Article III – stand at the core of the bargains that were struck by the parties in 1906, and they can only 12 properly be construed in the context of the Treaty as a whole. Now this appreciation will not be a novelty for international lawyers, as the interpretation of the structure of the general rule of treaty interpretation and the supplementary means of interpretation which are applicable in these in the propose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the provisions in dispate – that's the Treaty as a whole—2 to the circumstances, murdate reference to the object and purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the provisions in dispate – that's the Treaty as a whole—2 to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty, and that she Pready and the threaty is the provision of the treaty as a whole—2 to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty, and that's the reason for the the object of the treaty and the standard of the terms of paragraph 8 of Amexure D requires and the Court, before proceeding in the propose of the Treaty, And that's the reason for the the object pages, and that's the reason for the the object pages, and that she reason for the the object personal that is the treaty of the treaty and the standard provise of the treaty and the standard provise of the context, the origins and the object proceeding in the propose of the Treaty, and that's the reason for the the object proceeding in the propose of the Treaty, and that's the reason for the propose of the Treaty and the threaty of the treaty of the treat	5	paragraph 8 that's 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of	5	So the purpose of these opening submissions is to
8 we concluded that that approach would not suffice. The provisions in paragraph 8 — and indeed in 10 Article III — stand at the core of the bargains that 11 were struck by the parties in 1960, and they can only 12 properly be constructed in the context of the Treaty as a whole. 13 a whole. 14 Now this appreciation will not be a novelty for international lawyers, as the interpretation of treaty interpretation which are applicable in these 19 circumstances, mandare reference to the object and 19 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the 20 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the 21 provisions in dispute — that's the Treaty as a whole— 10 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the 22 purposision in dispute — that's the Treaty as a whole— 12 provisions in dispute — that's the Treaty as a whole— 13 and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb will diadress you on these issues more fully tomorrow. 24 and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb will address you on the sistence for the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for the 4 the 60-plus pages, and that's the reason for 4 the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for 4 the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for 4 the gardy and the standard that the reason for the 10 purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for 4 the gardy and the standard that the reason for the 10 purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for 4 the gardy and the standard that the reason for 4 the gardy and the standard that the reason of the 10 purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for 4 the gardy and the standard that the reason of the decidence of the wider context. The purpose of the Treaty, the original and the purpose of the Treaty, the purpose of the the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for 4 the gardy and the standard that the reason of the courts of the court of the courts of the court of the c	6	Annexure [D] corresponding to the questions at	6	set the broad contours of Pakistan's case and to address
9 provisions in question in paragraph 8 – and indeed in 10 Article III — stand at the core of the bargains that 11 were struck by the parties in 1900, and they can only 12 properly be construed in the context of the Treaty as 13 a whole. 14 Now this appreciation will not be a novelty for 15 international lawyers, as the interpretation of 16 treaties, based on the general rule of treaty 17 interpretation and the supplementary means of 18 interpretation and the supplementary incans of 18 interpretation which are applicable in these 19 circumstances, mandate reference to the object and 20 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the 21 provisions in dispute — that's the Treaty as a whole— 22 and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb 24 will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow. 25 But the bottom line is that the proper construction 26 Page 21 10:08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Amexure D requires 2 an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and 3 the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for 4 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 2 fleepily submissions that well be making this week. 6 Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding 8 of my submissions that well be making this week. 6 Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding 9 of my submissions shit morning. And as I've said. 10 Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. 11 My submissions shit she the terms of the 12 provisions in fine purpose of the three proper of a roadmap 18 of my submissions show the the making his week. 19 Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. 10 Pakistan's case more generally and to address some 10 Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. 11 My submissions shit take us through to the lunch 12 provision in the will be address some 13 provision of the proper soult the form of a roadmap 14 program of the will be address some 15 of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western 16 page soul on the proper soult the disconting the proper soult the q	7	paragraph 35(c) to (g) of Procedural Order No. 6. But	7	the issues with a relatively broad brush. My function
the coming days. A selfore, I'm very happy to take questions as we go along. It may be though, having a sense of what's to follow, that I defer some of the answers or at least some of the detailed answers or at least some of the detail	8	we concluded that that approach would not suffice. The	8	is to provide a framework for the filigree work that
11 were struck by the parties in 1960, and they can only 12 properly be construed in the context of the Treaty as 13 a whole. 14 Now this appreciation will not be a novelty for 15 international lawyers, as the interpretation of 16 treaties, based on the general rule of treaty 17 interpretation and the supplementary means of 18 interpretation and the supplementary means of 18 interpretation and the supplementary means of 18 interpretation and the supplementary means of 19 circumstances, mandate reference to the object and 20 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the 21 provisions in dispute – that's the Treaty as a whole— 22 to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty, 23 and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb 24 will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow. 25 But the bottom line is that the proper construction 26 Mr Abarh assaid, we very mach regret – we have 27 structured our oral submissions and allocated the 28 an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and 39 the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for the 40 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 41 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 42 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 43 the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for the 44 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 45 lengthy submissions that well be making this week. 46 Mr Chairman, members of the Counceding further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap of further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap of further, let me give you all the terms of the 10 Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. 11 Ma Serior and the Education and well also defer those to the second rounts. 12 break today. The ready to the terms of the error of the worder context, the origins and the treaty and the same of the submissions and allocated the endowed the submissions and allocated the engineering issues that will be mecassary to facilitate your profering submissions from Pakistan's engine	9	provisions in question in paragraph 8 and indeed in	9	will follow from others on Pakistan's advocacy team over
12 properly be construed in the context of the Treaty as a whole. 13 a whole. 14 Now this appreciation will not be a novelty for international lawyers, as the interpretation of 15 international lawyers, as the interpretation of 16 treateles, based on the general rule of treaty 16 interpretation and the supplementary means of 15 interpretation which are applicable in these 17 interpretation which are applicable in these 18 interpretation which are applicable in these 19 circumstances, mandate reference to the object and 20 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the 21 provisions in dispate — that's the Treaty as a whole— 22 to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. 23 and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb 24 will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow. 24 miles the best of the second for t	10	Article III stand at the core of the bargains that	10	the coming days.
13 a whole. 14 Now this appreciation will not be a novelty for international lawyers, as the interpretation of 15 international lawyers, as the interpretation of 16 treaties, based on the general rule of treaty 17 interpretation and the supplementary means of 18 interpretation which are applicable in these 19 circumstances, mandate reference to the object and 20 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the 21 provisions in dispute — that's the Treaty as a whole— 22 to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty, 23 and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb 24 will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow. 25 But the bottom line is that the proper construction 4 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for 24 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for 25 lengthy submissions that well be making this week. 26 In the bottom line is that well be making this week. 27 further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap 30 fm y submissions this morning. And as I've said, 31 further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap 30 fm y submissions this morning. And as I've said, 31 further, let me give you all tube bit more of a roadmap 30 fm y submissions will take us through to the lunch 31 for Pakistan's case more generally and to address some 32 further, let me give you all tube bit more of a roadmap 32 further, let me give you all tube bit more of a roadmap 34 further, let me give you all tube bit more of a roadmap 35 further, let me give you all tube bit more of a roadmap 36 further, let me give you all tube bit more of a roadmap 36 further, let me give you all tube bit more of a roadmap 36 further, let me give you all tube bit more of a roadmap 36 further, let me give you all tube bit more of a roadmap 36 further, let me give you all tube bit more of a roadmap 36 further, let me give you have a further your deliberations. 37 further let me give you have a further your deliberations. 38 further let me give you all tube bit more of a roadmap 36 further, let me give you have	11	were struck by the parties in 1960, and they can only	11	As before, I'm very happy to take questions as we go
14 Now this appreciation will not be a novelty for international lawyers, as the interpretation of treaties, based on the general rule of treaty treaty as a whole circumstances, mandate reference to the object and purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the provisions in dispute — that's the Treaty as a whole—to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty, and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb and all of the treaty is preparatory works. Professor Webb and the treaty is preparatory works. Professor Webb and the purpose of the Treaty, and that's the reason for the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for the foot plus pages, and that's the reason for	12	properly be construed in the context of the Treaty as	12	along. It may be though, having a sense of what's to
intermational lawyers, as the interpretation of tearlies, based on the general rule of treaty in the interpretation and the supplementary means of interpretation and the supplementary means of interpretation which are applicable in these interpretation of the which are a whole— 10:08 1 of the terms of purugaph 8 of Amexure D requires an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and a the purpose of the terms of purugaph 8 of Amexure D requires an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and a the purpose of the terms of purpose of the terms of purpose of the Court, before proceeding further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap of my submissions this morning. And as Ive said, a purpose of the court, before pro	13	a whole.	13	follow, that I defer some of the answers or at least
16 treaties, based on the general rule of treaty 17 interpretation and the supplementary means of 18 interpretation which are applicable in these 19 circumstances, mandate reference to the object and 20 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the 21 provisions in dispute - that's the Preaty as a whole 22 to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty, 23 and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb 24 will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow. 25 But the bottom line is that the proper construction 26 Page 21 10:08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires 27 an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and 28 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 29 long three, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap 30 of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, 31 of my submissions will take us through to the lunch 32 break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not 33 going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of 44 these opening submissions is to set the broad contours 45 long braids and the submissions is to set the broad contours 46 for Palastian's cane me generally and to address some 47 long braids and the submissions is to set the broad contours 48 for Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the 49 question of weaponisation. His initial identification 40 for Pakistan's cane me generally and to address some 40 for Pakistan's cane me generally and to address some 41 for Pakistan's cane me generally and to address some 42 for pakistan's cane me generally and to address some 43 for Pakistan's cane me generally and to address some 44 for Pakistan's cane me generally and to address some 45 for the terms of the contract of the Submany and the Peter Rae, whom you met on the site visit, although did not have a chance to engage with. 46 for the terms of the purpose of the Death of the Western 47 for the purpose of the Treaty. The purpose of the Medical proceedings. 48 for the purpose of the Death of the Court before the purpose of the De	14	Now this appreciation will not be a novelty for	14	some of the detailed answers to my colleagues to
interpretation and the supplementary means of interpretation which are applicable in these interpretation of the treaty of the part is a whole to the scenario or and submissions will according and advocacy tasks in a manner that we hope will provide the second round. 10.08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires an appreciation of the worlder context, the origins and the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for the deformance of the scenario or the sistents of the Respondent which, as Mr Akbar has said, we very much regret we have structured our oral submissions and allocated the advocacy tasks in a manner that we hope will provide the Page 23 10.09 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires an appreciation of the worlder context, the origins and the paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires an appreciation of the substant'	15	international lawyers, as the interpretation of	15	follow in due course. And we are of course conscious
18 interpretation which are applicable in these 19 circumstances, mandate reference to the object and 20 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the 21 provisions in dispute that's the Treaty as a whole 22 to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty, 23 and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb 24 will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow. 25 But the bottom line is that the proper construction 26 Page 21 10.08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires 27 an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and 28 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 29 lengthy submissions that well be making this week. 30 Mr Abra has said, we very much regret we have structured our oral submissions and allocated the advocacy tasks in a manner that we hope will provide the Page 23 10.08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires 29 an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and 30 the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for the 31 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 32 lengthy submissions that well be making this week. 33 Mr Abra has aid, we very much regret we have structured our oral submissions and allocated the advocacy tasks in a manner that we hope will provide the Page 23 10.08 1 Of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires 2a nappreciation of the wider context, the origins and the purpose of the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 10 of the first purpose of	16	treaties, based on the general rule of treaty	16	that particular questions that the Court may raise will
19 circumstances, mandate reference to the object and 20 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the 21 provisions in dispute – that's the Treaty as a whole – 22 to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty, and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb 24 will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow. 24 structured our oral submissions and allocated the 25 But the bottom line is that the proper construction Page 21	17	interpretation and the supplementary means of	17	in fact form the basis of the second-round submissions.
20 purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the 21 provisions in dispute — that's the Treaty as a whole — 22 to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty, 23 and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb 24 will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow. 25 But the bottom line is that the proper construction 26 Page 21 10:08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires 27 an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and 28 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 39 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 400-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 51 lengthy submissions that well be making this week. 61 Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding for further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, 61 I vill take you in particular to the terms of the 62 Dreak today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of these opening submissions is to set the broad contours of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some life is sues which occupy the horizon with a relatively broad brush. 63 I will take wou in particular to the terms of the lunch break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of these opening submissions is to set the broad contours of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some life is sues which occupy the horizon with a relatively broad brush. 64 I will take you in particular to the terms of the funch break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of these opening submissions is to set the broad contours of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some life is sues which occupy the horizon with a relatively broad brush. 64 I will take you in particular to the terms of the funch break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of the second re	18	interpretation which are applicable in these	18	So if there are questions that you raise which either
21 provisions in dispute — that's the Treaty as a whole— 22 to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty, sand to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow. 25 But the bottom line is that the proper construction Page 21 10:08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires 2 an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and 3 the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for the 4 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 5 lengthy submissions that we'll be making this week. 6 Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding 6 further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap 8 of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, 9 I will take you in particular to the terms of the 10 Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. 11 My submissions will take us through to the lunch 20 break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not 20 going to be one that hurts amy heads. The purpose of these opening submissions is to set the broad contours of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some 15 Mr Rae is a veteran of the Bagilhar proceedings. And arelatively broad brush. 18 Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the 19 question of weaponisation. His initial identification of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some 21 Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the 22 concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred 22 an abssequent answer to me is that in fact this is 24 an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in 25 some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions.	19	circumstances, mandate reference to the object and	19	require much more detailed answers or a little bit of
to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty, and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow. But the bottom line is that the proper construction Page 21 10:08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Amexure D requires an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for the lengthy submissions that we'll be making this week. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding for further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, I will take you in particular to the terms of the preats today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not be ging to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of these opening submissions is to set the broad contours of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively broad brush. Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the question of Peakistan's concerns as regards both the Western Rivers scripts exactly the concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is an issue that we're going to be one that this in fact this is an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that his in my submissions. 10 the absence of the Respondent — which, as affect will address and will address and will addressing you, to affer a waterucural water we hove will bromored a two advocacy tasks in a manner that we hope will provide the advocacy tasks in a manner that we hope will provide the advocacy tasks in a manner that we hope will provide the Page 23 10:10 1	20	purpose of the Treaty, to the wider context of the	20	research or clarification, we will also defer those to
and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow. But the bottom line is that the proper construction Page 21 10:08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the fempthy submissions that we'll be making this week. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, I've along session, but I hope it's not going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of these opening submissions is to set the broad contours of Pakistan's case and to seek clarity on the issues of fact, on the issues of law and on the engineering issues that will be necessary to facilitate your deliberations. The engineering aspect is most evident in our proffering submissions from Pakistan's engineering advisors, Dr Gregory Morris and Mr Peter Rae, whom you met on the site visit, although did not have a chance to engage with. Dr Morris is a veteran of the Kishenganga proceedings and one of the world's leading authorities on sediment management, including with wide experience throughout the Himalayan region. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. And relatively unusually for a dam engineer is that his experience runs from the very conception of hydroelectric plants, HEPs, all the way through to their of prakistan's case, and to seek clarity on the issues of fact, on the issues of law and on the engineering issues that will be necessary to facilitate your deliberations. The engineering aspect is most evident in our proffering submissions from Pakistan's engineering advisors, Dr Gregory Morris and Mr Peter Rae, whom you met on the site visit, although did not have a chance to engage with. Dr Morris is a veteran of the Kishenganga proceedings and one of the world's leading authorities on sediment management,	21	provisions in dispute that's the Treaty as a whole	21	the second round.
will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow. But the bottom line is that the proper construction Page 21 10:08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the lengthy submissions that we'll be making this week. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, I will take you in particular to the terms of the In My submissions will take us through to the lunch break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of these opening submissions is to set the broad contours of Pakistan's case and to seek clarity on the issues of fact, on the issues of law and on the engineering issues that will be necessary to facilitate your deliberations. The engineering aspect is most evident in our proffering submissions form Pakistan's engineering advisors, Dr Gregory Morris and Mr Peter Rae, whom you met on the site visit, although did not have a chance to engage with. Dr Morris is a veteran of the Kishenganga proceedings and one of the world's leading authorities on sediment management, including with wide experience throughout the Himalayan region. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. And relatively unusually for a dam engineer is that his experience runs from the very conception of hydroelectric plants, HEPs, all the way through to [their] operation. Mr Rae, the sessions with Dr Morris and Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing you, to afford you an opportunity to fully and reading advisors, Dr Gregory Morris and Mr Peter Rae, whom you met on the site visit, although did not have a chance to engage with. Dr Morris is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. And relatively unusually for a dam engineer is that his experience runs from the very conception of hydroelectri	22	to the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty,	22	In the absence of the Respondent which, as
25 But the bottom line is that the proper construction Page 21 10:08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires 2 an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and 3 the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the lengthy submissions that we'll be making this week. 6 Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, 9 I will take you in particular to the terms of the 10 Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. 11 My submissions will take us through to the lunch break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not 13 going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of these opening submissions is to set the broad contours 15 of Pakistant's case more generally and to address some 16 big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively broad brush. 18 Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the question of weaponisation. His initial identification of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western 21 Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exacely the concerns that we'ne going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. 25 But the bottom line is take the proad contours of the terms of prequires and the successary to factlitate prigorously test Pakistan's case, and to seek clarity on the sissues of fact, on the issues of fact, on the issues of fact, on the issues of the vall on the engineering issues that will be necessary to facilitate prigorously test Pakistan's case, and to seek clarity on the sissues of fact, on the issues of the denity on the engineering suscest hat will be necessary to facilitate prigorously test Pakistan's case, and to seek clarity on the sissues of fact, on the issues of fact, on the issues of fact, on the issues of fact, on the	23	and to the Treaty's preparatory works. Professor Webb	23	Mr Akbar has said, we very much regret we have
10:08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires 2 an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and 3 the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for 4 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 5 lengthy submissions that we'll be making this week. 6 Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding 7 further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap 8 of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, 9 I will take you in particular to the terms of the 10 Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. 11 My submissions will take us through to the lunch 12 break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not 13 going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of 14 these opening submissions is to set the broad contours 15 of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some 16 big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively 17 broad brush. 18 Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the 19 question of weaponisation. His initial identification 20 of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western 21 Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the 22 concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred 23 a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is 24 an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in 25 Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site	24	will address you on these issues more fully tomorrow.	24	structured our oral submissions and allocated the
10:08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires 2 an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and 3 the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for 4 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 5 lengthy submissions that we'll be making this week. 6 Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding 7 further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap 8 of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, 9 I will take you in particular to the terms of the 10 Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. 11 My submissions will take us through to the lunch 12 break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not 13 going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of 14 these opening submissions is to set the broad contours 15 of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some 16 big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively 17 broad brush. 18 Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the 19 question of weaponisation. His initial identification 20 of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western 21 Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the 22 concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred 23 a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is 24 an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in 25 Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site	25	But the bottom line is that the proper construction	25	advocacy tasks in a manner that we hope will provide the
10:08 1 of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires 2 an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and 3 the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for 4 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 5 lengthy submissions that we'll be making this week. 6 Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding 7 further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap 8 of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, 9 I will take you in particular to the terms of the 10 Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. 11 My submissions will take us through to the lunch 12 break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not 13 going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of 14 these opening submissions is to set the broad contours 15 of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some 16 big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively 17 broad brush. 18 Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the 19 question of weaponisation. His initial identification 20 of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western 21 Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the 22 concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred 23 a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is 24 an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in 25 Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site		Page 21		Page 23
2 an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and 3 the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for 4 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 5 lengthy submissions that we'll be making this week. 6 Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding 7 further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap 8 of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, 9 I will take you in particular to the terms of the 10 Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. 11 My submissions will take us through to the lunch 12 break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not 13 going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of 14 these opening submissions is to set the broad contours 15 of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some 16 big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively 17 broad brush. 18 Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the 19 question of weaponisation. His initial identification 20 of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western 21 Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the 22 concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred 23 a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is 24 an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in 25 some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions.		1 450 21		Tage 23
2 an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and 3 the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for 4 the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the 5 lengthy submissions that we'll be making this week. 6 Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding 7 further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap 8 of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, 9 I will take you in particular to the terms of the 10 Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. 11 My submissions will take us through to the lunch 12 break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not 13 going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of 14 these opening submissions is to set the broad contours 15 of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some 16 big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively 17 broad brush. 18 Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the 19 question of weaponisation. His initial identification 20 of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western 21 Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the 22 concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred 23 a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is 24 an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in 25 some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions.				
the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the lengthy submissions that we'll be making this week. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, I will take you in particular to the terms of the Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. My submissions will take us through to the lunch break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of these opening submissions is to set the broad contours of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively broad brush. Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the question of weaponisation. His initial identification of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred a n issue that we're going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions.	10:08 1	of the terms of paragraph 8 of Annexure D requires	10:10 1	Court with an interactive opportunity to fully and
the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the lengthy submissions that we'll be making this week. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, I will take you in particular to the terms of the Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. My submissions will take us through to the lunch break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of these opening submissions is to set the broad contours of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively broad brush. Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the question of weaponisation. His nitital identification of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. dendrical the engineering issues that will be necessary to facilitate your deliberations. The engineering issues that will be necessary to facilitate your deliberations. The engineering issues that will be necessary to facilitate your deliberations. The engineering issues that will be necessary to facilitate your deliberations. The engineering issues that will be necessary to facilitate your deliberations. The engineering issues that will be necessary to facilitate your deliberations. The engineering issues that will be necessary to facilitate your deliberations. The engineering issues that will be necessary to facilitate profering submissions from Pakistan's engineering advisors, Dr Gregory Morris and Mr Peter Rae, whom you met on the site visit, although did not have a chance to engage with. Dr Morris is a veteran of the Kishengang no sediment management, including with wide experience throughout the Himalayan region.	2	an appreciation of the wider context, the origins and	2	rigorously test Pakistan's case, and to seek clarity on
5 lengthy submissions that we'll be making this week. 6 Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding 7 further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap 8 of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, 9 I will take you in particular to the terms of the 10 Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. 11 My submissions will take us through to the lunch 12 break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not 13 going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of 14 these opening submissions is to set the broad contours 15 of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some 16 big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively 17 broad brush. 18 Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the 19 question of weaponisation. His initial identification 20 of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western 21 Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the 22 concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred 23 a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is 24 an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in 25 some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. 26 Mr Rae in engineering aspect is most evident in our 7 proffering submissions from Pakistan's engineering 8 advisors, Dr Gregory Morris and Mr Peter Rae, whom you 9 met on the site visit, although did not have a chance to 10 engage with. 11 Dr Morris is a veteran of the Kishenganga 12 proceedings and one of the world's leading authorities 13 on sediment management, including with wide experience 14 throughout the Himalayan region. 15 Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. 16 Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. 17 And relatively unusually for a dam engineer is that his 18 hydroelectric plants, HEPs, all the way through to 19 [their] operation. 20 We have structured the sessions with Dr Morris and 21 Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing 22 you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with 23 them, including on issues that may have arisen in the 24 Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but	3	the purpose of the Treaty. And that's the reason for	3	the issues of fact, on the issues of law and on the
Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, I will take you in particular to the terms of the ready to divide the stream of the site visit, although did not have a chance to met on the site visit, although did not have a	4	the 600-plus pages, and that's the reason for the	4	engineering issues that will be necessary to facilitate
further, let me give you a little bit more of a roadmap 8 of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, 9 I will take you in particular to the terms of the 10 Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. 11 My submissions will take us through to the lunch 12 break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not 13 going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of 14 these opening submissions is to set the broad contours 15 of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some 16 big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively 17 broad brush. 18 Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the 19 question of weaponisation. His initial identification 20 of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western 21 Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the 22 concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred 23 a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is 24 an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in 25 some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. 7 proffering submissions from Pakistan's engineering 8 advisors, Dr Gregory Morris and Mr Peter Rae, whom you 9 met on the site visit, although did not have a chance to 10 met on the site visit, although did not have a chance to 11 Dr Morris is a veteran of the Kishenganga 12 proceedings and one of the world's leading authorities 13 on sediment management, including with wide experience 14 throughout the Himalayan region. 15 Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. 16 And relatively unusually for a dam engineer is that his 17 experience runs from the very conception of 18 hydroelectric plants, HEPs, all the way through to 19 [their] operation. 20 We have structured the sessions with Dr Morris and 21 Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing 22 you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with 23 them, including on issues that may have arisen in the 24 Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the 25 Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site	5	lengthy submissions that we'll be making this week.	5	your deliberations.
of my submissions this morning. And as I've said, I will take you in particular to the terms of the I Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. I My submissions will take us through to the lunch break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of these opening submissions is to set the broad contours of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively broad brush. Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the question of weaponisation. His initial identification of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is advisors, Dr Gregory Morris and Mr Peter Rae, whom you met on the site visit, although did not have a chance to engage with. Dr Morris is a veteran of the Kishenganga proceedings and one of the world's leading authorities on sediment management, including with wide experience throughout the Himalayan region. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. And relatively unusually for a dam engineer is that his experience runs from the very conception of hydroelectric plants, HEPs, all the way through to [their] operation. We have structured the sessions with Dr Morris and Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with Neelum-Jhelum site visit, although did not have a chance to engage with. Dr Morris is a veteran of the Kishenganga proceedings and one of the world's leading authorities on sediment management, including with wide experience throughout the Himalayan region. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Saglina authorities on sediment management, including with wide experience throughout the Himalayan region. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Saglina authorities on sedime	6	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before proceeding	6	The engineering aspect is most evident in our
9 I will take you in particular to the terms of the 10 Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. 11 My submissions will take us through to the lunch 12 break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not 13 going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of 14 these opening submissions is to set the broad contours 15 of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some 16 big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively 17 broad brush. 18 Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the 19 question of weaponisation. His initial identification 20 of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western 21 Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the 22 concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred 23 a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is 24 an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in 25 some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions.	7		7	proffering submissions from Pakistan's engineering
Treaty, but will also refer to other documents. My submissions will take us through to the lunch break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of these opening submissions is to set the broad contours of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively broad brush. Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the question of weaponisation. His initial identification of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions.	8		8	- ·
11 My submissions will take us through to the lunch 12 break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not 13 going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of 14 these opening submissions is to set the broad contours 15 of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some 16 big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively 17 broad brush. 18 Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the 19 question of weaponisation. His initial identification 20 of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western 21 Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the 22 concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred 23 a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is 24 an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in 25 some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. 16 Dr Morris is a veteran of the Kishenganga 12 proceedings and one of the world's leading authorities 13 on sediment management, including with wide experience 14 throughout the Himalayan region. 15 Mr Rae is a veteran of the Kishenganga 16 proceedings and one of the world's leading authorities 18 on sediment management, including with wide experience 19 throughout the Himalayan region. 10 Mr Rae is a veteran of the Saiding authorities 11 Dr Morris is a veteran of the Kishenganga 12 proceedings and one of the world's leading authorities 13 on sediment management, including with wide experience 14 throughout the Himalayan region. 15 Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. 16 And relatively unusually for a dam engineer is that his 17 experience runs from the very conception of 18 hydroelectric plants, HEPs, all the way through to 19 [their] operation. 20 We have structured the sessions with Dr Morris and 21 Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing 22 you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with 23 them, including on issues that may have arisen in the 24 Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the 25 Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site	9	I will take you in particular to the terms of the	9	met on the site visit, although did not have a chance to
break today. It's a long session, but I hope it's not going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of these opening submissions is to set the broad contours of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively broad brush. Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the question of weaponisation. His initial identification of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. 12 proceedings and one of the world's leading authorities on sediment management, including with wide experience throughout the Himalayan region. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. hyr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. hyr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. His including with wide experience throughout the Himalayan region. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. What real including on the very conception of the way through to [their] operation. We have structured the sessions with Dr Morris and Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with them, including on issues that may have arisen in the Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site	10	-	10	
going to be one that hurts any heads. The purpose of these opening submissions is to set the broad contours of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively broad brush. Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the question of waponisation. His initial identification of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. Is an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. Is an issue that management, including with wide experience throughout the Himalayan region. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. And relatively unusually for a dam engineer is that his experience runs from the very conception of hydroelectric plants, HEPs, all the way through to [their] operation. We have structured the sessions with Dr Morris and Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with them, including on issues that may have arisen in the Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site				
these opening submissions is to set the broad contours of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively broad brush. Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the question of weaponisation. His initial identification of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. 14 throughout the Himalayan region. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. And relatively unusually for a dam engineer is that his experience runs from the very conception of hydroelectric plants, HEPs, all the way through to [their] operation. We have structured the sessions with Dr Morris and Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with them, including on issues that may have arisen in the Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site				
of Pakistan's case more generally and to address some big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively broad brush. Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the question of weaponisation. His initial identification of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. Mr Rae is a veteran of the Baglihar proceedings. And relatively unusually for a dam engineer is that his experience runs from the very conception of hydroelectric plants, HEPs, all the way through to [their] operation. We have structured the sessions with Dr Morris and Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with them, including on issues that may have arisen in the Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site				-
big issues which occupy the horizon with a relatively broad brush. Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the question of weaponisation. His initial identification of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. 16 And relatively unusually for a dam engineer is that his experience runs from the very conception of hydroelectric plants, HEPs, all the way through to [their] operation. We have structured the sessions with Dr Morris and Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with 23 them, including on issues that may have arisen in the Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site				
broad brush. Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the question of weaponisation. His initial identification of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. 17 experience runs from the very conception of hydroelectric plants, HEPs, all the way through to [their] operation. 20 We have structured the sessions with Dr Morris and Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with them, including on issues that may have arisen in the Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site				
Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the question of weaponisation. His initial identification of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred as subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. Mr Chairman, you asked our Deputy Agent about the hydroelectric plants, HEPs, all the way through to [their] operation. We have structured the sessions with Dr Morris and Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with them, including on issues that may have arisen in the Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site				
question of weaponisation. His initial identification of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. [their] operation. We have structured the sessions with Dr Morris and Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with them, including on issues that may have arisen in the Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site				
of Pakistan's concerns as regards both the Western Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. 20 We have structured the sessions with Dr Morris and Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with them, including on issues that may have arisen in the Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site				
Rivers and the Eastern Rivers scripts exactly the concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. 21 Mr Rae, the sessions in which they will be addressing you an opportunity to fully engage with them, including on issues that may have arisen in the Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site				
concerns that we have. The reason why he deferred 3 a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is 4 an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in 5 some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. 2 you, to afford you an opportunity to fully engage with 2 them, including on issues that may have arisen in the 2 Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the 2 Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site				
23 a subsequent answer to me is that in fact this is 24 an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in 25 some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. 26 them, including on issues that may have arisen in the 27 Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the 28 Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site				
24 an issue that we're going to be addressing you on in 25 some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. 26 Neelum-Jhelum site visit, but which, for reasons of the 27 Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site				
some detail, and I'll come to that in my submissions. 25 Site Visit Protocol and the structure of that site				
Page 22 Page 24	25	some detail, and til come to that in my submissions.	25	She visit protocol and the structure of that site
		Page 22		Page 24

,			
10:12 1	visit, you may not have had an opportunity to raise, and	10:15 1	Waters, Mr Shah, to give evidence immediately following
2	certainly didn't have an opportunity to raise with them.	2	the lunch break today. Mr Chairman, we are grateful to
3	As noted in chapter 1 of our Memorial, we are also	3	the Court for your willingness to accommodate this by
4	conscious very conscious that the bench is	4	agreeing to sit until 6.00 pm today, if that is
5	constituted by members with widely varying expertise,	5	necessary, and obviously that will be dependent on the
6	ranging from public international law, through national	6	scale of Court's examination of Mr Shah. If, of course,
7	law and chemical engineering, and also to hydrology and	7	you wish to go beyond today in your examination of
8	dam engineering. Given this, we have endeavoured in our	8	Mr Shah, Mr Shah understands that he will have to be
9	Memorial, and will further endeavour in our oral	9	sequestered overnight. But we will see how that goes.
10	submissions, to provide a baseline of information across	10	Mr Chairman, another short practical point of
11	all of the interdisciplinary elements engaged by these	11	proceedings as we start this week. As also addressed in
12	proceedings, so that you will have from us a common	12	our letter of 27 June, we have so arranged the scheme of
13	frame of reference for purposes of your deliberations.	13	our submissions to avoid lengthy back-to-back
14	Having said that, let me offer preemptive apologies	14	submissions on different topics by individual advocates.
15	if there are patches in our submissions that may seem	15	With your indulgence, therefore, Mr Chairman, if we
16	unnecessary to any one of you; it may be that we are	16	conclude a projected tranche of submissions early on any
17	addressing your neighbour when it comes to those	17	given day, perhaps because we go faster than we
18	submissions.	18	anticipated or there may be fewer questions from the
19	But this said, Mr Chairman, if we are either	19	Court than we have allowed for, with your indulgence, we
20	skirting over particular issues or spending too much	20	will seek an adjournment of the hearing for that day,
21	time on them, please direct us, as we would like to	21	even if it leaves a little bit of fallow time.
22	adjust accordingly and accommodate to the cadence of the	22	Just to illustrate, Mr Shah will be introduced and
23	Court. We look forward to fielding questions from you	23	led in his direct evidence and his re-direct as
24	during the course of these first-round submissions, and	24	appropriate by Ms Laura Rees-Evans. She is also due to
25	we will either respond to them in the course of those	25	address you on the travaux préparatoires and the history
23	we will educe respond to them in the course of those	25	address you on the duvada preparationes and the history
	Page 25		Page 27
10:13 1	submissions or next week	10:16 1	of the Treaty. I would like to avoid if at all
10:13 1	submissions or next week. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral	10:16 1	of the Treaty. I would like to avoid, if at all
2	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral	2	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the
2 3	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written	2 3	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that
2 3 4	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral	2 3 4	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions.
2 3 4 5	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to	2 3 4 5	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning.
2 3 4 5 6	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the	2 3 4 5 6	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time
2 3 4 5 6 7	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order	2 3 4 5 6 7	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate into their submissions responses to the written	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at the moment, on our projected schedule, that's likely to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate into their submissions responses to the written questions posed [by] the Court in advance of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at the moment, on our projected schedule, that's likely to be a fallow afternoon, or at least mostly. I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate into their submissions responses to the written questions posed [by] the Court in advance of the hearing. This mostly concerns the submissions by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at the moment, on our projected schedule, that's likely to be a fallow afternoon, or at least mostly. I think Professor Webb is due to speak for an hour or so on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate into their submissions responses to the written questions posed [by] the Court in advance of the hearing. This mostly concerns the submissions by Professor Webb and by Dr Miles, who will address you on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at the moment, on our projected schedule, that's likely to be a fallow afternoon, or at least mostly. I think Professor Webb is due to speak for an hour or so on Wednesday afternoon on the current schedule.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate into their submissions responses to the written questions posed [by] the Court in advance of the hearing. This mostly concerns the submissions by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at the moment, on our projected schedule, that's likely to be a fallow afternoon, or at least mostly. I think Professor Webb is due to speak for an hour or so on Wednesday afternoon on the current schedule. But it may also depend on how much you would like to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate into their submissions responses to the written questions posed [by] the Court in advance of the hearing. This mostly concerns the submissions by Professor Webb and by Dr Miles, who will address you on the interpretative issues concerning the subparagraphs	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at the moment, on our projected schedule, that's likely to be a fallow afternoon, or at least mostly. I think Professor Webb is due to speak for an hour or so on Wednesday afternoon on the current schedule.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate into their submissions responses to the written questions posed [by] the Court in advance of the hearing. This mostly concerns the submissions by Professor Webb and by Dr Miles, who will address you on the interpretative issues concerning the subparagraphs of paragraph 8. Dr Miles will also address you on Friday on your "what if?" question regarding the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at the moment, on our projected schedule, that's likely to be a fallow afternoon, or at least mostly. I think Professor Webb is due to speak for an hour or so on Wednesday afternoon on the current schedule. But it may also depend on how much you would like to engage with Dr Morris, because he will be here for two and a half hours the day before, and depending on that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate into their submissions responses to the written questions posed [by] the Court in advance of the hearing. This mostly concerns the submissions by Professor Webb and by Dr Miles, who will address you on the interpretative issues concerning the subparagraphs of paragraph 8. Dr Miles will also address you on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at the moment, on our projected schedule, that's likely to be a fallow afternoon, or at least mostly. I think Professor Webb is due to speak for an hour or so on Wednesday afternoon on the current schedule. But it may also depend on how much you would like to engage with Dr Morris, because he will be here for two and a half hours the day before, and depending on that, we may wish to go over.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate into their submissions responses to the written questions posed [by] the Court in advance of the hearing. This mostly concerns the submissions by Professor Webb and by Dr Miles, who will address you on the interpretative issues concerning the subparagraphs of paragraph 8. Dr Miles will also address you on Friday on your "what if?" question regarding the redesign of the Baglihar and Neelum-Jhelum HEPs in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at the moment, on our projected schedule, that's likely to be a fallow afternoon, or at least mostly. I think Professor Webb is due to speak for an hour or so on Wednesday afternoon on the current schedule. But it may also depend on how much you would like to engage with Dr Morris, because he will be here for two and a half hours the day before, and depending on that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate into their submissions responses to the written questions posed [by] the Court in advance of the hearing. This mostly concerns the submissions by Professor Webb and by Dr Miles, who will address you on the interpretative issues concerning the subparagraphs of paragraph 8. Dr Miles will also address you on Friday on your "what if?" question regarding the redesign of the Baglihar and Neelum-Jhelum HEPs in the light of the parties' respective conceptions of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at the moment, on our projected schedule, that's likely to be a fallow afternoon, or at least mostly. I think Professor Webb is due to speak for an hour or so on Wednesday afternoon on the current schedule. But it may also depend on how much you would like to engage with Dr Morris, because he will be here for two and a half hours the day before, and depending on that, we may wish to go over. Mr Chairman, in case it may assist your monitoring,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate into their submissions responses to the written questions posed [by] the Court in advance of the hearing. This mostly concerns the submissions by Professor Webb and by Dr Miles, who will address you on the interpretative issues concerning the subparagraphs of paragraph 8. Dr Miles will also address you on Friday on your "what if?" question regarding the redesign of the Baglihar and Neelum-Jhelum HEPs in the light of the parties' respective conceptions of the paragraph 8 design criteria.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at the moment, on our projected schedule, that's likely to be a fallow afternoon, or at least mostly. I think Professor Webb is due to speak for an hour or so on Wednesday afternoon on the current schedule. But it may also depend on how much you would like to engage with Dr Morris, because he will be here for two and a half hours the day before, and depending on that, we may wish to go over. Mr Chairman, in case it may assist your monitoring, we have a hand-up to give you which I think has been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate into their submissions responses to the written questions posed [by] the Court in advance of the hearing. This mostly concerns the submissions by Professor Webb and by Dr Miles, who will address you on the interpretative issues concerning the subparagraphs of paragraph 8. Dr Miles will also address you on Friday on your "what if?" question regarding the redesign of the Baglihar and Neelum-Jhelum HEPs in the light of the parties' respective conceptions of the paragraph 8 design criteria. As you will know from our letter of 27 June, with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at the moment, on our projected schedule, that's likely to be a fallow afternoon, or at least mostly. I think Professor Webb is due to speak for an hour or so on Wednesday afternoon on the current schedule. But it may also depend on how much you would like to engage with Dr Morris, because he will be here for two and a half hours the day before, and depending on that, we may wish to go over. Mr Chairman, in case it may assist your monitoring, we have a hand-up to give you which I think has been provided both electrically and in hard copy, which is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate into their submissions responses to the written questions posed [by] the Court in advance of the hearing. This mostly concerns the submissions by Professor Webb and by Dr Miles, who will address you on the interpretative issues concerning the subparagraphs of paragraph 8. Dr Miles will also address you on Friday on your "what if?" question regarding the redesign of the Baglihar and Neelum-Jhelum HEPs in the light of the parties' respective conceptions of the paragraph 8 design criteria. As you will know from our letter of 27 June, with the details now reflected in the annexure to PO12, we propose to call Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at the moment, on our projected schedule, that's likely to be a fallow afternoon, or at least mostly. I think Professor Webb is due to speak for an hour or so on Wednesday afternoon on the current schedule. But it may also depend on how much you would like to engage with Dr Morris, because he will be here for two and a half hours the day before, and depending on that, we may wish to go over. Mr Chairman, in case it may assist your monitoring, we have a hand-up to give you which I think has been provided both electrically and in hard copy, which is just the scheme of our submissions. I don't know whether that has been provided to you already or whether
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, our oral submissions will not simply repeat our written submissions. We have endeavoured to focus our oral submissions on the issues that are most likely to require your attention for purpose of response to the questions to which we were directed by Procedural Order No. 6. To this end, we have also endeavoured to pick up questions that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site visit and integrate them into our presentations. Insofar as such questions engage their submissions, each of the advocates addressing you will also integrate into their submissions responses to the written questions posed [by] the Court in advance of the hearing. This mostly concerns the submissions by Professor Webb and by Dr Miles, who will address you on the interpretative issues concerning the subparagraphs of paragraph 8. Dr Miles will also address you on Friday on your "what if?" question regarding the redesign of the Baglihar and Neelum-Jhelum HEPs in the light of the parties' respective conceptions of the paragraph 8 design criteria. As you will know from our letter of 27 June, with the details now reflected in the annexure to PO12, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	possible, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, that the minute that she sits down from Mr Shah's evidence, that she is asked to stand up to give her own submissions. So we have planned that for tomorrow morning. We think that the most likely point of fallow time is likely to be on Wednesday afternoon. As you'll recall, we had originally scheduled Wednesday afternoon to be a sort of fallow day, and then came back to you with a request that we be permitted to use that in the light of the possibility that your examination of Mr Shah might go on for more than just an hour. But at the moment, on our projected schedule, that's likely to be a fallow afternoon, or at least mostly. I think Professor Webb is due to speak for an hour or so on Wednesday afternoon on the current schedule. But it may also depend on how much you would like to engage with Dr Morris, because he will be here for two and a half hours the day before, and depending on that, we may wish to go over. Mr Chairman, in case it may assist your monitoring, we have a hand-up to give you which I think has been provided both electrically and in hard copy, which is just the scheme of our submissions. I don't know

10 (Pages 25 to 28)

10:18 1	the	10:21	1	purposes of the presentations
			2	purposes of the presentations. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much. And I'm grateful,
2 3	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I believe it has been provided to us already, so we have that.		3	Mr Chairman, for your accommodation to be making these,
4	We have discussed within the Court the issue of		4	as it were, mini-case management applications on the
5	perhaps ending early on any given day. The Court is		5	hoof.
6	certainly amenable to that, the only caveat being		6	
7	completion of the first round on Friday. And as		7	I don't propose to go through the scheme in detail. There are a number of aspects that I just should note,
8	I understand it, even if we were to finish early on		8	though, very briefly, in case they are useful to orient
9	certain days this week, the plan would still be to		9	our submissions going forward.
10	complete the first round by Friday, in which case		9 10	The first is that the submissions planned for
11	I think we have no difficulty with the approach you're		11	tomorrow morning and early afternoon are intended to
12	suggesting.		12	provide a general foundation for the other submissions
13	SIR DANIEL: Yes, indeed. Thank you very much for that		13	that will follow: negotiating the Treaty, principles of
14	clarification, Mr Chairman.		14	interpretation, water usage and sustainability. These
15	As you will see from this and I won't walk you		15	are, of course, immensely important submissions because
16	through the details, and in my submissions, I will take		16	they provide the foundation, and indeed we anticipate
17	you to some of the submissions that will follow but		17	that there will be lots of interest and lots of
18	you'll see where we've put in what we think is		18	questions from members of the Court across the whole
19	contingency time. The yellow square-bracketed numbers		19	range of the bench on these submissions.
20	next to each submission is intended to be our working		20	Secondly, as you will see, we have allocated
21	estimate of the time that's required. This is simply so		21	significant blocks of time to the submissions by
22	that you can follow the trajectory of our submissions as		22	Dr Morris and Mr Rae.
23	we go forward. So these timings are just indicative.		23	In particular, Dr Morris will be captive to your
24	Mr Chairman, just as a matter of formality		24	enquiries for around two and a half hours tomorrow
25	I don't anticipate that this will be an issue at all,		25	and as appropriate, if necessary, we can take that into
	-			
	Page 29			Page 31
10.10.1		40.00		
10:19 1	but just make sure that it is properly addressed on the		1	Wednesday as well addressing general run-of-river
2	record having regard to paragraph 2 of Procedural		2	design and operation issues. And he will again be
3 4	Order No. 12, and in particular paragraph 2.3 of Procedural Order No. 12, Pakistan proposes a very slight		3 4	coming back on Thursday for an hour and a half or so, again in a session which we will structure in a way
5	variation in the scheme of its submissions from that		5	that's designed to provoke enquiry from you, where he
6	that's outlined in the annexure to PO12, beyond those		6	will address approaching paragraph 8 from an engineering
7	addressed in paragraph 5 of our letter of 1 July.		7	perspective.
8	It is substantially utterly inconsequential. But in		8	Mr Rae, although he is projected to be on his feet
9	the annexure to PO12, I think we have Dr Miles making		9	for a shorter time, will be picking up on a number of
10	_		0	the issues that arose during the Neelum-Jhelum site
11	Professor Webb making her submissions on outlets,		11	visit when he speaks on Wednesday morning, as he will be
12			12	addressing the issue of the incorporation of
13			13	a run-of-river HEP into an integrated power system,
14			14	including wind and solar. We recall that there were
15	build on some of the submissions that Professor Webb	1	15	a number of questions in particular from Dr Blackmore
16	will make.	1	16	and Professor Buytaert about that, but also from other
17	So that's reflected in this handout. It's not	1	17	members of the Court. So we wanted to provide
18	entirely clear from paragraph 2.3 of PO12 whether we	1	18	an opportunity to be responsive to that.
19	need to request formal permission from you to make that	1	19	Third and finally, just on the scheme of the
20	sort of slight adjustment, or whether that proposal in	2	20	submissions, as you will see, we have allowed almost
21	our scheme of submissions is simply a matter that's left		21	two full days for the detailed submissions on the
22	to our own recognisance, but to draw to your attention.		22	interpretation of the individual subparagraphs of
23		_	23	paragraph 8.
	* *			
24	THE CHAIRMAN: I think that the Court has no difficulty in	2	24	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with this said,
24 25		2		
	THE CHAIRMAN: I think that the Court has no difficulty in	2	24	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with this said,

11 (Pages 29 to 32)

10:23	1	submissions that I will be making for the rest of the	10:26 1	_	proceedings. And I will say a little more about this
	2	morning. And I propose to address you on four topics,	2	1	latter issue shortly.
	3	as follows.	3		Following the further directions on this issue, the
	4	First, I will make some preliminary observations on	4		document disclosure issue, in your letter of 11 June, we
	5	the scope and the scheme of these proceedings and,	5		have submitted into the record all the documents from
	6	insofar as I am able to do so, the parallel proceedings	6		the Kishenganga proceedings that are responsive to the
	7	before the Neutral Expert. And there are limitations on what I will be able to say there, but I will be able to	7 8		direction in paragraph 1.3 of PO11, and I understand
	8	•	9	·	that the Registry has those available. We have also submitted into the record all of the
	9 10	say something. Second, I will address the origins of the Indus	10		documents that are in Pakistan's possession and control
	11	Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, as Mr Akbar	11		from the Baglihar proceedings that are responsive to
	12	has referenced, the concern about India's weaponisation	12		your direction in paragraph 1.2 of PO11. We have had
	13	of water going, Mr Chairman, to your question and	13		some engagement with the Secretary-General and the
	14	the relevance of these issues for the Court's task.	14		Secretariat of ICSID, that acted as the registry for the
	15	Third, I will address the three bargains at the	15		Baglihar proceedings. There are, I think, one or two
	16	heart of the Treaty and make some preliminary	16		documents that are still missing, and we are chasing
	17	observations about the construction of Article III and	17		those up, but we will make sure that they are provided
	18	Annexure D of the Treaty. I will use that part of the	18		expeditiously.
	19	submissions, if I may, Mr Chairman just to refresh all	19		As regards the documents identified in
	20	of our collective memories about the particular	20	I	paragraphs 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6 of PO11 namely, that's
	21	provisions of the Treaty that are in issue, and this is	21	8	all the records of the Permanent Indus Commission, all
	22	the point at which I will invite you to open your hard	22	1	relevant correspondence between the Pakistan and Indian
	23	copies or your electronic bundles and just walk you	23		Indus Waters Commissioners, and all relevant
	24	through some of the provisions again.	24		intergovernmental communications the Islamabad team
	25	Then, fourth, I will address the genesis of the	25	ŀ	has begun to search for and collect this material for
		Page 33			Page 35
10:25		present dispute, the opposition of the parties on the	10:28 1		purposes of both the digitisation of the records and for
	2	key issues and the relevance of the Kishenganga and	2	ä	a relevance review by the legal team.
	3	Baglihar decisions.	3		As I understand it, many of these records which
	4	Now in most instances, my observations will be	4		go back to 1960, so 64 years of records were boxed in
	5 6	intended to provide a foundation for the more detailed submissions to come from my colleagues. The intention	5 6		storage, and have had to be and in some cases must still be located and transferred to the office of the
	7	of these opening submissions is to endeavour to cast	7		PCIW. But these 64 years of records are not all
	8	a very broad net and to give you a sense of some of the	8		well-archived or in a good condition, so we are
	9	big issues on the horizon, with a view to orienting the	9		undertaking that process at the moment. Once the
	10	submissions that will follow.	10		collation of these records has been achieved, Pakistan's
	11	Mr Chairman, before I there is always an	11		counsel team will review everything for relevance.
	12	inevitable clearing-away of some of the administrative	12		I note in this regard that the formulation that's
	13	issues at the start of these hearings but before	13		used in PO11, which is documents "that address matters
	14	I turn to the first of my substantive topics, let me	14		at issue before the Court in the First Phase on the
	15	also briefly address you on the progress that has been	15]	Merits", will, in effect, require that each document is
	16	made on the issues of your document disclosure	16		reviewed for relevance, and in some cases that
	17	directions in Procedural Order No. 11. We indicated	17		a judgment is made, as these issues particularly
	18	that we would provide a little bit of an update in the	18	-	pre-1988, when the first entrails, if you like, of the
	19	hearing.	19		Kishenganga dispute began to arise these issues are
	20	As a preliminary matter, I note that since receipt	20		unlikely to have been neatly addressed in a manner that
	21	of PO11 on 27 May, both the Islamabad and the external	21		will allow relevance to be quickly and easily assessed.
	22	counsel teams have been very heavily preoccupied on	22		There isn't a searchable heading, for example.
	23 24	two case-related issues: the first, of course, is the	23 24		So once the documents have been identified, we will have to undertake a review of those. We will of course
	24 25	preparation for this hearing; the second is a site visit to India as part of the parallel Neutral Expert	25		provide you with everything that looks even remotely
	43	to mola as part of the parallel Neutral Expert	23	J	provide you with everything that looks even remotery
		Page 34			Page 36

10:29 1	relevant. But it may be that there are many thousands	10:32 1	it's in sort of published form.
2	of documents that will have to be reviewed.	2	Subsequently, when the legal team has been in
3	We note that in PO11, you have raised the issue of	3	Islamabad, we've been through documents. We've managed
4	if this is unduly burdensome, and we will come back to	4	to identify documents that seem on first blush to be
5	you if that is the case, but we are not, at the moment,	5	relevant, but then, as we've looked at them, they really
6	in a position to make such an assessment.	6	are not.
7	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel.	7	In fact, this brings me to a point that I was about
8	First of all, let me say, on behalf of the Court,	8	to come to, Mr Chairman. And that is that in our
9	how grateful we are to the Government of Pakistan for	9	correspondence to you following PO11, we proposed and
10	the searching out and compiling together of the Baglihar	10	we're grateful to the Court for accepting this
11	and Kishenganga materials, understanding that some of	11	timeline we proposed that we would submit these
12	the Baglihar materials aren't yet before us. It was	12	documents by, I think, 30 September. We proposed that
13	a relatively quick time period in which you did that and	13	we would do so under cover of what we described as
13	presented it to the Court, and we're very grateful for	14	a "post-hearing submission".
		15	You deferred the question, understandably, of
15 16	it. Indeed, members of the Court have already been looking at those materials in preparation for this	16	a post-hearing submission to the end of these
17	hearing, so the timeliness was quite helpful.	17	proceedings. But just to explain at this point, the
18	With respect to the other materials that you are	18	reason why we propose that we should do it under cover
19	•	19	of a post-hearing submission is that we would be able to
	referring to, the standard that we set forth in that		use the post-hearing submission to explain to you in
20	procedural order was an attempt to try to acknowledge	20	
21	that there may well be a lot of materials that aren't	21	detail, in a written document, precisely what searches have been undertaken, what relevance review was
22	especially relevant. On the other hand, the Court is	22	
23	not familiar with the degree of volume here. And so one	23	undertaken, what judgment calls were made.
24	judgment call that Pakistan may wish to make is whether	24	So I appreciate that we'll come back to the
25	doing that analysis of relevance is necessary, in the	25	post-hearing submission issue at the end of these
	Page 37		Page 39
10:31 1	sense that if there is not too much volume, it's	10:33 1	proceedings, but that was the thinking of it. We didn't
10:31 1 2	sense that if there is not too much volume, it's possible all of the materials could be provided without	10:33 1 2	proceedings, but that was the thinking of it. We didn't want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents
2	possible all of the materials could be provided without	2	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents
2 3	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to	2 3	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to
2 3 4	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due	2 3 4	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context.
2 3 4 5	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to	2 3 4 5	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no.
2 3 4 5 6	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the	2 3 4 5 6	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated
2 3 4 5 6 7	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in this room don't know what the volume of that material	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, I will say a little bit more about this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in this room don't know what the volume of that material is. For purposes of the preparation of this case, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, I will say a little bit more about this shortly, insofar as I'm able to do so.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in this room don't know what the volume of that material is. For purposes of the preparation of this case, we feel reasonably confident that we've had sight of and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, I will say a little bit more about this shortly, insofar as I'm able to do so. Beyond that, Pakistan's search for such materials,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in this room don't know what the volume of that material is. For purposes of the preparation of this case, we feel reasonably confident that we've had sight of and been able to capture the key documents going back to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, I will say a little bit more about this shortly, insofar as I'm able to do so. Beyond that, Pakistan's search for such materials, the paragraph 1.7 materials, is proceeding in tandem
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in this room don't know what the volume of that material is. For purposes of the preparation of this case, we feel reasonably confident that we've had sight of and been able to capture the key documents going back to 1988, because at least that's when the Kishenganga	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, I will say a little bit more about this shortly, insofar as I'm able to do so. Beyond that, Pakistan's search for such materials, the paragraph 1.7 materials, is proceeding in tandem with the search for the documents addressed in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in this room don't know what the volume of that material is. For purposes of the preparation of this case, we feel reasonably confident that we've had sight of and been able to capture the key documents going back to 1988, because at least that's when the Kishenganga dispute began to bubble up.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, I will say a little bit more about this shortly, insofar as I'm able to do so. Beyond that, Pakistan's search for such materials, the paragraph 1.7 materials, is proceeding in tandem with the search for the documents addressed in paragraphs 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6. But as we said in our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in this room don't know what the volume of that material is. For purposes of the preparation of this case, we feel reasonably confident that we've had sight of and been able to capture the key documents going back to 1988, because at least that's when the Kishenganga dispute began to bubble up. But if you take it back to 1960, we don't quite know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, I will say a little bit more about this shortly, insofar as I'm able to do so. Beyond that, Pakistan's search for such materials, the paragraph 1.7 materials, is proceeding in tandem with the search for the documents addressed in paragraphs 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6. But as we said in our correspondence of 6 June, we don't have a sense that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in this room don't know what the volume of that material is. For purposes of the preparation of this case, we feel reasonably confident that we've had sight of and been able to capture the key documents going back to 1988, because at least that's when the Kishenganga dispute began to bubble up. But if you take it back to 1960, we don't quite know what's out there. Just to illustrate the point, there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, I will say a little bit more about this shortly, insofar as I'm able to do so. Beyond that, Pakistan's search for such materials, the paragraph 1.7 materials, is proceeding in tandem with the search for the documents addressed in paragraphs 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6. But as we said in our correspondence of 6 June, we don't have a sense that there is a whole hinterland of other documents that will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in this room don't know what the volume of that material is. For purposes of the preparation of this case, we feel reasonably confident that we've had sight of and been able to capture the key documents going back to 1988, because at least that's when the Kishenganga dispute began to bubble up. But if you take it back to 1960, we don't quite know what's out there. Just to illustrate the point, there is, for example, one document that's already in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, I will say a little bit more about this shortly, insofar as I'm able to do so. Beyond that, Pakistan's search for such materials, the paragraph 1.7 materials, is proceeding in tandem with the search for the documents addressed in paragraphs 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6. But as we said in our correspondence of 6 June, we don't have a sense that there is a whole hinterland of other documents that will be caught by the catch-all 1.7 request.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in this room don't know what the volume of that material is. For purposes of the preparation of this case, we feel reasonably confident that we've had sight of and been able to capture the key documents going back to 1988, because at least that's when the Kishenganga dispute began to bubble up. But if you take it back to 1960, we don't quite know what's out there. Just to illustrate the point, there is, for example, one document that's already in the record which I will refer to, and I think others will as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, I will say a little bit more about this shortly, insofar as I'm able to do so. Beyond that, Pakistan's search for such materials, the paragraph 1.7 materials, is proceeding in tandem with the search for the documents addressed in paragraphs 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6. But as we said in our correspondence of 6 June, we don't have a sense that there is a whole hinterland of other documents that will be caught by the catch-all 1.7 request. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in this room don't know what the volume of that material is. For purposes of the preparation of this case, we feel reasonably confident that we've had sight of and been able to capture the key documents going back to 1988, because at least that's when the Kishenganga dispute began to bubble up. But if you take it back to 1960, we don't quite know what's out there. Just to illustrate the point, there is, for example, one document that's already in the record which I will refer to, and I think others will as well, in relation to an agreement between Pakistan and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, I will say a little bit more about this shortly, insofar as I'm able to do so. Beyond that, Pakistan's search for such materials, the paragraph 1.7 materials, is proceeding in tandem with the search for the documents addressed in paragraphs 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6. But as we said in our correspondence of 6 June, we don't have a sense that there is a whole hinterland of other documents that will be caught by the catch-all 1.7 request. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with the administrative issues out of the way, let me turn to my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in this room don't know what the volume of that material is. For purposes of the preparation of this case, we feel reasonably confident that we've had sight of and been able to capture the key documents going back to 1988, because at least that's when the Kishenganga dispute began to bubble up. But if you take it back to 1960, we don't quite know what's out there. Just to illustrate the point, there is, for example, one document that's already in the record which I will refer to, and I think others will as well, in relation to an agreement between Pakistan and India on the Salal plant, which goes back, if memory	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, I will say a little bit more about this shortly, insofar as I'm able to do so. Beyond that, Pakistan's search for such materials, the paragraph 1.7 materials, is proceeding in tandem with the search for the documents addressed in paragraphs 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6. But as we said in our correspondence of 6 June, we don't have a sense that there is a whole hinterland of other documents that will be caught by the catch-all 1.7 request. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with the administrative issues out of the way, let me turn to my more substantive remarks, and start with some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in this room don't know what the volume of that material is. For purposes of the preparation of this case, we feel reasonably confident that we've had sight of and been able to capture the key documents going back to 1988, because at least that's when the Kishenganga dispute began to bubble up. But if you take it back to 1960, we don't quite know what's out there. Just to illustrate the point, there is, for example, one document that's already in the record which I will refer to, and I think others will as well, in relation to an agreement between Pakistan and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, I will say a little bit more about this shortly, insofar as I'm able to do so. Beyond that, Pakistan's search for such materials, the paragraph 1.7 materials, is proceeding in tandem with the search for the documents addressed in paragraphs 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6. But as we said in our correspondence of 6 June, we don't have a sense that there is a whole hinterland of other documents that will be caught by the catch-all 1.7 request. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with the administrative issues out of the way, let me turn to my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	possible all of the materials could be provided without doing that analysis. But we leave it to you to come back to us in due course, as you work your way through the materials, to see if there is some difficulty in complying with the order as we've set it, and whether any adjustment is possibly useful in that regard. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, and I'm grateful for that accommodation. I have to say that at the moment, we at least the external team and the Pakistani team that are here in this room don't know what the volume of that material is. For purposes of the preparation of this case, we feel reasonably confident that we've had sight of and been able to capture the key documents going back to 1988, because at least that's when the Kishenganga dispute began to bubble up. But if you take it back to 1960, we don't quite know what's out there. Just to illustrate the point, there is, for example, one document that's already in the record which I will refer to, and I think others will as well, in relation to an agreement between Pakistan and India on the Salal plant, which goes back, if memory	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	want, as it were, just to submit a tranche of documents with no context. So the post-hearing submission was to provide you with context. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I'm just looking to my colleagues to see whether they've got any updated information: no. As regards the more general catch-all category of documents that are addressed in paragraph 1.7 of PO11, this was addressed in paragraph 3(c) of Pakistan's letter of 6 June. Insofar as this covers documents that were submitted by India into the parallel Neutral Expert proceedings, I will say a little bit more about this shortly, insofar as I'm able to do so. Beyond that, Pakistan's search for such materials, the paragraph 1.7 materials, is proceeding in tandem with the search for the documents addressed in paragraphs 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6. But as we said in our correspondence of 6 June, we don't have a sense that there is a whole hinterland of other documents that will be caught by the catch-all 1.7 request. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, with the administrative issues out of the way, let me turn to my more substantive remarks, and start with some

13 (Pages 37 to 40)

10:35 1	proceedings and the parallel proceedings before the	10:38 1	geological, they may be financial; there may be other
2	Neutral Expert.	2	constraints. But there will always be constraints of
3	As an initial observation, I would like to take us	3	one kind or another. And faced with such constraints,
4	immediately beyond the Neelum-Jhelum site visit. You	4	the task of an engineer charged with designing a HEP is
5	have the point already, so perhaps forgive me for making	5	to do so within the applicable constraints. And there
6	it. But I make it to underline the issue, as it forms	6	is seldom such a thing as "can't". Dam engineers are
7	the basis of this entire proceedings.	7	adept at finding design solutions: that is their job.
8	The Neelum-Jhelum site visit was an exercise in	8	If the constraint, for whatever reason, is to design
9	familiarising the Court with the general aspects of the	9	a HEP with, for example, a certain configuration of
10	design and operation of run-of-river hydroelectric	10	spillways, or that will be required to operate on the
11	plants along the Indus system of rivers. This purpose	11	basis of a restricted flow of water through the
12	was expressly stated in paragraph 1.1 of Procedural	12	turbines, that can be done. The task of the design team
13	Order No. 10, the Court's Site Visit Protocol. And	13	is not to circumvent the constraints, but rather to
13	paragraph 1.2 of the Site Visit Protocol went on to	13	design the best possible HEP within the permissible
15	expressly differentiate between Indian run-of-river HEPs	15	envelope of those applicable constraints.
16	on the Western Rivers, the design and operation of which	16	And as you will hear again from Dr Morris and from
17	is expressly regulated by the Treaty, and Pakistani	17	Mr Rae, there is nothing inherently problematical about
18	run-of-river HEPs on the Western Rivers, such as the	18	the run-of-river HEP design constraints in paragraph 8
19	Neelum-Jhelum plant, the design and operation of which	19	of Annexure D of the Treaty. They are there for a wider
20	is not regulated by the Treaty.	20	purpose, and the design engineers will be, in our view,
20	As I say, you have this point: it arose in the	20	perfectly able and capable of navigating their way
22	context not just of the Site Visit Protocol but the site		
	visit itself, from some of the questions and comments	22 23	around them to come up with a functioning and
23 24	made by the members of the Court; and of course it's at		satisfactory design.
25	the heart of the written questions that you put to us	24	Where issues of circumvention arise is not at the
23	the heart of the written questions that you put to us	25	engineering level but at the policy, political and
	Page 41		Page 43
10:37 1	before the hearing.	10:40 1	financial levels. Designing a HEP to accommodate
2	But the reason for emphasising the point is to	10:40 1 2	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that
2 3	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and		applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper
2 3 4	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are	2 3 4	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off
2 3	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument	2 3	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at
2 3 4	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western	2 3 4 5 6	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding
2 3 4 5 6 7	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3	2 3 4 5 6 7	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by intent: this is the very purpose of the Treaty. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant. But where constraints are given, they cannot simply
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by intent: this is the very purpose of the Treaty. The design and operation straitjacket for that is what it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant. But where constraints are given, they cannot simply be discarded or disregarded; they must be complied with.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by intent: this is the very purpose of the Treaty. The design and operation straitjacket for that is what it is: a design and operation straitjacket in respect of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant. But where constraints are given, they cannot simply be discarded or disregarded; they must be complied with. The reality at the heart of the dispute between Pakistan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by intent: this is the very purpose of the Treaty. The design and operation straitjacket for that is what it is: a design and operation straitjacket in respect of Indian run-of-river HEPs on Western Rivers is the pivot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant. But where constraints are given, they cannot simply be discarded or disregarded; they must be complied with. The reality at the heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India is that India, we say, wants to read down or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by intent: this is the very purpose of the Treaty. The design and operation straitjacket for that is what it is: a design and operation straitjacket in respect of Indian run-of-river HEPs on Western Rivers is the pivot around which the various bargains reflected in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant. But where constraints are given, they cannot simply be discarded or disregarded; they must be complied with. The reality at the heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India is that India, we say, wants to read down or read out the regulatory constraints of the Treaty from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by intent: this is the very purpose of the Treaty. The design and operation straitjacket for that is what it is: a design and operation straitjacket in respect of Indian run-of-river HEPs on Western Rivers is the pivot around which the various bargains reflected in the Treaty rotate.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant. But where constraints are given, they cannot simply be discarded or disregarded; they must be complied with. The reality at the heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India is that India, we say, wants to read down or read out the regulatory constraints of the Treaty from the design and operation of its Western Rivers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by intent: this is the very purpose of the Treaty. The design and operation straitjacket for that is what it is: a design and operation straitjacket in respect of Indian run-of-river HEPs on Western Rivers is the pivot around which the various bargains reflected in the Treaty rotate. As you will hear from Dr Morris and Mr Rae in due	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant. But where constraints are given, they cannot simply be discarded or disregarded; they must be complied with. The reality at the heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India is that India, we say, wants to read down or read out the regulatory constraints of the Treaty from the design and operation of its Western Rivers run-of-river HEPs.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by intent: this is the very purpose of the Treaty. The design and operation straitjacket for that is what it is: a design and operation straitjacket in respect of Indian run-of-river HEPs on Western Rivers is the pivot around which the various bargains reflected in the Treaty rotate. As you will hear from Dr Morris and Mr Rae in due course, and as I anticipate the engineering members of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant. But where constraints are given, they cannot simply be discarded or disregarded; they must be complied with. The reality at the heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India is that India, we say, wants to read down or read out the regulatory constraints of the Treaty from the design and operation of its Western Rivers run-of-river HEPs. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, based on India's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by intent: this is the very purpose of the Treaty. The design and operation straitjacket for that is what it is: a design and operation straitjacket in respect of Indian run-of-river HEPs on Western Rivers is the pivot around which the various bargains reflected in the Treaty rotate. As you will hear from Dr Morris and Mr Rae in due course, and as I anticipate the engineering members of the Court will well appreciate, constraints on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant. But where constraints are given, they cannot simply be discarded or disregarded; they must be complied with. The reality at the heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India is that India, we say, wants to read down or read out the regulatory constraints of the Treaty from the design and operation of its Western Rivers run-of-river HEPs. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, based on India's own figures, it has somewhere in the region of 5,264
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by intent: this is the very purpose of the Treaty. The design and operation straitjacket for that is what it is: a design and operation straitjacket in respect of Indian run-of-river HEPs on Western Rivers is the pivot around which the various bargains reflected in the Treaty rotate. As you will hear from Dr Morris and Mr Rae in due course, and as I anticipate the engineering members of the Court will well appreciate, constraints on the design and operation of a hydroelectric plant are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant. But where constraints are given, they cannot simply be discarded or disregarded; they must be complied with. The reality at the heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India is that India, we say, wants to read down or read out the regulatory constraints of the Treaty from the design and operation of its Western Rivers run-of-river HEPs. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, based on India's own figures, it has somewhere in the region of 5,264 completed large dams on its rivers. You will find this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by intent: this is the very purpose of the Treaty. The design and operation straitjacket for that is what it is: a design and operation straitjacket in respect of Indian run-of-river HEPs on Western Rivers is the pivot around which the various bargains reflected in the Treaty rotate. As you will hear from Dr Morris and Mr Rae in due course, and as I anticipate the engineering members of the Court will well appreciate, constraints on the design and operation of a hydroelectric plant are standard fare for engineers. The constraints may be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant. But where constraints are given, they cannot simply be discarded or disregarded; they must be complied with. The reality at the heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India is that India, we say, wants to read down or read out the regulatory constraints of the Treaty from the design and operation of its Western Rivers run-of-river HEPs. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, based on India's own figures, it has somewhere in the region of 5,264 completed large dams on its rivers. You will find this figure at Exhibit P-562, which is at tab 14 of your core
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by intent: this is the very purpose of the Treaty. The design and operation straitjacket for that is what it is: a design and operation straitjacket in respect of Indian run-of-river HEPs on Western Rivers is the pivot around which the various bargains reflected in the Treaty rotate. As you will hear from Dr Morris and Mr Rae in due course, and as I anticipate the engineering members of the Court will well appreciate, constraints on the design and operation of a hydroelectric plant are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant. But where constraints are given, they cannot simply be discarded or disregarded; they must be complied with. The reality at the heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India is that India, we say, wants to read down or read out the regulatory constraints of the Treaty from the design and operation of its Western Rivers run-of-river HEPs. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, based on India's own figures, it has somewhere in the region of 5,264 completed large dams on its rivers. You will find this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by intent: this is the very purpose of the Treaty. The design and operation straitjacket for that is what it is: a design and operation straitjacket in respect of Indian run-of-river HEPs on Western Rivers is the pivot around which the various bargains reflected in the Treaty rotate. As you will hear from Dr Morris and Mr Rae in due course, and as I anticipate the engineering members of the Court will well appreciate, constraints on the design and operation of a hydroelectric plant are standard fare for engineers. The constraints may be regulatory, they may be topographical, they may be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant. But where constraints are given, they cannot simply be discarded or disregarded; they must be complied with. The reality at the heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India is that India, we say, wants to read down or read out the regulatory constraints of the Treaty from the design and operation of its Western Rivers run-of-river HEPs. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, based on India's own figures, it has somewhere in the region of 5,264 completed large dams on its rivers. You will find this figure at Exhibit P-562, which is at tab 14 of your core bundle. I don't invite you to turn it up because I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	But the reason for emphasising the point is to underscore the wider issue, namely that the design and operation of Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers are strictly regulated by the Treaty. This is an instrument by design that regulates Indian HEPs on the Western Rivers. All of these HEPs, the Annexure D, [Part] 3 HEPS, must be run-of-river plants; they must all be designed and operated within the tight regulatory constraints of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. In other words, the Treaty does not give free rein to India to design and operate a run-of-river HEP on the Western Rivers as it may wish to do so. And this is by intent: this is the very purpose of the Treaty. The design and operation straitjacket for that is what it is: a design and operation straitjacket in respect of Indian run-of-river HEPs on Western Rivers is the pivot around which the various bargains reflected in the Treaty rotate. As you will hear from Dr Morris and Mr Rae in due course, and as I anticipate the engineering members of the Court will well appreciate, constraints on the design and operation of a hydroelectric plant are standard fare for engineers. The constraints may be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	applicable constraints may entail costs. It may be that cutting corners on costs would enable the cheaper generation of electricity. It may be that throwing off constraints would enable a HEP to be constructed at a different location. It may be that disregarding constraints would allow a greater generating head to be achieved without the need for lengthy tunnelling. It may be that ignoring constraints would allow costs to be saved on turbine abrasion and replacement, rather than coating the turbines. It may be that circumventing constraints would enable a HEP to operate for uninterrupted periods, rather than as a peaking plant. But where constraints are given, they cannot simply be discarded or disregarded; they must be complied with. The reality at the heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India is that India, we say, wants to read down or read out the regulatory constraints of the Treaty from the design and operation of its Western Rivers run-of-river HEPs. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, based on India's own figures, it has somewhere in the region of 5,264 completed large dams on its rivers. You will find this figure at Exhibit P-562, which is at tab 14 of your core

14 (Pages 41 to 44)

,		40 :-	
10:42 1	just drawing attention to a figure. The reason why	10:45 1	were directed to address in that order are set out in
2	I say "somewhere in the region" is because this figure	2	paragraph 35 of the order, which references
3	comes from a scholarly article published by an Indian	3	Mr Chairman, as you recalled in your opening
4	dam engineer from the Central Water Commission, and the	4	observations which references Article III and Approxima D. support graphs 8(a) (b) (c) (d) (c) and (f) of
5 6	headline figure that he quotes in 2022 is 5,264 large dams in India.	5	Annexure D, subparagraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of
7	The number of planned Indian run-of-river HEPs on	6 7	the Treaty. The scope of this phase of the proceedings, however,
8	the Western Rivers of the Indus Basin, of around about	8	is addressed elsewhere in PO6, in the context of the
9	200, is less than 4% of this total. While the cascading	9	Court's decision of the general duty of mutual respect
10	effects of these dams for Pakistan's water supply is	10	and comity that you, the Court, concluded applies both
11	very significant, and potentially catastrophic for	11	to your organisation of the proceedings, in respect of
12	Pakistan, they are quite literally a drop in the bucket	12	the dispute of which you are seised, and to the Neutral
13	for India: less than 4% of the total of Indian large	13	Expert's organisation of the parallel proceedings, in
14	dams.	14	respect of the differences that may properly fall within
15	The design, construction and operation of large dams	15	his scope of competence under Part 1 of Annexure F of
16	on a national scale in a country the size of India is	16	the Treaty.
17	undertaken by reference to template standards and	17	Now I use the conditional "may properly fall" with
18	guidelines which are informed by a design configuration	18	respect to the scope of the competence of the Neutral
19	that is focused on the general, on the 5,264 large dams	19	Expert for three reasons.
20	nationally, rather than on the particular, the 201	20	First, the Neutral Expert has not himself yet
21	planned or operational HEPS on the Western Rivers. And	21	addressed his competence. As will be evident from
22	the result of this is that there is quite evidently	22	paragraph 2.3 of the Neutral Expert's Supplementary
23	a strong national imperative on India's part to design	23	Rules of Procedure, which are published and publicly
24	its Western Rivers run-of-river HEPs by reference to its	24	available on the PCA website, and which we have also put
25	Treaty-unconstrained design criteria that are used for	25	in at Exhibit P-549 at core bundle tab 1, the Neutral
	Page 45		Page 47
10:43 1	the country as a whole	10:46 1	Expert there's no need for you to turn them up, but
10:43 1	the country as a whole. While this works for India, however, it does not	10:46 1 2	Expert there's no need for you to turn them up, but if you're looking at them in any event as you will
2	While this works for India, however, it does not	2	if you're looking at them in any event as you will
	-		if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated
2 3	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at	2 3	if you're looking at them in any event as you will
2 3 4	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design	2 3 4	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the
2 3 4 5	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus	2 3 4 5	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty.
2 3 4 5 6	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as	2 3 4 5 6	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western run-of-river HEP design must conform to the Treaty in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond, you have the hardcopy documents in front of you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western run-of-river HEP design must conform to the Treaty in order to safeguard Pakistan's rights to the waters of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond, you have the hardcopy documents in front of you. The paragraph 7 procedure of Annexure F is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western run-of-river HEP design must conform to the Treaty in order to safeguard Pakistan's rights to the waters of those rivers. Pakistan says, further, that there is no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond, you have the hardcopy documents in front of you. The paragraph 7 procedure of Annexure F is a procedure by which the Neutral Expert is required to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western run-of-river HEP design must conform to the Treaty in order to safeguard Pakistan's rights to the waters of those rivers. Pakistan says, further, that there is no overriding reason of principle or practicality, from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond, you have the hardcopy documents in front of you. The paragraph 7 procedure of Annexure F is a procedure by which the Neutral Expert is required to decide whether a difference of which he is purportedly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western run-of-river HEP design must conform to the Treaty in order to safeguard Pakistan's rights to the waters of those rivers. Pakistan says, further, that there is no overriding reason of principle or practicality, from an engineering position, why this can't be achieved, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond, you have the hardcopy documents in front of you. The paragraph 7 procedure of Annexure F is a procedure by which the Neutral Expert is required to decide whether a difference of which he is purportedly seised properly falls within the scope of [Part] 1 of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western run-of-river HEP design must conform to the Treaty in order to safeguard Pakistan's rights to the waters of those rivers. Pakistan says, further, that there is no overriding reason of principle or practicality, from an engineering position, why this can't be achieved, and this is the core of the dispute between the parties.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond, you have the hardcopy documents in front of you. The paragraph 7 procedure of Annexure F is a procedure by which the Neutral Expert is required to decide whether a difference of which he is purportedly seised properly falls within the scope of [Part] 1 of Annexure F. And I think I've addressed this to you in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western run-of-river HEP design must conform to the Treaty in order to safeguard Pakistan's rights to the waters of those rivers. Pakistan says, further, that there is no overriding reason of principle or practicality, from an engineering position, why this can't be achieved, and this is the core of the dispute between the parties. Let me turn from this preliminary point to address	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond, you have the hardcopy documents in front of you. The paragraph 7 procedure of Annexure F is a procedure by which the Neutral Expert is required to decide whether a difference of which he is purportedly seised properly falls within the scope of [Part] 1 of Annexure F. And I think I've addressed this to you in the past. Part 1 of Annexure F is the enumeration of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western run-of-river HEP design must conform to the Treaty in order to safeguard Pakistan's rights to the waters of those rivers. Pakistan says, further, that there is no overriding reason of principle or practicality, from an engineering position, why this can't be achieved, and this is the core of the dispute between the parties. Let me turn from this preliminary point to address the scope and scheme of the proceedings before the Court	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond, you have the hardcopy documents in front of you. The paragraph 7 procedure of Annexure F is a procedure by which the Neutral Expert is required to decide whether a difference of which he is purportedly seised properly falls within the scope of [Part] 1 of Annexure F. And I think I've addressed this to you in the past. Part 1 of Annexure F is the enumeration of a whole series of items which a Neutral Expert is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western run-of-river HEP design must conform to the Treaty in order to safeguard Pakistan's rights to the waters of those rivers. Pakistan says, further, that there is no overriding reason of principle or practicality, from an engineering position, why this can't be achieved, and this is the core of the dispute between the parties. Let me turn from this preliminary point to address the scope and scheme of the proceedings before the Neutral Expert.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond, you have the hardcopy documents in front of you. The paragraph 7 procedure of Annexure F is a procedure by which the Neutral Expert is required to decide whether a difference of which he is purportedly seised properly falls within the scope of [Part] 1 of Annexure F. And I think I've addressed this to you in the past. Part 1 of Annexure F is the enumeration of a whole series of items which a Neutral Expert is competent to address; and paragraph 7 of Annexure F is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western run-of-river HEP design must conform to the Treaty in order to safeguard Pakistan's rights to the waters of those rivers. Pakistan says, further, that there is no overriding reason of principle or practicality, from an engineering position, why this can't be achieved, and this is the core of the dispute between the parties. Let me turn from this preliminary point to address the scope and scheme of the proceedings before the Court	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond, you have the hardcopy documents in front of you. The paragraph 7 procedure of Annexure F is a procedure by which the Neutral Expert is required to decide whether a difference of which he is purportedly seised properly falls within the scope of [Part] 1 of Annexure F. And I think I've addressed this to you in the past. Part 1 of Annexure F is the enumeration of a whole series of items which a Neutral Expert is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western run-of-river HEP design must conform to the Treaty in order to safeguard Pakistan's rights to the waters of those rivers. Pakistan says, further, that there is no overriding reason of principle or practicality, from an engineering position, why this can't be achieved, and this is the core of the dispute between the parties. Let me turn from this preliminary point to address the scope and scheme of the proceedings before the Court and the parallel proceedings before the Neutral Expert. The scope and scheme of the first phase on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond, you have the hardcopy documents in front of you. The paragraph 7 procedure of Annexure F is a procedure by which the Neutral Expert is required to decide whether a difference of which he is purportedly seised properly falls within the scope of [Part] 1 of Annexure F. And I think I've addressed this to you in the past. Part 1 of Annexure F is the enumeration of a whole series of items which a Neutral Expert is competent to address; and paragraph 7 of Annexure F is the procedure by which, where there is a dispute, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western run-of-river HEP design must conform to the Treaty in order to safeguard Pakistan's rights to the waters of those rivers. Pakistan says, further, that there is no overriding reason of principle or practicality, from an engineering position, why this can't be achieved, and this is the core of the dispute between the parties. Let me turn from this preliminary point to address the scope and scheme of the proceedings before the Court and the parallel proceedings before the Neutral Expert. The scope and scheme of the first phase on the merits is defined by the terms of Procedural Order	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond, you have the hardcopy documents in front of you. The paragraph 7 procedure of Annexure F is a procedure by which the Neutral Expert is required to decide whether a difference of which he is purportedly seised properly falls within the scope of [Part] 1 of Annexure F. And I think I've addressed this to you in the past. Part 1 of Annexure F is the enumeration of a whole series of items which a Neutral Expert is competent to address; and paragraph 7 of Annexure F is the procedure by which, where there is a dispute, the competence of the Neutral Expert with respect to that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western run-of-river HEP design must conform to the Treaty in order to safeguard Pakistan's rights to the waters of those rivers. Pakistan says, further, that there is no overriding reason of principle or practicality, from an engineering position, why this can't be achieved, and this is the core of the dispute between the parties. Let me turn from this preliminary point to address the scope and scheme of the proceedings before the Court and the parallel proceedings before the Neutral Expert. The scope and scheme of the first phase on the merits is defined by the terms of Procedural Order No. 6, which you handed down on 6 July 2023, alongside your Award on Competence. The key questions that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond, you have the hardcopy documents in front of you. The paragraph 7 procedure of Annexure F is a procedure by which the Neutral Expert is required to decide whether a difference of which he is purportedly seised properly falls within the scope of [Part] 1 of Annexure F. And I think I've addressed this to you in the past. Part 1 of Annexure F is the enumeration of a whole series of items which a Neutral Expert is competent to address; and paragraph 7 of Annexure F is the procedure by which, where there is a dispute, the competence of the Neutral Expert with respect to that Part 1 is tested. As the Neutral Expert's revised programme of work
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	While this works for India, however, it does not work for Pakistan. And more importantly, it is at odds we say starkly at odds with the design constraints and the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty by which India is bound. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I highlight this point in opening Pakistan's substantive submissions as it goes to the very heart of the dispute between Pakistan and India of which you are seised. India wants to proceed on the basis of a one-size-fits-all approach to HEP design. Pakistan, however, insists that Western run-of-river HEP design must conform to the Treaty in order to safeguard Pakistan's rights to the waters of those rivers. Pakistan says, further, that there is no overriding reason of principle or practicality, from an engineering position, why this can't be achieved, and this is the core of the dispute between the parties. Let me turn from this preliminary point to address the scope and scheme of the proceedings before the Court and the parallel proceedings before the Neutral Expert. The scope and scheme of the first phase on the merits is defined by the terms of Procedural Order No. 6, which you handed down on 6 July 2023, alongside	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	if you're looking at them in any event as you will see from paragraph 2.3, the Neutral Expert has mandated a procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F of the Treaty. I don't know, Mr Chairman, whether you would find it convenient to have a look at paragraph 7 of Annexure F. There's no particular reason to do so. But if you would find it helpful, it is at page 208, and I will ask my colleague to project that on the screen. It's page 208 of the United Nations Treaty Series document. (Pause) While we're waiting for the AV just to respond, you have the hardcopy documents in front of you. The paragraph 7 procedure of Annexure F is a procedure by which the Neutral Expert is required to decide whether a difference of which he is purportedly seised properly falls within the scope of [Part] 1 of Annexure F. And I think I've addressed this to you in the past. Part 1 of Annexure F is the enumeration of a whole series of items which a Neutral Expert is competent to address; and paragraph 7 of Annexure F is the procedure by which, where there is a dispute, the competence of the Neutral Expert with respect to that Part 1 is tested.

15 (Pages 45 to 48)

Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of you. It says: "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to financial compensation) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." So we maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of tyou. It says: 10 an issue that we addressed in the competence hearing. 11 I think the issue is a little bit different from what you've just described. Because we accept that the Neutral Expert has not quite in terms of compétence 12 Annexure F in the way that it's addressed, for example, in Annexure G but we accept that the Neutral Expert 13 I think the issue is a little bit different from 14 What you've just described. Because we accept that the 15 Annexure F in the way that it's addressed, for example, in Annexure G but we accept that the Neutral Expert 16 in Annexure F but we accept that the Neutral Expert 17 must be capable of determining whether a matter falls 18 within Part 1 of Annexure F; whether the design of a particular plant has been properly raised before him. 20 So that's not the issue. 21 Where our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the 22 Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence						
document — Pakistam, as the moving party, filed its statement under paragraph? 7 of Annexure F on 1 February this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 7 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 8 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 8 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 8 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 1 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 1 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 1 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 1 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 1 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 1 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 1 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 1 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 1 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 1 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 1 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 1 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph? 1 rely on 14 June this year; India filed its year; And this is a matter which the year india filed its year; And this is a matter which the paragraph? India filed	10:49					
4 document — Pakistan, as the moving party, filed its 5 statement under paragraph 7 of Amexure F on I Februs 6 this year; India filed its paragraph 7 reply on 14 June 7 this year; and the third meeting of the Neutral Expert, 8 at which the parties will present or all submissions on 9 the paragraph 7 issue, is scheduled for 10 and 10 11 Seperther this year. After that, the Neutral 11 Expert — there we have it on the screen — after that, 12 the Neutral Expert will issue his decision on the 13 paragraph 7 competence issues. 14 So as we stand here before you today, at the 15 beginning of July, the Neutral Expert has yet to address 16 his own competence. And this is a matter which 17 necessarily also includes the organisation of his 18 proceedings in accordance with the general duty of 19 mutual respect and comisty. 20 So that's one of the reasons why I use the 21 conditional language in reference to issues that "may 22 properly fall" within the Neutral Expert sourpetence. 23 The second reason for using conditional language 24 when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert and promisty. 25 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 26 paragraph 3 of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course 27 of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 3 panagraph 2 of Procedural Order No. 6; namely that, 4 quite apart from the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course 2 of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 3 panagraph 2 of Procedural Order No. 6; namely that, 4 quite apart from the competence of the 5 Neutral Expert proceedings in the course 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert proceeding in the course 10 front of your. It says: 11 "Wilhout prejudice to the finality of the Neutral 12 Expert dut are not visit in the competence of the competence of the competence of the competence of the decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by generome, be settled in accordance with the 17 provi			-			· · ·
this year; and the third meeting of the Neutral Expert, this year; and the third meeting of the Neutral Expert, the whole of the dispute that is contained in now that there will be no need to adopt such a course, but that there will be no need to adopt such a course, but that there will be no need to adopt such a course, but that there will be no need to adopt such a course of the Neutral Expert that, the next all the there will be no need to adopt such a course of the Neutral Expert has, yet to address that that parity and the Court has itself expressly reserved its position on the status of the Neutral that we recall that the Court has itself expressly reserved its position on the status of the Neutral that we recall that the Court has itself expersely that we recall that the Court has itself that you have ruised the issue that a paragraph? and provide the new recall that the Court has itself expressly reserved its position on the status of the Neutral Expert will an unature whic			_			=
this year; India filed its paragraph 7 reply on 14 June this year; India filed its paragraph 7 results with meeting of the Neutral Expert, at which the parties will present oral submissions on at which the parties will present oral submissions on the paragraph 7 issue, is scheduled for 10 and 10 11 September this year. After that, the Neutral 11 Expert - then we have it on the screen - after that, 12 the Neutral Expert will issue his decision on the 13 paragraph 7 competence issues. 14 So as we stand here before you today, at the 15 beginning of July, the Neutral Expert has yet to address 16 his own competence. And this is a mutter which 17 necessarily also includes the organisation of his 18 proceedings in accordance with the general duty of 19 mutual respect and comity. 20 So that's one of the reasons why! use the 21 conditional language in reference to issues that 'may 22 properly fall' within the Neutral Expert's competence. 23 The second reason for using conditional language 24 when adhressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is 25 that Pakistan maintains the cavear that we expressed in 26 Page 49 10.51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert spotson of this surplined in the Neutral Expert is 27 the proceedings in the course of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 28 paragraph 26 of Pon No. 6. namely that, 29 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 30 Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 31 proceedings in the course of your hearing on competence of the Neutral Expert we presently competence, that 32 a paragraph 26 of Pon No. 6. namely that, 33 paragraph 26 of Pon No. 6. namely that, 44 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 54 Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 55 proceedings in a competence of the Neutral Expert when adhressing the competence of the neutral fall of the competence of a Neutral Expert with the course of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 35 paragraph 26 of Pon No. 6. namely that, 4 quite apart fr						
7 this year; and the third meeting of the Neutral Expert, at which the parties will present or al submissions on the paragraph? Issue, is scheduled for 10 and 11 September this year. After that, the Neutral 12 Expert — there we have it on the screen — after that, the Neutral 12 the Neutral Expert will issue his decision on the paragraph? To competence. And this is a matter which 15 beginning of July, the Neutral Expert has yet to address his fow own competence. And this is a matter which 16 so war competence. And this is a matter which 16 more consulting a some of the reasons why I use the 22 conditional language in reference to issues that "may 22 properly fall" within the Neutral Expert so ompetence. 23 The second reason for using conditional language 24 when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert so ompetence. 24 when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is paragraph 2 of Orpocadural Order No. 6 namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 25 Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position reparagraph 3 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front of you. It says: 11 Expert share of a Neutral Expert by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 13 feather of the Neutral Expert some the competence of a Neutral Expert some procedure of the Neutral Expert with the server of the Neutral Expert is decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 13 feather of the Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 17 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 10.51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert some position of the Neutral Expert was a since that the addressed in the competence of the Neutral Expert some position of the Neutral Expert was a nisse that we addressed in the competence hearing. 14 his the sage is all the bit of different from what you've just described. Because we accept that the Neutral Expert should arise out						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
8 at which the parties will present oral submissions on 9 the paragraph 7 issue, is scheduled for 10 and 10 11 September this year. After that, the Neutral 11 Expert – there we have it on the screen – after that, 12 the Neutral Expert will issue his decision on the 12 when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert will suse his decision on the 12 hard paragraph 7 competence issues. 13 paragraph 7 competence issues. 14 So as we stand here before you today, at the 15 beginning of July, the Neutral Expert has yet to address 16 his own competence. And this is a matter which 18 proceedings in accordance with the general duty of 19 mutual respect and countly. 20 So that's one of the reasons why I use the 21 conditional language in reference to issues than "may 22 properly fall" within the Neutral Expert's competence. 22 when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is 40 that paragraph 26 of PoOs, when you say. 19 the 19 mutual respect and countly. 19 mutual respect and countly. 20 So that's one of the reasons why I use the 21 conditional language in reference to issues than "may 22 properly fall" within the Neutral Expert's competence. 22 when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is 40 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 25 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 25 that paragraph 37 and if so, is it 20 that paragraph 37 and if so, is it 25 decides that a matter is outside of his competence, that 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F. pakistan neserves its position regarding the 25 paragraph 13 of Annexure F. pakistan neserves its position regarding the 25 paragraph 13 of Annexure F pakistan neserves its position regarding the 25 paragraph 13 of Annexure F pikistan neserves its position experting the 25 paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front you. It says: 10 that the current screen in						-
9 the paragraph 7 issue, is scheduled for 10 and 10 11 September this year. After that, the Neutral 12 Expert — there we have it on the screen — after that, 13 paragraph 7 competence issues. 14 So as we stand here before you today, at the 15 beginning of July, the Neutral Expert has ye to address 16 his own competence. And this is a manter which 17 necessarily also includes the organisation of his 18 proceedings in accordance with the general duty of 19 mutual respect and comity. 19 mutual respect and comity. 20 So that's one of the reasons why I use the 21 conditional language 22 properly fall" within the Neutral Expert's competence. 23 The second reason for using conditional language 24 when addressing an ecordance with the general duty of 25 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 26 paragraph 7 competence, and that is recorded as 3 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert brooded in cluding a claim to 10 front of you. It says: 10 Faragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 11 monto of you. It says: 11 main and the course of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 12 competence and competence of the Neutral Expert's competence of the Neutral Expert with the says is a server of the Neutral Expert with the course of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 2 properly fall "without prejudice to the competence of the Neutral Expert should arise to the competence of the Neutral Expert with the course of your view that if the cou						
10 11 September this year. After that, the Neutral 11 Expert — there we have it on the screen — after that, 12 the Neutral Expert will issue his decision on the 13 paragraph 7 competence issues. 14 So as we stand here before you today, at the 15 beginning of July, the Neutral Expert has yet to address 16 his own competence. And this is a matter which 17 necessarily also includes the organisation of his 18 proceedings in accordance with the general duty of 19 mutual respect and comity. 20 So that's one of the reasons wil 1 use the 21 conditional language in reference to issues that "may 22 properly fall" within the Neutral Expert's competence. 23 The second reason for using conditional language 24 when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert are 25 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 26 of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 27 paragraph 12 6 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 28 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 29 Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 29 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 20 Neutral Expert have recreased in front of you. It says: 21 10:51 1 "Expert proceedings in the course of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 3 paragraph 2 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 5 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of 8 Annexure F. Pakistan remains on the course of the Neutral Expert in the Neutral Expert has a total cave and that we addressed in the competence hearing. 11 "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral 12 Expert decision, that question shall, if t cannot be resolved to by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 14 competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if t cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 18 provisions of Articla						•
11 Expert — there we have it on the screen — after that, 12 the Neutral Expert will issue his decision on the 13 paragraph 7 competence issues. 14 So as we stand here before you today, at the 15 beginning of July, the Neutral Expert has yet to address 15 "Accordingly — although the Court expressly 16 his own competence. And this is a matter which 17 necessarily also includes the organisation of his 18 proceedings in accordance with the general duty of 19 mutual respect and comity. 19 properly fall "within the Neutral Expert so to suses that "may 22 properly fall" within the Neutral Expert so that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 19 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 25 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 26 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert so that Pakistan mountains the competence of the Neutral Expert so that paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front of you. It says: 10 manager 10 in paragraph 26 of Procedural paragraph 13 of financial compensation) which is not within the 14 competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his 15 decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved 19 in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6: — paragraph 13 and form 19 in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6: — paragraph 13 and form 19 in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6: — paragraph 13 and form 29 in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6: — paragraph 13 and form 29 in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6: — paragraph 13 of an ancessarily the case that that matter comes to this 20 in an ancessarily the case that that matter comes to this 20 in an ancessarily the case that that matter comes to this 20 in an ancessarily the case that that matter comes to this 20 in an ancessarily the case that that matter comes to this 20 in an ancessarily the case that that matter comes to this 20 in ancessarily the						
that we recall that the Court has itself expressly reserved its position on this issue in PO6, and that's a paragraph 28 of PO6, where you say: "Accordingly — although the Court expressly reserved its position on this issue in PO6, and that's at paragraph 28 of PO6, where you say: "Accordingly — although the Court expressly reserves any position on the status of the Neutral Expert proceeding in accordance with the general duty of mutual respect and comity." So that's one of the reasons why I use the conditional language in reference to issues that "may properly fall" within the Neutral Expert is conditional language in reference to issues that "may properly fall" within the Neutral Expert so that paragraph 12 that you drew our attention to. The second reason for using conditional language when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is that Pakistan maintains the cavear that we expressed in Page 49 10.51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course of your presentation, Thructious decides that a matter is atken a position with respect to that paragraph 13 that you drew our attention to. Is it your view that if the current Neutral Expert are provided as a paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the course of your presentation, Thructious that you we then enter paragraph 13? And if so, is it necessarily the case that that matter comes to this course of your presentation, Thructious that you we then enter paragraph 13? And if so, is it necessarily the case that that matter comes to this course of your presentation, Thructious that you we then enter paragraph 13? And if so, is it necessarily the case that that matter comes to this course of your presentation, Thructious that it is your view that if the current Neutral Expert when the course of your presentation, Thructious that it is your view that if the current Neutral Expert are provisions of At adulange to the compe						
13 paragraph 7 competence issues. 14 So as we stand here before you today, at the 15 beginning of July, the Neutral Expert has yet to address 15 is own competence. And this is a matter which 16 in sown competence. And this is a matter which 17 necessarily also includes the organisation of his 18 proceedings in accordance with the general duty of 19 mutual respect and cornity. 20 So that's one of the reasons why I use the 21 conditional language in reference to issues that "may 22 properly fall" within the Neutral Expert scompetence. 23 The second reason for using conditional language 24 when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is 25 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 25 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 26 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 27 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 28 paragraph 3 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 29 paragraph 3 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 29 paragraph 3 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 29 paragraph 3 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 29 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 21 The CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, since you have raised the 21 that pakistan has taken a position with respect to 4 that paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 29 paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 29 paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 29 paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 29 paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 29 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 21 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 22 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 23 paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 - paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral 29 paragraph 13 are from the provisions of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan renames acutely alert to the 20 paragraph 13 are sits in the event that the 20 paragraph 13 are sits in the event			_			
14 So as we stand here before you today, at the 15 beginning of July, the Neutral Expert to address his own competence. And this is a matter which 16 in so wn competence. And this is a matter which 17 necessarily also includes the organisation of his 18 proceedings in accordance with the general duty of 19 mutual respect and comity. 20 So that's one of the reasons why I use the 21 conditional language in reference to issues that "may properly fall" within the Neutral Expert's competence. 23 The second reason for using conditional language properly fall" within the Neutral Expert's competence. 24 When addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 25 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 26 a for your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as a paragraph 2 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 13 of Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of you. It says: 27 the second reason for surging the paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of you. It says: 28 that a matter is outside of his competence to paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of you. It says: 39 paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of you. It says: 40 the paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of you. It says: 41 the size of the Neutral Expert has—not quite in terms of compétence cearing. 42 that you've just described. Because we accept that the Neutral Expert has—not quite in terms of compétence to competence, and the visual Expert has—not quite in terms of compétence to competence cearing. 42 that pakistan maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of you. It says: 40 the contribution of a new court to address that matter? 51 the contribution of a new court to address that matter? 52 that paragraph 2 of th						
15 beginning of July, the Neutral Expert has yet to address 16 his own competence. And this is a matter which 17 necessarily also includes the organisation of his 18 proceedings in accordance with the general duty of 19 mutual respect and comity. 20 So that's one of the reasons why I use the 21 conditional language in reference to issues that "may 22 properly fall" within the Neutral Expert competence. 23 The second reason for using conditional language 24 when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is 25 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 26 Page 49 10:51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course 27 of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 28 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert proceedings in the course 9 Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front of you. It says: 11 "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral 12 Expert's decision, if any question (michuling) a claim to 13 financial compensation) which is not within the 14 competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his 15 decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved 16 by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 17 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 18 So we maintain our reservation of position set out 19 in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 – paragraph 13, addressing 19 questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral 20 Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for 21 the record that Pakistan remains acutely alter to the 22 Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for 23 the conditional language in the account of his decision within his or her competence. 24 that paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 25 that Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 26 conditional maguage in the course of your persentation. The court is su						_
16 his own competence. And this is a matter which 17 necessarily also includes the organisation of his 18 proceedings in accordance with the general duty of 19 mutual respect and comity. 20 So that's one of the reasons why I use the 21 conditional language in reference to issues that "may 22 properly fall" within the Neutral Expert's competence. 23 The second reason for using conditional language 24 when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is 25 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 26 Page 49 10:51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course 27 of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 28 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 29 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 29 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 29 Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 20 front of you. It says: 20 (10:54 1 your then enter paragraph 13? And if so, is it 21 necessarily the case that both the 22 (22 control Arbitration and the Neutral Expert are 23 that paragraph 13 that you drew our attention to. 24 Is it your view that if the current Neutral Expert whether a position with respect to the fare and the correct as a paragraph 13? And if so, is it 25 necessarily the case that that matter of the current Neutral Expert whether a necessarily the case that that matter is outside of his competence, that a necessarily the case that that matter or ment of the current Neutral Expert is outside of his competence, that a necessarily the case that that matter or ment of the current Neutral Expert is outside of his competence of your presentation. I'm curious whether a necessarily the case that that matter or one of the neutral Expert is outside of his competence of a necessarily the case that that matter or one of the necessarily the case that that matter or one of the necessarily the case that that matter or one of the necessarily the case that that matter or one of the necess						
17 necessarily also includes the organisation of his proceedings in accordance with the general duty of 19 mutual respect and comity. 20 So that's one of the reasons why I use the 21 conditional language in reference to issues that "may 22 properly fall" within the Neutral Expert so conditional language when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is 25 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 24 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6 namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedural Order No. 6 namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedural under paragraph 7 of 2 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert of the Neutral Expert procedural Order No. 6 namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedural Order No. 6 namely that, 5 annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert procedural Order No. 6 namely that, 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert procedural Order No. 6 namely that, 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert procedural Order No. 6 namely that, 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert procedural Order No. 6 namely that, 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert procedural Order No. 6 namely that, 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert procedural Order No. 6 namely that, 7 namely that, 8 namely 10						
18 proceedings in accordance with the general duty of mutual respect and comity. 20 So that's one of the reasons why I use the 21 conditional language in reference to issues that "may properly fall" within the Neutral Expert's competence. 23 The second reason for using conditional language when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in Page 49 10:51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as a paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6 namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of 8 Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 10 paragraph 13 of Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 2 paragraph 13 of Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 2 paragraph 13 of Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 2 paragraph 13 of Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 2 paragraph 13 of Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 2 paragraph 13 of Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 2 paragraph 13 of Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 2 paragraph 13 of Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 2 paragraph 13 of Annexure F. In the value of this was an issue that we addressed in the competence hearing. 10 Financial compensation) which is not within the 2 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 10 Financial compensation) which is not within the 2 competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved 15 paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13 addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral 2 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 10 Financial compensation) which is not within the 2 provisions o						* *
19 mutual respect and comity. 20 So that's one of the reasons why I use the 21 conditional language in reference to issues that "may 22 properly fall" within the Neutral Expert's competence. 23 The second reason for using conditional language 24 when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is 25 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 26 Page 49 10:51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course 27 of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 28 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of 8 Annexure F. 9 Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front of you. It says: 11 "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral 12 Expert decision, if any question (including a claim to 13 financial compensation) which is not within the 14 competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his 15 decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved 16 by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 17 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 18 So we maintain our reservation of position set out 19 in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 - paragraph 13, addressing 20 questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral 21 Expert that are not within his or her competence. 22 Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for 23 that paragraph 13 of annexure F, bettled that matter; 24 sissues in the course of your presentation, I'm curious 25 whether Pakistan has taken a position with respect to that paragraph 13 far hat you drew our attention to. 25 Is it your view that if the current Neutral Expert is 26 decides that a matter is outside of his competence, that the accreating that paragraph 13? And if so, is it 30 ceides that a matter is outside of his competence in the consentence, that that matter comes to this 31 Court, or whether one follows pr						
20 So that's one of the reasons why I use the 21 conditional language in reference to issues that "may 22 properly fall" within the Neutral Expert s competence. 23 The second reason for using conditional language 24 when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is 25 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 26 Page 49 10:51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course 27 of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 28 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of 8 Annexure F. Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 9 Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front of you. It says: 10 Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to 11 financial compensation) which is not within the 12 Expert's decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved 15 by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 16 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 18 So we maintain our reservation of position set out 19 in paragraph 2 of OPONo. 6 – paragraph 13, addressing 20 questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral 21 Expert that are not within the 22 Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for 23 THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, since you theher the design of that paragraph 13 that you drew our attention to. 18 it your view that if the current Neutral Expert should arise out of his 24 that pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in 25 decides that a matter is outside of his competence, and that is recorded as 26 paragraph 13 that you drew our attention to. 27 Is it your view that if the current Neutral Expert shouts of the neutral Expert and the vent at a matter is outside of his competence, that 26 cises that a matter is outside of his competence of the 27 count, or whether one follows procedures for the 28 constituti						_
21 conditional language in reference to issues that "may properly fall" within the Neutral Expert's competence. 23 The second reason for using conditional language 24 when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in Page 49 10:51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as paragraph 26 of Pro-Codural Order No. 6: namely that, quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of Annexure F. Paga 49 10:51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as paragraph 26 of Pro-Cedural Order No. 6: namely that, quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of Annexure F. Page 51 10:54 1 you then enter paragraph 13? And if so, is it necessarily the case that that matter comes to this Court, or whether one follows procedures for the constitution of a new court to address that matter? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, we have considered that ve constitution of a new court to address that memory may not be serving me, because there are commingings of all sorts of things in my mind on these committee of the competence hearing. It hink the issue is a little bit different from what you've just described. Because we accept that the Neutral Expert has not quite in terms of competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, it it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." So we maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 - paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neut						
22 properly fall" within the Neutral Expert's competence. 23 The second reason for using conditional language 24 when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is 25 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in Page 49 10:51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course 2 of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 3 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of 8 Annexure F. 9 Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front of you. It says: 11 "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral 12 Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to 13 financial compensation) which is not within the 14 competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his 15 decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved 16 by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 17 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 18 So we maintain our reservation of position set out 19 in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 - paragraph 13, addressing 20 questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral 21 Expert that are not within his or her competence. 22 Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for 23 that paragraph 13 flat you drew our attention to. 11 that paragraph 13 flat you drew our attention to. 12 that paragraph 13 flat you drew our attention to. 13 that your we that if the turent Neutral Expert decideds that a matter is outside of his cousided his routside of his coursel decideds that a matter is outside of his cousided that we caresarily the case that that matter comes to this 2 necessarily the case that that matter comes to this 2 necessarily the case that that matter comes to this 2 necessarily the case that that matter comes to this 2 occur, or whether one follows procedures for the 2 constitution of a new court to address that matter? 3 SIR			-			·
The second reason for using conditional language when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in Page 49 The second reason for using conditional language when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as a paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 61 cannelly that, quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of you. It says: The second reason for using conditional language when addressing that that was a decision, if any question (including a claim to financial compensation) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5). The second reason for using conditional language when addressing the cause that that matter is outside of his competence, that Decides that a matter is outside of his competence, that Decides that a matter is outside of his competence, that Decides that a matter is outside of his competence, that Decides that a matter is outside of his competence, that Decides that a matter is outside of his competence, that Decides that a matter is outside of his competence, that Decides that a matter is outside of his competence, that Decides that a matter is outside of his competence of the course and that is recorded as paragraph 13? And if so, is it is proceeding that the current Neutral Expert of decides that a matter is outside of his competence, bearily the case that that matter comes to this Court, or whether one follows procedures for the constitution of a new court to address that matter? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, we have considered that we carefully. And indeed, if memory serves						· =
when addressing the competence of the Neutral Expert is that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in Page 49 10:51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of you. It says: "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral Expert's decides that a matter is outside of his competence, that Page 51 10:51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course of you then enter paragraph 13? And if so, is it necessarily the case that that matter comes to this Court, or whether one follows procedures for the constitution of a new court to address that matter? 5 SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, we have considered that ve acarefully. And indeed, if memory serves me — but memory may not be serving me, because there are comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these competence of a Neutral Expert has even in financial compensation) which is not within the decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 10 So we maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 — paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. 10 Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the						
25 that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in Page 49 10:51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course 2 of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 3 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of 8 Annexure F. 9 Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front of you. It says: 11 "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral 12 Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to 13 financial compensation) which is not within the 14 competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his 15 decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved 16 by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 17 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 18 So we maintain our reservation of position set out 19 in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing 20 questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral 21 Expert that are not within his or her competence. 22 Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for 23 Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence 24 Neural Expert makes a decision within his competence. 25 Where our reservation of position with regard to 26 possibility of a challenge to the conselence, 27 Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for 28 the case that that matter is outside of his competence, and the course of you then enter paragraph 13? And if so, is it 2 necessarily the case that that matter comes to this 2 necessarily the case that that matter comes to this 2 necessarily the case that that matter comes to this 2 necessarily the case that that matter comes to this 2 necessarily the case that that matter comes to this 2 necessarily the case that that matter comes to this 2 necessarily the case that that matter of sourts or the 2 constitution of a new court to addressed in the constitution						
Page 49 Page 51 10:51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of Annexure F. Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of you. It says: "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to financial compensation) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." Page 51 10:54 1 you then enter paragraph 13? And if so, is it necessarily the case that that matter comes to this Court, or whether one follows procedures for the concettuition of a new court to address that matter? SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, we have considered that vere carefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but memory may not be serving me, because there are comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these issues but if memory serves me, I think this was an issue that we addressed in the competence hearing. 11 I think the issue is a little bit different from what you've just described. Because we accept that the 13 Neutral Expert has not quite in terms of compétence de la compétence, because that's not addressed in de la compétence, because that is not addressed in annexure F: in the way that it's addressed, for example, in Annexure F: whether the design of a particular plant has been properly raised before him. So we maintain our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acu						
10:51 1 respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course 2 of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 3 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of 8 Annexure F. 9 Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front of you. It says: 11 "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral 12 Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to 13 financial compensation) which is not within the 14 competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his 15 decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved 16 by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 17 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 18 So we maintain our reservation of position set out 19 in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 - paragraph 13, addressing 20 questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral 21 Expert that are not within his or her competence. 22 Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for 23 the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the		25	that Pakistan maintains the caveat that we expressed in	25	5	decides that a matter is outside of his competence, that
2 of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 3 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of 8 Annexure F. 9 Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front of you. It says: 11 "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral 12 Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to 13 financial compensation) which is not within the 13 decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved 15 by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 16 paragraph 26 of PO No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan remains acutely alert to the 6 constitution of a new court to address that matter? 7 SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, we have considered that ver coarefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but memory may not be serving me, because there are comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these carefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but memory may not be serving me, because there are comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in memory serves me, I think this was a little bit different from what you've just described. Because we accept that the Neutral Ex			Page 49			Page 51
2 of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 3 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of 8 Annexure F. 9 Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front of you. It says: 11 "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral 12 Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to 13 financial compensation) which is not within the 13 decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved 15 by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 16 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan remains acutely alert to the 6 constitution of a new court to address that matter? 7 SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, we have considered that ver coarefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but memory may not be serving me, because there are comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these carefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but memory may not be serving me, because there are comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in memory serves me, I think this was an issue that we addressed in the competence hearing. 11 I think the issue is a little bit different from what you've just described.						
2 of your hearing on competence, and that is recorded as 3 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of 8 Annexure F. 9 Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front of you. It says: 11 "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral 12 Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to 13 financial compensation) which is not within the 13 decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved 15 by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 16 paragraph 26 of PO No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan remains acutely alert to the 6 constitution of a new court to address that matter? 7 SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, we have considered that ver coarefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but memory may not be serving me, because there are comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these carefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but memory may not be serving me, because there are comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in memory serves me, I think this was a little bit different from what you've just described. Because we accept that the Neutral Ex	10:51	1	respect of the Neutral Expert proceedings in the course	10.54 1	1	you then enter paragraph 13? And if so is it
3 paragraph 26 of Procedural Order No. 6: namely that, 4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of 8 Annexure F. 9 Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front of you. It says: 11 "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral 12 Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to 13 financial compensation) which is not within the 14 constitution of a new court to address that matter? 15 SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, we have considered that very carefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but memory may not be serving me, because there are comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these acomming of all sorts of things in my mind on these acomminglings of all sorts of think this was an issue that we addressed in the competence hearing. 11 I think the issue is a little bit different from what you've just described. Because we accept that the Neutral Expert has not quite in terms of compétence de la compétence, because that's not addressed in Annexure F in the way that it's addressed in must be capable of determining whether a matter falls within Part 1 of Annexure F; whether the design of a particular plant has been properly raised before him. 15 So we maintain our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the 16 Carefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but memory may not be serving me, because there are comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these carefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but mem	10.01					
4 quite apart from the procedure under paragraph 7 of 5 Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the 6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of 8 Annexure F. 9 Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front of you. It says: 11 "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral 12 Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to 13 financial compensation) which is not within the 14 competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his 15 decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved 16 by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 17 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 18 So we maintain our reservation of position set out 19 in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing 20 questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral 21 Expert that are not within his or her competence. 22 Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for 23 the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the 4 constitution of a new court to address that matter? 5 SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, we have considered that ver carefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but memory may not be serving me, because there are 6 carefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but memory may not be serving me, because there are 6 carefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but memory may not be serving me, because there are 6 comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these 7 memory may not be serving me, because there are 8 comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these 10 an issue that we addressed in the competence hearing. 11 I think the issue is a little bit different from 12 what you've just described. Because we accept that the 13 Neutral Expert has not quite in terms of compétence 14 de la compétence, because that's not addressed in 15 Annexure F in the way that it's addressed, for example, 16 in Annexure G but we accept that the Neutral Expert 18 within Part 1 of Annexure F; whether t						•
Annexure F, Pakistan reserves its position regarding the possibility of a challenge to the competence of the Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of Annexure F. Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of you. It says: "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to financial compensation) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." So we maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for 23 the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the screen in formation of position within his competence of the carefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but memory may not be serving me, because there are comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings			* * *			_
6 possibility of a challenge to the competence of the 7 Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of 8 Annexure F. 9 Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in 10 front of you. It says: 11 "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral 12 Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to 13 financial compensation) which is not within the 14 competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his 15 decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved 16 by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 17 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 18 So we maintain our reservation of position set out 19 in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing 20 questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral 21 Expert that are not within his or her competence. 22 Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for 23 the financial compensation of position set out 24 the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the 25 the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the 26 carefully. And indeed, if memory serves me but 27 memory may not be serving me, because there are 28 comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts o				5	5	
Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of Annexure F. Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of you. It says: "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to financial compensation) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." So we maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the remory may not be serving me, because there are comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these sisues but if memory serves me, I think this was an issue that we addressed in the competence hearing. I think the issue is a little bit different from what you've just described. Because we accept that the he cause that we addressed in the competence hearing. Annexure F in the way that it's addressed in an issue that we addressed in the competence. He hard a particular Expert has not quite in terms of compétence an issue that we addressed in the competence bearing. Think the issue is a little bit different from Annexure F in the way that it's addressed in an issue that we addressed in the competence bearing. It hink the issue is a little bit different from Annexure F in the way that it's addressed in So we maint						
Annexure F. Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of you. It says: "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to financial compensation) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." So we maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the scomminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these issues but if memory serves me, I think this was an issue that we addressed in the competence hearing. Hithink the issue is a little bit different from what you've just described. Because we accept that the Neutral Expert has not quite in terms of compétence de la compétence, because that's not addressed in Annexure F in the way that it's addressed, for example, in Annexure G but we accept that the Neutral Expert within Part 1 of Annexure F; whether the design of a particular plant has been properly raised before him. So that's not the issue. Where our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence		7	Neutral Expert by reference to paragraph 13 of	7	7	memory may not be serving me, because there are
Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in front of you. It says: "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to financial compensation) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." So we maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the 10 issues but if memory serves me, I think this was an issue that we addressed in the competence hearing. 11 I think the issue is a little bit different from what you've just described. Because we accept that the Neutral Expert has not quite in terms of compétence de la compétence, because that's not addressed in Annexure F in the way that it's addressed, for example, in Annexure G but we accept that the Neutral Expert must be capable of determining whether a matter falls within Part 1 of Annexure F; whether the design of a particular plant has been properly raised before him. 20 So that's not the issue. Where our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence		8		8	3	comminglings of all sorts of things in my mind on these
11 "Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral 12 Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to 13 financial compensation) which is not within the 14 competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his 15 decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved 16 by agreement, be settled in accordance with the 17 provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." 18 So we maintain our reservation of position set out 19 in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing 20 questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral 21 Expert that are not within his or her competence. 22 Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for 23 the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the 11 I think the issue is a little bit different from 12 what you've just described. Because we accept that the 13 Neutral Expert has not quite in terms of compétence 14 de la compétence, because that's not addressed in 15 Annexure F in the way that it's addressed, for example, 16 in Annexure G but we accept that the Neutral Expert 17 must be capable of determining whether a matter falls 18 within Part 1 of Annexure F; whether the design of 19 a particular plant has been properly raised before him. 20 So that's not the issue. 21 Where our reservation of position with regard to 22 paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the 23 Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence			Paragraph 13 of Annexure F is there on the screen in	9)	
Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to financial compensation) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." So we maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the 12 what you've just described. Because we accept that the Neutral Shear and position and the paragraph as not quite in terms of compétence de la compétence, because that's not addressed in Annexure F in the way that it's addressed, for example, in Annexure G but we accept that the Neutral Expert must be capable of determining whether a matter falls within Part 1 of Annexure F; whether the design of a particular plant has been properly raised before him. 20 So that's not the issue. Where our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence		10	front of you. It says:	10	0	an issue that we addressed in the competence hearing.
financial compensation) which is not within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." So we maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the 13 Neutral Expert has not quite in terms of compétence de la compétence, because that's not addressed in Annexure F in the way that it's addressed, for example, in Annexure G but we accept that the Neutral Expert must be capable of determining whether a matter falls within Part 1 of Annexure F; whether the design of a particular plant has been properly raised before him. So that's not the issue. Where our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence		11	"Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral	11	1	I think the issue is a little bit different from
competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." So we maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the de la compétence, because that's not addressed in Annexure F in the way that it's addressed, for example, in Annexure G but we accept that the Neutral Expert must be capable of determining whether a matter falls within Part 1 of Annexure F; whether the design of a particular plant has been properly raised before him. So that's not the issue. Where our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence		12	Expert's decision, if any question (including a claim to	12	2	what you've just described. Because we accept that the
decision, that question shall, if it cannot be resolved by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." So we maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the 15 Annexure F in the way that it's addressed, for example, in Annexure G but we accept that the Neutral Expert must be capable of determining whether a matter falls within Part 1 of Annexure F; whether the design of a particular plant has been properly raised before him. So that's not the issue. 21 Where our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence		13		13	3	
by agreement, be settled in accordance with the provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." So we maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the in Annexure G but we accept that the Neutral Expert must be capable of determining whether a matter falls within Part 1 of Annexure F; whether the design of a particular plant has been properly raised before him. So that's not the issue. Where our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the Neutral Expert Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence		14	competence of a Neutral Expert should arise out of his			-
provisions of Article IX(3), (4) and (5)." So we maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the nust be capable of determining whether a matter falls within Part 1 of Annexure F; whether the design of a particular plant has been properly raised before him. So that's not the issue. Where our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the		15	<u>*</u>	15	5	
So we maintain our reservation of position set out in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the within Part 1 of Annexure F; whether the design of a particular plant has been properly raised before him. So that's not the issue. Where our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the		16				
in paragraph 26 of PO No. 6 paragraph 13, addressing questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the 19 a particular plant has been properly raised before him. 20 So that's not the issue. 21 Where our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the			_			•
questions which arise from a decision of the Neutral Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the So that's not the issue. Where our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence			•			
Expert that are not within his or her competence. Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the Where our reservation of position with regard to paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence						
Now, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I note for the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the paragraph 13 arises is that in the event that the Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence			÷			
the record that Pakistan remains acutely alert to the Neutral Expert makes a decision within his competence						
·						
24 proper boundaries of the Neutral Evpert's competence I 24 formally within his competence "I Neutral Evpert or			The state of the s			
		24	proper boundaries of the Neutral Expert's competence,	24		formally within his competence "I, Neutral Expert, am
and we reserve the right to bring any such matter to the 25 entitled to say that this is within my remit" but it		25	and we reserve the right to bring any such matter to the	25)	entitled to say that this is within my remit" but it
Page 50 Page 52			Page 50			Page 52

16 (Pages 49 to 52)

10:55	1	is our appreciation that in fact that that decision	10:58 1	come to this Court, or do you begin a new process
	2	raises questions which take him outside of his	2	through Article
	3	competence for example, let's take a hypothetical	3	SIR DANIEL: Our position would be: no, that does not, as it
	4	I don't assume this to be the case, but just to	4	were, start a fresh process. It may be that under the
	5	illustrate the point, let's say that a neutral expert	5	terms of Article IX of the Treaty, if we just had
	6	were to say in a paragraph 7 decision that, "I, Neutral	6	a Neutral Expert process and not a parallel Court
	7	Expert X, have concluded that I am entitled to make	7	process, then we would have to go back, because
	8	determinations of systemic interpretation of the Treaty	8	essentially that's what Article IX and paragraph 7 say.
	9	that apply beyond the particular plant of which I am	9	But the fact that you, this Court, are already
	10	seised, to all run-of-river plants". We would say that	10	seised of those disputes would simply mean that your
	11	that goes beyond his or her competence. And we would	11	proceedings which at the moment are structured around
	12	also say that the consequence of the decision, which is	12	a first phase on the merits, the systemic questions of
	13	procedurally formally appropriate that he or she is	13	interpretation, Mr Chairman, that you've addressed
	14	entitled to make that determination of competence	14	would then simply, we say, move to a second phase on the
	15	then takes him into the paragraph 13 space, because	15	merits, which would then address the particular
	16	it says:	16	dam-related disputes, so whatever the Neutral Expert has
	17	"Without prejudice to the finality of the Neutral	17	decided is not within his remit, because it is within
	18	Expert's decision, if any question which is not	18	your remit.
	19	within the competence of a Neutral Expert should arise	19	The only reason why the Kishenganga and the Ratle
	20	out of his decision"	20	issues are not being addressed in the context of, for
	21	Then that takes you into the other Article IX	21	example, these proceedings is because of the general
	22	processes.	22	duty that you have identified in relation to the way in
	23	So [if] the Neutral Expert makes a decision which he	23	which you are organising your proceedings and the way in
	24	or she is procedurally entitled to make, [and] the	24	which the Neutral Expert must organise his proceedings.
	25	substantive content of that decision takes him or her	25	MR MINEAR: Thank you.
		Page 53		Page 55
		1 480 33		1 ugc 33
10:57	1	outside of their competence, we say that gives rise to	11:00 1	THE CHAIRMAN: We probably don't need to go too deeply into
	2	the possibility of a paragraph 13 proceedings.	2	this issue
	3	Then to your question about whether we then get	3	SIR DANIEL: Yes.
	4	drawn into the vortex of having to go back to the	4	THE CHAIRMAN: given where we are in this particular part
	5	Permanent Indus Commission, go through the process of	5	of the proceeding. But I suppose I was wondering
	6	raising this as a dispute and all the proceedings under	6	whether one even necessarily gets to paragraph 13 in
	7	Article IX, paragraphs (3), (4) and (5), we say that	7	these possible scenarios. We currently have a situation
	8	that's not required, for the very straightforward reason	8	where, from the Court's perspective, you've got issues
	9	that you, the Court, have determined that you are	9	that are equally before the Neutral Expert and the Court
	10	competent in respect of the whole of the dispute; and	10	of Arbitration. And to the extent that issues are
	11	you have also decided, in PO6, that there is a duty of	11	determined to be outside the scope of the Neutral
	12	comity that applies in respect of both your proceedings	12	Expert's competence, then the issue is before the Court
	13	and the Neutral Expert proceedings. And therefore we	13	and doesn't necessarily require invoking paragraph 13.
	14	say that we can actually bring that matter directly to	14	Or to put it another way, if I understand correctly,
	15	you, because you are already seised of that wider	15	Pakistan has consented to the procedure before the
	16	dispute.	16	Neutral Expert based on the Neutral Expert having
	17	Now, I'm not expecting that this issue will arise;	17	a certain competence; and once it is determined, in some
	1 /			
	18	I hope that it does not arise. If it does arise, no	18	fashion, that it's outside that competence, then the
	18 19	doubt you will wish to schedule a hearing which will	19	fashion, that it's outside that competence, then the matter is already before the Court of Arbitration, such
	18 19 20	doubt you will wish to schedule a hearing which will address exactly the procedures and the competence and	19 20	fashion, that it's outside that competence, then the matter is already before the Court of Arbitration, such that one doesn't necessarily get to paragraph 13.
	18 19 20 21	doubt you will wish to schedule a hearing which will address exactly the procedures and the competence and the jurisdiction of those issues. But that would be, in	19 20 21	fashion, that it's outside that competence, then the matter is already before the Court of Arbitration, such that one doesn't necessarily get to paragraph 13. But that's just speculation on my part. I'm not
	18 19 20 21 22	doubt you will wish to schedule a hearing which will address exactly the procedures and the competence and the jurisdiction of those issues. But that would be, in a nutshell, our thinking on that point.	19 20 21 22	fashion, that it's outside that competence, then the matter is already before the Court of Arbitration, such that one doesn't necessarily get to paragraph 13. But that's just speculation on my part. I'm not particularly well informed by any submissions made on
	18 19 20 21 22 23	doubt you will wish to schedule a hearing which will address exactly the procedures and the competence and the jurisdiction of those issues. But that would be, in a nutshell, our thinking on that point. MR MINEAR: Sir Daniel, does the same process apply if the	19 20 21 22 23	fashion, that it's outside that competence, then the matter is already before the Court of Arbitration, such that one doesn't necessarily get to paragraph 13. But that's just speculation on my part. I'm not particularly well informed by any submissions made on the issue. So perhaps if you want to respond to that,
	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	doubt you will wish to schedule a hearing which will address exactly the procedures and the competence and the jurisdiction of those issues. But that would be, in a nutshell, our thinking on that point. MR MINEAR: Sir Daniel, does the same process apply if the Neutral Expert concludes that something is outside his	19 20 21 22 23 24	fashion, that it's outside that competence, then the matter is already before the Court of Arbitration, such that one doesn't necessarily get to paragraph 13. But that's just speculation on my part. I'm not particularly well informed by any submissions made on the issue. So perhaps if you want to respond to that, you can, but perhaps we just continue to mull over the
	18 19 20 21 22 23	doubt you will wish to schedule a hearing which will address exactly the procedures and the competence and the jurisdiction of those issues. But that would be, in a nutshell, our thinking on that point. MR MINEAR: Sir Daniel, does the same process apply if the	19 20 21 22 23	fashion, that it's outside that competence, then the matter is already before the Court of Arbitration, such that one doesn't necessarily get to paragraph 13. But that's just speculation on my part. I'm not particularly well informed by any submissions made on the issue. So perhaps if you want to respond to that,
	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	doubt you will wish to schedule a hearing which will address exactly the procedures and the competence and the jurisdiction of those issues. But that would be, in a nutshell, our thinking on that point. MR MINEAR: Sir Daniel, does the same process apply if the Neutral Expert concludes that something is outside his	19 20 21 22 23 24	fashion, that it's outside that competence, then the matter is already before the Court of Arbitration, such that one doesn't necessarily get to paragraph 13. But that's just speculation on my part. I'm not particularly well informed by any submissions made on the issue. So perhaps if you want to respond to that, you can, but perhaps we just continue to mull over the
	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	doubt you will wish to schedule a hearing which will address exactly the procedures and the competence and the jurisdiction of those issues. But that would be, in a nutshell, our thinking on that point. MR MINEAR: Sir Daniel, does the same process apply if the Neutral Expert concludes that something is outside his competence under paragraph 7? Does that matter then	19 20 21 22 23 24	fashion, that it's outside that competence, then the matter is already before the Court of Arbitration, such that one doesn't necessarily get to paragraph 13. But that's just speculation on my part. I'm not particularly well informed by any submissions made on the issue. So perhaps if you want to respond to that, you can, but perhaps we just continue to mull over the matter for decision in due course.

17 (Pages 53 to 56)

11:02 1 SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, let me respond to it briefly, 2 because again, my recollection is re- but it may be 3 faulty or off-mark — precollection is that we have 4 skired around this issue in the competence hearing, 5 As I say, I hope we don't get not, I hope that 6 we don't have to get to it; and it may very well be 7 that, as, you say quite correctly, we rever get to 8 paragraph I. It may be that we never get to 9 paragraph I. It may be that we never get to 10 paragraph I. It may be that we never get to 11 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 12 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 13 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 14 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 15 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 16 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 17 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 18 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 18 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 19 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 20 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 21 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 22 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 23 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 24 purpagraph I. It may be that we never get to 25 more in the rectann why the decision of the Notarial Expert we found in the purpagraph I. It should be decision 26 its reads, upon the parties and upon any Court of 27 A phariation 28 purpagraph I. It should be decision 29 purpagraph I. It should be decision 20 purpagraph I. It should be decision 20 purpagraph I. It should be decision 21 purpagraph I. It should be decision 22 purpagraph I. It should be decision 23 purpagraph I. It should be decision 24 purpagraph I. It should be decision 25 purpagraph I. It should be decision 26 purpagraph I. It should be decision 27 purpagraph I. It should be decision 28 purpagraph I. It should be decision 29 purpagraph I. It should be decision 29 purpagraph I. It should be decision 29 purpagraph I. It should be purpagraph I. It should be decision 29 purp				
2 because again, my recollection is – but it may be 3 faulty or off-mats – my recollection is — but it may be 4 skirted around this issue in the competence hearing. 5 As I say, I hope we don't get to it, I hope that 6 we don't have no get to it, and it may ve well he 7 that, as you say quite correctly, we never get to 8 pangapph 13 in shee proceedings, but it may be that we never get to 9 pangapph 13 in these proceedings, but it may be that we were get to 10 get to pangapph 13 in other proceedings. 11 But the reason why pangapph 13 is important is 12 because of now other provisions in the Treaty, with at 13 least one of which you will be very familiar. The first 14 one is Article IX, pangapph 6. 15 The provisions of Pangapphs (3), (4) and (5) shall 16 not apply to any difference while it is being dealt with 17 by a Neutral Expert. 18 And then pangapph 11 of Annexure F, if I can call 19 it up, says: 20 The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters 21 within his competence shall be final and binding, in 22 respect of the particular matter on which the decision is 23 is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of 24 Arbitration 25 The reason why we are focused very much on 26 Pape 57 11.03 1 pangapph 13 is because pangaph 13. if you like, 2 operates beyond pangapph 11. So if some byopheteical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I. Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 6 pangaph 13. Pangapph 13 is because pangaph 13 is it because of provisions that the six host population is pangaph 13 is because pangaph 13 is it because of the shoot disquest, "In Neutral Expert were to simply decide," "I. Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 6 pangaph 13. Pangapph 13 is because pangaph 13 is it only the provisions of the Neutral Expert is and of a farmed pangaph 13 is because of pangaph 13 is the substance of the pangapph 13 is because pangaph 13 is it possible. 9 pr				
4 skirted around this issue in the competence hearing. 5 As I say, I hope we don't get to it, I hope that 6 we don't have to get to it, and it may very well be 7 that, as you say quide correctly, we never get to 8 paragraph 13. It may be that we never get to 9 paragraph 13. It may be that we never get to 10 paragraph 13. It may be that we never get to 11 But the reason why paragraph 13 is important is 12 because of two other provisions in the Treaty, with at 13 leact one of which you will be very familiar. The first 14 one is Article IX, paragraph 33. (4) and (5) shall 15 not apply to any difference while it is being dealt with 17 by a Neurral Expert on all matters 20 "The decision of the Neurral Expert on all matters 21 within his competence shall be final and binding, in 22 respect of the particular matter on which the decision 23 is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of 24 Arbitration" 25 The reason why we are focused very much on 26 paragraph 13 of hone were denyth to decision 27 paragraph 13 of hone were denyth to decision 28 paragraph 11 of Anneaure F, ther would be almost 3 paragraph 13 fis because paragraph 13 if you like. 4 paragraph 14 of hone man F, there would be almost 5 paragraph 15 procedure. The control of the Neutral Expert on all matters 8 paragraph 14 of Anneaure F, there would be almost 9 paragraph 15 of hone were denyth to decision 10 paragraph 14 paragraph 15 is the pockade, "I. Neutral 11 paragraph 14 paragraph 15 is the procedure. It was necessary to be a second paragraph 15 of hone with the decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters 14 paragraph 15 paragraph 15 of hone with the decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters 15 paragraph 15 of hone with the decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters 16 paragraph 16 pa		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
skirded around this issue in the competence hearing. A Lay, I hope we don't have to get to it; and it may very well be that, as you say quite correctly, we never get to paragraph 13 in these proceedings, but it may be that we were paragraph 13 in the order proceedings. But the reason why paragraph 13 is important is because of two other provisions in the Treaty, with at least one of which you will be very familiar. The first one is Article IX, paragraph 6. The provisions of Paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) shall not apply to any difference while it is being dealt with psi value and the paragraph 11 of Annexure F, if I can call it yo, asys: The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of Arbitration Page 57 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 77 I paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if yon like, paragraph 14 of Annexure F, the can call it is paragraph 15 or an annexure of a Court of Arbitration And then paragraph 15 or of hose byophetical a Neutral Expert cere or all matters within his competence of a Court of Arbitration The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 77 I paragraph 13 is because paragraph 15, if yon like, paragraph 16 or Annexure F, the can call it is the competence of a Court of Arbitration And we say that cannot be is because of paragraph 14 of Annexure F, there would be almost a persumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert a Neutral Expert were to a matter a Neutral Expert were to a matter a Neutral Expert were to make the wall appraise that we are reasonabled. So it is an intrinsic were on the ferman and the reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 77 Page 78 Page 79 I prograph 13 in the section of the Neutral Expert were to a form the competence of a Court of Arbitration I pre		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
section thave to get to it, I hope that we don't shave to get to it, and it may very well be that, as you say quite correctly, we never get to gargarph 13. It may be that we never get to gargarph 13. It may be that we never get to gargarph 13. It may be that we never get to gargarph 13. It may be that we never get to gargarph 13 is other proceedings. 11 But the reason why puragraph 13 is important is because of two other provisions in the Tealy, with at least one of which you will be every familiar. The first one is Article IX, puragraph 6. 15 "The provisions of Puragraphs (3), (4) and (5) shall 16 not apply to any difference while is is being dealt with by a Neutral Expert on all matters within 14 you say. 20 "The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters within 15 completence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter or which the decision is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of Arbitration" 11.03 1 puragraph 13 is because paragraph 13 if you like, operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical and paragraph 11 of Annexure F, if I can call 19 if the paragraph 11 of Annexure F, if I can call 19 if the parties and upon any Court of Arbitration" 21 The checksion of the Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter or which the decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters within 18 competence of a count of Arbitration and you were simply to look at a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert and we go operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical and paragr		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
that, as you say quite correctly, we never get to paragraph 1.3 in these proceedings, but it may be that we got to paragraph 1.3 in these proceedings, but it may be that we got to paragraph 1.3 in these proceedings, but it may be that we got to paragraph 1.3 in these proceedings, but it may be that we got to paragraph 1.3 in these proceedings, but it may be that we got to paragraph 1.3 in the proceedings. But the reason why paragraph 1.3 is important is because of two other provisions in the Treaty, with a 12 a cancentent point for you to take the better print to a cancentent point for you to take the best print of wake—or maybe not. Maybe, Mr Chairman, I'll come back. I've got more than just a minute or two on this ison, but I can deal with that after the break. The provisions of Paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) shall not apply to any difference while it is being dealt with 17 by a Neutrural Expert. And then paragraph 1.4 or Annexure F. if I can call it yes asys: "The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and hinding, in respect of the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of Arbitration is— Page 57 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 59 The provisions of the Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence of a Court of Arbitration is competence of a Paragraph 1.1 of Annexure F, there would be almost a paragraph 1.3 in the source simply to look at a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert, and we got so taken up with the exchanges about paragraphs 1.4 and we say that hecause the Court is competence of another procedure. We have may have a competence to most in competence of another procedure is a matter who we may have a concern that the competence of another procedure is another proceedings. The reason of the Neutral Expert of the Neutral Expert is a matter who we may have a competence to most in the course of the whole disput, it would		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
7 that, as you say quite correctly, we never get to 8 paragraph 13. It may be that we never get to 9 paragraph 13 in these proceedings, but it may be that we 10 get to paragraph 13 in other proceedings. 11 But the reason why paragraph 13 is in important is 12 because of two other provisions in the Treaty, with at 13 least one of which you will be very familiar. The first 14 one is Article IX, paragraph 6: 15 "The provisions of Paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) shall 16 not apply to any difference while it is being dealt with 17 by a Neutral Expert." 18 And then paragraph 11 of Amexure F, if I can call 19 it up, says: 20 "The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters 21 within his competence shall be final and hinding, in 22 respect of the particular matter on which the decision 23 is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of 24 Arbitration" 25 The reason why we are focused very much on 26 Page 57 11:03 1 paragraph 13 is because puragraph 13, if you like, 2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neural Expert were to simply decide, "Neural 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration," and you week singly to look at 6 paragraph 11 of Amexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert and the decision of the Neural Expert were to the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 of more graph 12. Branch of the Neural Expert proceedings. 18 Autral Expert camot that decisions when hypothetical 19 when addressing the issue of the Neutral Expert, and we 20 got so take the break, II come 21 the CHARIMAN: I was a long point in the break of the one will also a long transparent and an an analysis of the reasons why I had been using conditional language 22 from the State of the very such of the reasons why I had been using conditional language 23 in the reason why that cannot be is because of 24 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backston of the Neutral Expert were to the land the the		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
8 paragraph 13. It may be that we never get to 9 paragraph 13 in these proceedings, but it may be that we 10 get to paragraph 13 in other proceedings, but it may be that we 11 But the reason why paragraph 13 is important is 12 because of two other provisions in the Treaty, with at 13 least one of which you will be very familiar. The first 14 one is Article IX, paragraph (3), (4) and (5) shall 16 not apply to any difference while it is being dealt with 17 by a Neutral Expert." 18 And then paragraph 11 of Amexure F, if I can call 19 it up, says: 20 "The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters 21 within his competence shall be final and binding, in 22 respect of the particular matter on which the decision 23 is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of 24 Arbitration" 25 The reason why we are focused very much on 26 Page 57 11.03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert wave to simply decide, "I, Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I where the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 6 paragraph 13 in these proceedings, the intervention of paragraph 13. Faragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert wave to simply decide, "I, Neutral 12 in the arganaph and in make — or maybe not. Maybe, the Chairman, If his is 12 acconvenient point fory so to take the form to won this 14 issue, but I can deal with that after the break. 15 THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. Let's take our break and resume 16 at 11.35. 17 ISR DANIEL: Thank you. 18 (11.05 am) 19 (A short break) 21 THE CHAIRMAN: Were well. Let's take our break and resume 18 to 11.05 am) 19 (A short break) 21 THE CHAIRMAN: Were well. Are the the expending in the reasons why I had been using conditional language 22 got so taken up with the exchanges about paragraphs 11 and 13 that I forgot to make — or maybe not. Maybe, and the reasons why I had been using conditional language 22 got so taken up with the exchanges about paragraphs 1 in do in the paragraph is and the decision of the Poutral				
9 paragraph 13 in these proceedings, but it may be that we go get to paragraph 13 in other proceedings. But it may be that we go get to paragraph 13 in other proceedings. But the reason why paragraph 13 is important is because of two other provisions in the Treaty, with at least one of which you will be very familiar. The first one is Article IX, paragraph 6. 15 "The provisions of Paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) shall not apply to any difference while it is being dealt with by a Neutral Expert." 18 And then paragraph 11 of Annexure F, if I can call it up, says: 20 "The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of Arbitration" 21 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 11:03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 11, So if some hypothetical should be paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical and Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of Arbitration, and you were simply to look at paragraph 13 is the bockstop that says: 11:03 1 paragraph 13 is the bockstop that says: 11:03 1 paragraph 13 is the bockstop that says: 11:03 1 paragraph 13 is the bockstop that says: 11:04 1 Arbitration, and you were simply to look at paragraph 13 is the bockstop that says: 11:05 1 paragraph 13 is the bockstop that says: 11:05 1 paragraph 13 is the bockstop that says: 11:06 2 paragraph 13 is the bockstop that says: 11:07 2 paragraph 13 is the bockstop that says: 11:08 3 paragraph 13 is the bockstop that says: 11:09 1 paragraph 13 is the bockstop that says: 12:00 2 paragraph 13 paragraph 13 is the bockstop that says: 13:00 2 paragraph 13 parag				
10 get to paragraph 13 in other proceedings. 10		* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		
11 But the reason why paragraph 13 is important is 12 because of two other provisions in the Treaty, with at 13 least one of which you will be very familiar. The first 14 one is Article IX, paragraph 6: 15 "The provisions of Paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) shall 16 not apply to any difference while it is being dealt with 17 by a Neutral Expert. 18 And then paragraph 11 of Annexure F, if I can call 19 it up, says: 20 "The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters 21 within his competence shall be final and binding, in 22 respect of the particular matter on which the decision 23 is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of 24 Arbitration" 25 The reason why we are focused very much on 26 Page 57 11:03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if you like, 2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert cot samply decide. The Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration*, and you were simply to look at 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration*, and you were simply to look at 5 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is because pragraphs 14 is housed by the cannot be is because of 6 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is because that the is a matter 19 hat gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is because of 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is because of 11 a Noural Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond hat paragraph 14 is a francise IX procedures. 11 a Noural Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond hat paragraph 15 is because that then is a matter 11 a house 14 is a specified by the cannot be is because of 12 paragraph 14 is competence, because that then is a matter 13 don't get there. But we think that are of the Neutral Expert is only decide. The parties are directed to maintains "Sirict confidentiality" of those proceedings, see in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert is ordered otherwise. 24 THE CHARMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now.				_
12 because of two other provisions in the Treaty, with at least one of which you will be very familiar. The first tone is Article RV, paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) shall 16 not apply to any difference while it is being dealt with 17 by a Neutral Expert." 18			10	
13 least one of which you will be very familiar. The first one is Article IX, paragraph 6: 14 one is Article IX, paragraph 6: 15 "The provisions of Paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) shall not apply to any difference while it is being dealt with 17 by a Neutral Expert." 18 And then paragraph 11 of Annexure F, if I can call it up, says: 20 "The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in 22 respect of the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of 24 Arbitration" 21 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 11:03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if you like, 2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical Associated that the second period of 2 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost a paragraph 13 is because the Court is competence of a Court of 2 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost a paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the beckstop that says: a binding on the Court of Arbitration is self. 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the beckstop that says: a fast that decision of the Neutral Expert was the that decision of the Neutral Expert was the fore the lunch break I will do you with it now, but just before the lunch break I will do you will it now, but just before the lunch break I will do you will it now, but just before the lunch break I will do you will it now, but just before the lunch break I will do you will it now, but just before the lunch break I will do you will it now, but just before the lunch break I will do you will it now, but just before the lunch break I will do you then the competence of a soo fire whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So Si ra intricate and the competence of another procedure is unwarranted. 17 Har CHAIRMAN: Very well. Let's take our break and resume 11. 35. If IL 13.5 if you like, the competence within his competence within his competence within his competence. 18 bank IV- Qual I was a defressing the reasons whell and the decisi				
11-03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if you like, coperates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neutral 4 Expert, decide that lawe the competence of a Court of 4 Arbitration". If you were simply to look at 6 paragraph 13 is health and ecision of the Neutral Expert and we go perates beyond paragraph 13 is health and ecision of the Neutral Expert and we go were simply of look at 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 6 paragraph 12 in Annexure F, there would be almost 6 paragraph 13 is because that the is a matter 1 was the competence, because that the is a matter 1 and the sort get of the reason why that camon to be because of 1 paragraph 13 is performent of the court of 2 paragraph 13 is performent of the court of 2 provisions, we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 110-03 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is a matter of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is a matter of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is a matter of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is a matter of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is a matter of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is a matter of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is a matter of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is a matter of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is a matter of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is a matter of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is a matter of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is a matter of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is an interest of 1 paragraph 13 is because the fourth of the decision which go beyond 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is an interest of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is an interest of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is an interest of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is an interest of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is an interest of 1 paragraph 13 is because that the is an interest of 1 paragraph 13 is b		*		
11:03 1 pargraph 13 is because paragraph 13. if you like, 2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neurral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neurral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 4 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 5 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence. Peases that the ris a matter 1 which we nave a concern that the competence of a count of 2 paragraph 13. if you like, 3 paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competene in 2 paragraph 13. if which we may have a concern that the competence of a count of 3 paragraph 13. if you disk, the competence backstop that says: 14 And we say that because the Court is competene in 2 paragraph 13. in the target competence of a count of 4 british in the courts of count of 2 a mother procedure is unwarranted. 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you, 2 another procedure is unwarranted. 2 a larger ferred you to them: they are at Eshibit P-549, at core bundle fall — the parties are directed to maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings, and one or two small other prints. And we say that because the Court is competene in 2 paragraph 14.3 of the Neutral Expert; Supplementary 2 within the courts of the Neutral Expert is point which we may have a concern that the competence of a another procedure is unwarranted. 2 profit which we may have a concern that the competence of a another procedure is unwarranted. 2 and 11 that Chall the parties are directed to maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings. 3 the Chall that paragraph 11 does say 2 "on all matters within his competence". 3 Sir DANIEL: Thank you. 11 the CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that we are reassembled. 2 the CHAIRMAN: Very go	13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
16 not apply to any difference while it is being dealt with 17 by a Neutral Expert." And then paragraph 11 of Annexure F, if I can call 19 it up, says: 20 "The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters 21 within his competence shall be final and binding, in 22 respect of the particular matter on which the decision 23 is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of 24 Arbitration" 25 The reason why we are focused very much on 26 Page 57 11:03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if you like, 2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neutral 4 Expert, decide that have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration", and you were simply to took at 6 paragraph 13 for Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert 8 is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. 9 Now the reason why that cannot be is because of 10 paragraph 13 Expert cannot take decision that the decision of the Neutral Expert 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decision that the decision of the Neutral Expert 12 lis or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brough tack into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 19 which we may have a concern that the course of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Thank you. 24 ITHE CHAIRMAN: Wery good. I think that was are reassembled. 25 SIR DANIEL: Thath you wery much, Mr Chairman. 24 Mr Chairman, just before the break, I was addressing the issue of the Neutral Expert, and we got so taken up with the exchanges about paragraphs 11 and 13 that I forgot to make the small application and clarification regarding documents that I was intending to do just before the torollee break. I won't burden you with in the course of with it now, but just before the lunch break I will do so that you have an opportunity to give us guidance with in t	14		14	
17 by a Neutral Expert." 18 And then paragraph I1 of Annexure F, if I can call 19 it up, says: 20 "The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter on which the decision 22 is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of 24 Arbitration" 21 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that we are reassembled. 22 So. Sir Daniel, whenever you're ready, please proceed. 23 SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. 24 Mr Chairman, just before the break, I was addressing the reasons why I had been using conditional language Page 59 11:03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if you like, 2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 4 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 5 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 6 paragraph 11 Annexure F, there would be almost 6 a pragraph 13 of Arbitration", and you were simply to clock at 1 have the competence of a loop paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 15 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 16 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if you like, the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Thank you cyr much, Mr Chairman, 22 Mr Chairman, just before the Prack I was addressing the issue of the Neutral Expert, and we got so taken up with the exchanges about paragraphs 11 and 13 that I forgot to make the small application and 4 clarification regarding documents that I was intending 5 to do just before the coffee beack. I	15		15	THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. Let's take our break and resume
And then paragraph 11 of Annexure F, if I can call i tit, p. says: The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of Arbitration" The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 Page 59 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 59 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 59 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 59 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 59 The CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that we are reassembled. So, Sir Daniel, whenevery ou're ready, please proceed. So, Sir Daniel, whenever you're ready, Horse Archimate, Nor Daniel, Whenever you're ready, Horse Archimate, Nor Daniel, Whenever you're ready, Horse Archimate, Nor Daniel, Whenever you're ready, Horse Archimate, So, Sir Daniel, Whenever you're ready. Horse Archimate, So, Sir Daniel, Whenever you're ready, Horse Archimate, So, Sir Daniel, Whenever you're ready. Brown than the competence of a Court of Arbitration. The reason why has deverted to the Archimate, So, Sir Daniel, Whenever you're ready. Horse Archimate, So, Sir Daniel, Whenever, You're ready. Horse Archimate, So, Sir Daniel, Whenever, You're ready. Horse Archimate, So, Sir Daniel, Whenever, You're rea	16	not apply to any difference while it is being dealt with	16	at 11.35.
19 it up, says: 20 "The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter on which the decision 23 is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of 24 Arbitration" 21 Arbitration	17	by a Neutral Expert."	17	SIR DANIEL: Thank you.
20 "The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters within his competence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the particular matter on which the decision on any page 57 11:03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if you like, 2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I. Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 4 clarification regarding documents that I was intending to do just before the coffee break. I won't burden you 4 clarification regarding documents that I was intending 4 clarification regarding documents that I was intending 5 to do just before the coffee break. I won't burden you 6 with it now, but just before the lunch break I will do so, so that you have an opportunity to give us guidance 1 just after that. It's not a big point; it just relates 1 mostly to a correction of a document that we put in, and one or two small other points. 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 1 paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 1 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 1 paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 1 and 1 shat gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 1 and 1 shat gets brough back into the Article IX procedures. 1 and 1 shat gets brough back into the Article IX procedures. 1 and 1 shat gets brough back into the Article IX procedures. 1 and 1 shat gets brough t	18	And then paragraph 11 of Annexure F, if I can call	18	(11.06 am)
21 within his competence shall be final and binding, in respect of the particular matter on which the decision is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of Arbitration" 22 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 59 11:03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if you like, 2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neutral 2 and 12 that I forgot to make the small application and 12 that I forgot to make the small application and 12 that I forgot to make the small application and 13 that I forgot to make the small application and 14 clarification regarding documents that I was intending 15 to do just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the funch break I will do 7 so, so that you have an opportunity to give us guidance 12 just after that. It's not a big point; it just relates 12 mostly to a correction of a document that we put in, and one or two small other points. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So if's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if 17 which we may have a concern that the competence of another procedure is unwarranted. 18 poul like, the competence backstop in circumstances in which we may have a concern that the competence of another procedure is unwarranted. 19 paragraph 14. So if the Neutral Expert supplementary Robert Protection of a document that we put in, and one or two small other points. 19 paragraph 13 is, if 17 paragraph 13 is, if 18 poul like, the competence backstop in circumstances in which we may have a concern that the competence of another procedure is unwarranted. 19 paragraph 14. So if the Neutral Expert subject the reason why I had been using conditional language Stream Page 59 20	19	it up, says:	19	(A short break)
22 respect of the particular matter on which the decision 23 is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of 24 Arbitration" 25 The reason why we are focused very much on 26 Page 57 11:03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if you like, 27 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 38 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neutral 48 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 49 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 40 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 40 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 41 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 42 paragraph 13 paragraph 13 is because of paragraph 14 paragraph 15 para	20	"The decision of the Neutral Expert on all matters	20	(11.35 am)
is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of Arbitration" 24 Arbitration" 25 The reason why we are focused very much on 26 Page 57 27 Page 59 28 IR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. 29 Mr Chairman, just before the break, I was addressing the reasons why I had been using conditional language 29 Page 59 29 Page 59 20 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if you like, 20 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert 8 is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. 9 Now the reason why that cannot be is because of 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, just before the break. I was addressing the reasons why I had been using conditional language 23 SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, just before the using conditional language 24 got so taken up with the exchanges about paragraphs 11 25 and 13 that I forgot to make the small application and clarification regarding documents that I was intending to do just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with the exchanges about paragraph 12 and 13 that I forgot to ma	21	within his competence shall be final and binding, in	21	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think that we are reassembled.
24 Arbitration" Page 57 Page 59 11:03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if you like, operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 4 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert with in the paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 1 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 7 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 15 paragraph 14. So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 16 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say "on all matters within his competence". 22 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now.	22	respect of the particular matter on which the decision	22	So, Sir Daniel, whenever you're ready, please proceed.
25 The reason why we are focused very much on Page 57 11:03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if you like, 2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, 'T, Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration', and you were simply to look at 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert 8 is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. 9 Now the reason why that cannot be is because of paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 12 point which I will come on to momentarily, I will say 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now.	23	is made, upon the parties and upon any Court of	23	SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman.
11:03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if you like, 2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert 8 is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. 9 Now the reason why that cannot be is because of 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for 25 now. 26 Page 59 11:35 1 when addressing the issue of the Neutral Expert, and we clarification regarding the issue of the Neutral Expert, and we clarification regarding to and 13 that I forgot to make the small application and clarification regarding documents that I was intending to do just before the confee the scale and 13 that I forgot to make the small application and clarification regarding documents that I was intending to do just before the coffee break. I work burd burt his to do just before the coffee break. I work burt his that I was intending to do just before the coffee break. I work burt his that I was intending to do just before the coffee break. I work burt his that I was intending to do just before the coffee break. I work burt hit had clarification regarding documen	24	Arbitration"	24	Mr Chairman, just before the break, I was addressing
11:03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if you like, 2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert 8 is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. 9 Now the reason why that cannot be is because of 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So if's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now. 11 and 13 that I forgot to make the small application and clarification regarding documents that I was intending to to do just eithe we hand 13 that I forgot to make the small application and clarification regarding documents that I was intending to to do just before the coffee break. I won't bund clarification regarding documents that I was intending to to do just before the coffee break. I won't but one operatice be decided to thool to too just before the cufned sharily in do to, but either how, but just before the cufned sharily in do to, but either how, but just before the cufned sharily in do to, just after that. It's not a big point; it just relates mostly to a correction of a document that we put in, an	25	The reason why we are focused very much on	25	the reasons why I had been using conditional language
11:03 1 paragraph 13 is because paragraph 13, if you like, 2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert 8 is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. 9 Now the reason why that cannot be is because of 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So if's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now. 11 and 13 that I forgot to make the small application and clarification regarding documents that I was intending to to do just eithe we hand 13 that I forgot to make the small application and clarification regarding documents that I was intending to to do just before the coffee break. I won't bund clarification regarding documents that I was intending to to do just before the coffee break. I won't but one operatice be decided to thool to too just before the cufned sharily in do to, but either how, but just before the cufned sharily in do to, but either how, but just before the cufned sharily in do to, just after that. It's not a big point; it just relates mostly to a correction of a document that we put in, an		P 57		D 50
2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert 8 is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. 9 Now the reason why that cannot be is because of 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if' 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for 25 now. 25 Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of		Page 37		Page 39
2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert 8 is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. 9 Now the reason why that cannot be is because of 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if' 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for 25 now. 25 Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of				
2 operates beyond paragraph 11. So if some hypothetical 3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert 8 is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. 9 Now the reason why that cannot be is because of 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if' 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for 25 now. 25 Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of	11.02 1	management 12 is hasayyaa management 12 if yaay liba	11.25 1	when addressing the issue of the Newton Francis and we
3 Neutral Expert were to simply decide, "I, Neutral 4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert 8 is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. 9 Now the reason why that cannot be is because of 9 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for 25 now. 3 and 13 that I forgot to make the small application and 4 clarification regarding documents that I was intending 5 to do just before the coffee break. I won't burden you 4 clarification regarding documents that I was intending 5 to do just before the coffee break. I won't burden you 4 clarification regarding documents that I was intending 5 to do just before the coffee break. I won't burden you 4 clarification regarding documents that I was intending 5 to do just before the coffee break. I won't burden you 4 with it now, but just before the confere beach I will do 5 so, so that you have an opportunity to give us guidance 5 just after that. It's not a big point, it just relates 6 mostly to a correction of a document that we put in, and 7 one or two small other points. 10 The Chairman, members of the Court, but for one brief 12 point which I will come on to momentarily, I				•
4 Expert, decide that I have the competence of a Court of 5 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert 8 is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. 9 Now the reason why that cannot be is because of 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for 25 now. 24 Clarification regarding documents that I was intending to do just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I will do so, so that you have an opportunity to give us guidance just after that. It's not a big point; it just relates mostly to a correction of a document that we put in, and one or two small other points. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, but for one brief point which I will come on to momentarily, I will say only a little mo				
5 Arbitration", and you were simply to look at 6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert 8 is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. 9 Now the reason why that cannot be is because of 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for 25 now. 25 Lo do just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I won't burden you with it now, but just before the coffee break. I won't a big point; it just relates nostly to a correction of a document that we put in, and one or two small other points. By ust after that. It's not a big point; it just relates nostly to a correction of a document that we put in, and one or two small other points. By ust after that. It's not a big point; it just relates nostly to a correction of a document that we put in, and one or two small other points. By ust after that. It's not a big point; it just relates nostly to a corre				
6 paragraph 11 of Annexure F, there would be almost 7 a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert 8 is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. 9 Now the reason why that cannot be is because of 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for 25 now. 3 with it now, but just before the lunch break I will do 3 so, so that you have an opportunity to give us guidance 3 so, so that you have an opportunity to give us guidance 3 so, so that you have an opportunity to give us guidance 3 so, so that you have an opportunity to give us guidance 3 so, so that you have an opportunity to give us guidance 4 spust after that. It's not a big point; it just relates 4 mostly to a correction of a document that we put in, and 5 one or two small other points. 10 one or two small other points. 11 Mr Chairman, members of the Court, but for one brief 12 point which I will come on to momentarily, I will say 13 only a little more about the Neutral Expert's Supplementary 14 The reason for this is that, having regard to 15 paragraph 14.3 of the Neutral Expert's Supplementary 16 Rules of Procedure which are on the record, I've 17 already referred you to them: they are at Exhibit P-549, 18 at core bundle tab I the parties are directed to 19 maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings		-		
a presumption that that decision of the Neutral Expert is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. Now the reason why that cannot be is because of paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for 25 now. 27 so, so that you have an opportunity to give us guidance 3 just after that. It's not a big point; it just relates 3 mostly to a correction of a document that we put in, and one or two small other points. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, but for one brief 12 point which I will come on to momentarily, I will say only a little more about the Neutral Expert proceedings. 14 The reason for this is that, having regard to 15 paragraph 14.3 of the Neutral Expert's Supplementary 16 Rules of Procedure which are on the record, I've 17 already referred you to them: they are at Exhibit P-549, at core bundle tab 1 the parties are directed to 18 matter with a more about the Neutral Expert deal only it is a core brief 19 matter within his competence of 19 maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings, 20 ave in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert 21 directs otherwise. 22 Now the Neutral Expert has not so directed 23 otherwise. And as you will see in due course from 24 recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the Neutral Expert's 25 Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course				*
is binding on the Court of Arbitration itself. Now the reason why that cannot be is because of paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: In a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence, because that then is a matter his or her competence backstop in circumstances in his or her compe				•
9 Now the reason why that cannot be is because of 10 paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for 25 now. 29 mostly to a correction of a document that we put in, and 20 one or two small other points. 10 mostly to a correction of a document that we put in, and 20 one or two small other points. 11 Mr Chairman, members of the Court, but for one brief 22 point which I will come on to momentarily, I will say 23 only a little more about the Neutral Expert proceedings. 24 The reason for this is that, having regard to 25 point which I will come on to momentarily, I will say 26 only a little more about the Neutral Expert proceedings. 27 The reason for this is that, having regard to 28 The reason for this is that, having regard to 29 point which I will come on to momentarily, I will say 29 only a little more about the Neutral Expert proceedings. 20 Procedure which are on the record, I've 21 already referred you to them: they are at Exhibit P-549, 22 are or bundle tab 1 the parties are directed to 23 maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings, 24 are or bundle tab 1 the parties are directed to 25 maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings, 26 save in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert directed to 27 otherwise. 28 Now the Neutral Expert has not so directe				
paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 is the backstop that says: 1 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond his or her competence, because that then is a matter that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. And we say that because the Court is competent in respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in which we may have a concern that the competence of another procedure is unwarranted. THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say "on all matters within his competence". SIR DANIEL: Yes. 10 one or two small other points. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, but for one brief 12 point which I will come on to momentarily, I will say only a little more about the Neutral Expert proceedings. Had the Neutral Expert soupplementary Rules of Procedure which are on the record, I've already referred you to them: they are at Exhibit P-549, at core bundle tab 1 the parties are directed to maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings, ave in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert at core bundle tab 1 the parties are directed to maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings, ave in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert 20 save in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert 21 directs otherwise. 22 Now the Neutral Expert has not so directed otherwise. And as you will see in due course from recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the Neutral Expert's Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of				
11 a Neutral Expert cannot take decisions which go beyond 12 his or her competence, because that then is a matter 13 that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. 14 And we say that because the Court is competent in 15 respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. 16 So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we 17 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if 18 you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in 19 which we may have a concern that the competence of 20 another procedure is unwarranted. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for 25 now. 26 In Mr Chairman, members of the Court, but for one brief 26 point which I will come on to momentarily, I will say 27 only a little more about the Neutral Expert proceedings. 28 It leave the Neutral Expert proceedings. 29 The Chairman, members of the Court, but for one brief 20 point which I will come on to momentarily, I will say 29 only a little more about the Neutral Expert proceedings. 20 The reason for this is that, having regard to 20 paragraph 14.3 of the Neutral Expert's Supplementary 21 Rules of Procedure which are on the record, I've 22 already referred you to them: they are at Exhibit P-549, 23 at core bundle tab 1 the parties are directed to 24 maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings, 25 save in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert 26 don't get there. But we think that paragraph 11 does say 27 directs otherwise. 28 Now the Neutral Expert has not so directed 29 otherwise. And as you will see in due course from 29 recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the Neutral Expert's 29 Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of				*
his or her competence, because that then is a matter that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. And we say that because the Court is competent in respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in which we may have a concern that the competence of another procedure is unwarranted. THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say "on all matters within his competence". THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now. Diont which I will come on to momentarily, I will say only a little more about the Neutral Expert proceedings. He reason for this is that, having regard to paragraph 14.3 of the Neutral Expert's Supplementary Rules of Procedure which are on the record, I've already referred you to them: they are at Exhibit P-549, at core bundle tab 1 the parties are directed to maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings, save in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert directs otherwise. Now the Neutral Expert has not so directed otherwise. And as you will see in due course from recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the Neutral Expert's Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of				-
that gets brought back into the Article IX procedures. And we say that because the Court is competent in respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in which we may have a concern that the competence of another procedure is unwarranted. THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say "on all matters within his competence". THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now. 13 only a little more about the Neutral Expert proceedings. 14 The reason for this is that, having regard to paragraph 14.3 of the Neutral Expert's Supplementary 16 Rules of Procedure which are on the record, I've already referred you to them: they are at Exhibit P-549, at core bundle tab 1 the parties are directed to maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings, save in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert directs otherwise. Now the Neutral Expert has not so directed otherwise. And as you will see in due course from recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the Neutral Expert's Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of		-		
And we say that because the Court is competent in respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in which we may have a concern that the competence of another procedure is unwarranted. THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say "on all matters within his competence". THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now. THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now.				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
respect of the whole dispute, it would come back to you. So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in which we may have a concern that the competence of another procedure is unwarranted. THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say "on all matters within his competence". THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now. 15 paragraph 14.3 of the Neutral Expert's Supplementary Rules of Procedure which are on the record, I've already referred you to them: they are at Exhibit P-549, at core bundle tab 1 the parties are directed to maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings, save in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert 21 directs otherwise. Now the Neutral Expert has not so directed otherwise. And as you will see in due course from recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the Neutral Expert's Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of				
So it's an intricate web of provisions; we hope we don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in which we may have a concern that the competence of another procedure is unwarranted. THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say "on all matters within his competence". SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now. 16 Rules of Procedure which are on the record, I've already referred you to them: they are at Exhibit P-549, at core bundle tab 1 the parties are directed to maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings, save in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert directs otherwise. Now the Neutral Expert has not so directed otherwise. And as you will see in due course from recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the Neutral Expert's Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of				
don't get there. But we think that paragraph 13 is, if you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in which we may have a concern that the competence of another procedure is unwarranted. THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say "on all matters within his competence". SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now. 17 already referred you to them: they are at Exhibit P-549, at core bundle tab 1 the parties are directed to maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings, save in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert 21 directs otherwise. 22 Now the Neutral Expert has not so directed 23 otherwise. And as you will see in due course from 24 recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the Neutral Expert's 25 Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of				1 0 1
you like, the competence backstop in circumstances in which we may have a concern that the competence of another procedure is unwarranted. THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say "on all matters within his competence". SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now. 18 at core bundle tab 1 the parties are directed to maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings, save in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert directs otherwise. Now the Neutral Expert has not so directed otherwise. And as you will see in due course from recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the Neutral Expert's Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of				·
which we may have a concern that the competence of another procedure is unwarranted. THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say "on all matters within his competence". SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now. 19 maintain "strict confidentiality" of those proceedings, save in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert 21 directs otherwise. 22 Now the Neutral Expert has not so directed 23 otherwise. And as you will see in due course from 24 recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the Neutral Expert's 25 Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of				
another procedure is unwarranted. THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say "on all matters within his competence". SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now. 20 save in circumstances in which the Neutral Expert 21 directs otherwise. 22 Now the Neutral Expert has not so directed 23 otherwise. And as you will see in due course from 24 recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the Neutral Expert's 25 Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of				-
THE CHAIRMAN: I would just note that paragraph 11 does say "on all matters within his competence". SIR DANIEL: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now. 21 directs otherwise. 22 Now the Neutral Expert has not so directed 23 otherwise. And as you will see in due course from 24 recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the Neutral Expert's 25 Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
 22 "on all matters within his competence". 23 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for now. 22 Now the Neutral Expert has not so directed 23 otherwise. And as you will see in due course from 24 recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the Neutral Expert's 25 Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of 				-
23 SIR DANIEL: Yes. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for 25 now. 25 Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of				
24 THE CHAIRMAN: But as I say, perhaps we will leave this for 24 recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the Neutral Expert's 25 now. 25 Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of				1
25 now. 25 Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of				•
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Page 58 Page 60	25	now.	25	Site Visit Protocol, which have, just in the course of
Tage 00		Page 58		Page 60
		1 450 50		1 450 00

18 (Pages 57 to 60)

11:36 1	the coffee break, I understand, been posted on the PCA	11:39 1	Pakistan to the KHEP and the RHEP sites in the period
2	website so one of the applications that we will be	2	from 12 August 2014. And in that context, the recent
3	making to you is to actually put those documents into	3	site visit was the first time that Pakistan had had
4	the record, although they are publicly available as	4	an opportunity to inspect the KHEP site since the KHEP
5	you will see from recital 14 and paragraph 9.3 of the	5	became operational in 2018, and the first opportunity
6	Neutral Expert's Site Visit Protocol, which have just	6	that Pakistan had to inspect the RHEP since construction
7	been posted on the PCA website along with the press	7	commenced.
8	release of the site visit, Pakistan considered it	8	But I am, unfortunately, precluded by the Site Visit
9	necessary to adopt a self-denying ordinance in respect	9	Protocol and by the Neutral Expert's Supplemental Rules
10	of any applications to the Neutral Expert under	10	from addressing any more detail of that in these
11	paragraph 14.3 of his Supplemental Rules with the	11	proceedings.
12	purposes of facilitating the Neutral Expert's site visit	12	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before I leave
13	and his competence process. And this self-denying	13	this issue, there's also one other point, for clarity
14	ordinance in respect of paragraph 14.3 of the Neutral	14	and completeness, that I need to note. Again, it's
15	Expert's Supplemental Rules is relevant also to	15	a point that you all have, but I underline it for the
16	Pakistan's response to paragraph 1.7 of PO11 concerning	16	record, and that is that the present phase of the
17	document production.	17	proceedings before the Court concerns systemic issues of
18	So I hope that that just draws some of the threads	18	Treaty interpretation rather than any question going to
19	together. We are subject to a pretty firm ruling on	19	the application of the Treaty to the KHEP and the RHEP,
20	confidentiality. We made a self-denying ordinance that	20	and we haven't put before you in the Memorial details
21	we would not make any applications to disclose documents	21	relating to the KHEP and the RHEP. So we are proceeding
22	into these proceedings. That's evident on the public	22	on the basis that those issues will be addressed,
23	record of the Neutral Expert proceedings now. But that,	23	subject to issues of competence, by the Neutral Expert
24	I hope, explains the position.	24	or by you in due course.
25	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the remaining	25	But given this, Pakistan has not been hamstrung in
	Page 61		Page 63
11:38 1	brief point regarding the Neutral Expert proceedings	11:41 1	our submissions to you by the confidentiality
	brief point regarding the Neutral Expert proceedings that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture		our submissions to you by the confidentiality constraints under which it is required to operate in the
2	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture	11:41 1 2 3	constraints under which it is required to operate in the
	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and	2	
2 3	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture	2 3	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our
2 3 4	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook	2 3 4	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt
2 3 4 5	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The	2 3 4 5	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the
2 3 4 5 6	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site	2 3 4 5 6	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published	2 3 4 5 6 7	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of those media reports in the core bundle for your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And I imagine that you will have lots of interesting questions about these issues, given, Mr Chairman, your opening question to Mr Akbar.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of those media reports in the core bundle for your information, and these are at Exhibits P-551 to P-556	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And I imagine that you will have lots of interesting questions about these issues, given, Mr Chairman, your opening question to Mr Akbar. The origins of the Indus Waters Treaty have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of those media reports in the core bundle for your information, and these are at Exhibits P-551 to P-556 and are at the core bundle tabs 3 to 8.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And I imagine that you will have lots of interesting questions about these issues, given, Mr Chairman, your opening question to Mr Akbar. The origins of the Indus Waters Treaty have been addressed at length in Pakistan's Memorial and also in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of those media reports in the core bundle for your information, and these are at Exhibits P-551 to P-556 and are at the core bundle tabs 3 to 8. There is nothing material at all that turns on this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And I imagine that you will have lots of interesting questions about these issues, given, Mr Chairman, your opening question to Mr Akbar. The origins of the Indus Waters Treaty have been addressed at length in Pakistan's Memorial and also in its accompanying Appendix A. Ms Rees-Evans will make
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of those media reports in the core bundle for your information, and these are at Exhibits P-551 to P-556 and are at the core bundle tabs 3 to 8. There is nothing material at all that turns on this. It is public domain information. I just wanted to make	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And I imagine that you will have lots of interesting questions about these issues, given, Mr Chairman, your opening question to Mr Akbar. The origins of the Indus Waters Treaty have been addressed at length in Pakistan's Memorial and also in its accompanying Appendix A. Ms Rees-Evans will make further submissions on this tomorrow morning. My
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of those media reports in the core bundle for your information, and these are at Exhibits P-551 to P-556 and are at the core bundle tabs 3 to 8. There is nothing material at all that turns on this. It is public domain information. I just wanted to make sure that you were aware of what was going on in those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And I imagine that you will have lots of interesting questions about these issues, given, Mr Chairman, your opening question to Mr Akbar. The origins of the Indus Waters Treaty have been addressed at length in Pakistan's Memorial and also in its accompanying Appendix A. Ms Rees-Evans will make further submissions on this tomorrow morning. My purpose is not to anticipate her remarks, but simply to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of those media reports in the core bundle for your information, and these are at Exhibits P-551 to P-556 and are at the core bundle tabs 3 to 8. There is nothing material at all that turns on this. It is public domain information. I just wanted to make sure that you were aware of what was going on in those proceedings.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And I imagine that you will have lots of interesting questions about these issues, given, Mr Chairman, your opening question to Mr Akbar. The origins of the Indus Waters Treaty have been addressed at length in Pakistan's Memorial and also in its accompanying Appendix A. Ms Rees-Evans will make further submissions on this tomorrow morning. My purpose is not to anticipate her remarks, but simply to pick up and elaborate on the point made by Pakistan's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of those media reports in the core bundle for your information, and these are at Exhibits P-551 to P-556 and are at the core bundle tabs 3 to 8. There is nothing material at all that turns on this. It is public domain information. I just wanted to make sure that you were aware of what was going on in those proceedings. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, recalling	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And I imagine that you will have lots of interesting questions about these issues, given, Mr Chairman, your opening question to Mr Akbar. The origins of the Indus Waters Treaty have been addressed at length in Pakistan's Memorial and also in its accompanying Appendix A. Ms Rees-Evans will make further submissions on this tomorrow morning. My purpose is not to anticipate her remarks, but simply to pick up and elaborate on the point made by Pakistan's Deputy Agent this morning.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of those media reports in the core bundle for your information, and these are at Exhibits P-551 to P-556 and are at the core bundle tabs 3 to 8. There is nothing material at all that turns on this. It is public domain information. I just wanted to make sure that you were aware of what was going on in those proceedings. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, recalling Pakistan's explanatory note of 9 May 2023 on site visit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And I imagine that you will have lots of interesting questions about these issues, given, Mr Chairman, your opening question to Mr Akbar. The origins of the Indus Waters Treaty have been addressed at length in Pakistan's Memorial and also in its accompanying Appendix A. Ms Rees-Evans will make further submissions on this tomorrow morning. My purpose is not to anticipate her remarks, but simply to pick up and elaborate on the point made by Pakistan's Deputy Agent this morning. It's a matter of common record, but also addressed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of those media reports in the core bundle for your information, and these are at Exhibits P-551 to P-556 and are at the core bundle tabs 3 to 8. There is nothing material at all that turns on this. It is public domain information. I just wanted to make sure that you were aware of what was going on in those proceedings. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, recalling Pakistan's explanatory note of 9 May 2023 on site visit correspondence, which was submitted to you in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And I imagine that you will have lots of interesting questions about these issues, given, Mr Chairman, your opening question to Mr Akbar. The origins of the Indus Waters Treaty have been addressed at length in Pakistan's Memorial and also in its accompanying Appendix A. Ms Rees-Evans will make further submissions on this tomorrow morning. My purpose is not to anticipate her remarks, but simply to pick up and elaborate on the point made by Pakistan's Deputy Agent this morning. It's a matter of common record, but also addressed in our Memorial fully, that the Indian subcontinent was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of those media reports in the core bundle for your information, and these are at Exhibits P-551 to P-556 and are at the core bundle tabs 3 to 8. There is nothing material at all that turns on this. It is public domain information. I just wanted to make sure that you were aware of what was going on in those proceedings. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, recalling Pakistan's explanatory note of 9 May 2023 on site visit correspondence, which was submitted to you in the context of the preliminary phase on competence, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And I imagine that you will have lots of interesting questions about these issues, given, Mr Chairman, your opening question to Mr Akbar. The origins of the Indus Waters Treaty have been addressed at length in Pakistan's Memorial and also in its accompanying Appendix A. Ms Rees-Evans will make further submissions on this tomorrow morning. My purpose is not to anticipate her remarks, but simply to pick up and elaborate on the point made by Pakistan's Deputy Agent this morning. It's a matter of common record, but also addressed in our Memorial fully, that the Indian subcontinent was partitioned by an act of the British Parliament of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of those media reports in the core bundle for your information, and these are at Exhibits P-551 to P-556 and are at the core bundle tabs 3 to 8. There is nothing material at all that turns on this. It is public domain information. I just wanted to make sure that you were aware of what was going on in those proceedings. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, recalling Pakistan's explanatory note of 9 May 2023 on site visit correspondence, which was submitted to you in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And I imagine that you will have lots of interesting questions about these issues, given, Mr Chairman, your opening question to Mr Akbar. The origins of the Indus Waters Treaty have been addressed at length in Pakistan's Memorial and also in its accompanying Appendix A. Ms Rees-Evans will make further submissions on this tomorrow morning. My purpose is not to anticipate her remarks, but simply to pick up and elaborate on the point made by Pakistan's Deputy Agent this morning. It's a matter of common record, but also addressed in our Memorial fully, that the Indian subcontinent was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of those media reports in the core bundle for your information, and these are at Exhibits P-551 to P-556 and are at the core bundle tabs 3 to 8. There is nothing material at all that turns on this. It is public domain information. I just wanted to make sure that you were aware of what was going on in those proceedings. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, recalling Pakistan's explanatory note of 9 May 2023 on site visit correspondence, which was submitted to you in the context of the preliminary phase on competence, that explanatory note documented India's denial of access by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And I imagine that you will have lots of interesting questions about these issues, given, Mr Chairman, your opening question to Mr Akbar. The origins of the Indus Waters Treaty have been addressed at length in Pakistan's Memorial and also in its accompanying Appendix A. Ms Rees-Evans will make further submissions on this tomorrow morning. My purpose is not to anticipate her remarks, but simply to pick up and elaborate on the point made by Pakistan's Deputy Agent this morning. It's a matter of common record, but also addressed in our Memorial fully, that the Indian subcontinent was partitioned by an act of the British Parliament of 18 July 1947. The act divided the land but it failed to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that I will mention is simply to fill out the picture for you, and it is very much in the public domain, and that is that the Neutral Expert recently undertook a site visit to the Kishenganga and Ratle plants. The details of that site visit are now addressed in the Site Visit Protocol and the press release that are published on the Neutral Expert PCA website, to which I referred a moment ago. Also illuminating, and again very much in the public domain, are the numerous real-time press reports by the Indian media covering the site visit. I don't invite you to turn them up, but we have included a selection of those media reports in the core bundle for your information, and these are at Exhibits P-551 to P-556 and are at the core bundle tabs 3 to 8. There is nothing material at all that turns on this. It is public domain information. I just wanted to make sure that you were aware of what was going on in those proceedings. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, recalling Pakistan's explanatory note of 9 May 2023 on site visit correspondence, which was submitted to you in the context of the preliminary phase on competence, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	constraints under which it is required to operate in the Neutral Expert proceedings. We have developed our Memorial and pleadings to you as fully as we felt necessary to do in order to illuminate all of the issues. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I turn to the second part of my topics, and that is the origins of the Indus Waters Treaty, its cornerstone character, the concern about India's weaponisation of water, and the relevance of these issues for the Court's task. And I imagine that you will have lots of interesting questions about these issues, given, Mr Chairman, your opening question to Mr Akbar. The origins of the Indus Waters Treaty have been addressed at length in Pakistan's Memorial and also in its accompanying Appendix A. Ms Rees-Evans will make further submissions on this tomorrow morning. My purpose is not to anticipate her remarks, but simply to pick up and elaborate on the point made by Pakistan's Deputy Agent this morning. It's a matter of common record, but also addressed in our Memorial fully, that the Indian subcontinent was partitioned by an act of the British Parliament of

19 (Pages 61 to 64)

11:42 1	delimit the rights and obligations of the two emergent	11:45 1	now-independent states.
2	states that respect of the water that flowed across that	2	Given the history of the dispute over water between
3	land. This failure to delimit the parties' entitlements	3	Pakistan and India, and the wider territorial dispute
4	to water had virtually immediate and near-catastrophic	4	between the two states over Kashmir, divided by the
5	consequences when, only eight short months after	5	Line of Control, the Indus Waters Treaty was and remains
6	independence, Indian East Punjab cut off the flow of	6	a cornerstone instrument of settlement between Pakistan
7	water to Pakistani West Punjab.	7	and India, defining a critical element of their
8	The Inter-Dominion Water Agreement of 4 May 1948	8	relationship. It did not declare peace: there's no
9	that settled the Punjab water dispute was the precursor	9	language in the Treaty declaring peace. But it settled
10	of the Indus Waters Treaty, the painstaking negotiation	10	an issue that had caused a rapture of seismic
11	of which took another 12 years to complete. Indeed, it	11	proportions in an area that had been beset by conflict.
12	was in the context of the Inter-Dominion Water Agreement	12	It did not itself draw a line on the ground, but it
13	that the parties got together with their legal teams and	13	delimited the entitlement to the water that flowed on
14	discovered, or decided, that there were many other	14	the ground that had been divided.
15	issues that they needed to address. And that led to the	15	So while not in name either a boundary treaty or
16	negotiating process, which the World Bank shepherded	16	a treaty of peace, the Indus Waters Treaty is akin to
17	along, that led to the Indus Waters Treaty. So the	17	both. And most significantly, it completed a critical
18	Indus Waters Treaty is a no puns intended but is	18	element that had been left undone by the British
19	a direct outflow of the Punjab water dispute of 1948.	19	Parliamentary Act of Partition of 1947, where the land
20	The Treaty delimited the rights to the water of the	20	had been divided, but not the water that flowed
21	Indus Basin between the two sides by a division of	21	across it.
22	rights in respect of the six major rivers of the Indus	22	The Treaty is not subject to temporal limitation and
23	Basin that are shared by the two states: the Eastern	23	it contains no provisions for modification or
24	Rivers the Beas, the Ravi and the Sutlej the	24	termination other than "by a duly ratified treaty
25	unrestricted use of which, subject to limited exception,	25	concluded for that purpose" by the parties. This is the
	Page 65		Page 67
	1 450 03		1 450 07
11:44 1			
11.77	was accorded to India; and the Western Rivers the	11:47 1	language of Article XII, paragraphs (3) and (4) of the
2	was accorded to India; and the Western Rivers the Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use	11:47 1 2	language of Article XII, paragraphs (3) and (4) of the Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument
			Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship
2 3 4	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan.	2 3 4	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties.
2 3	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and	2 3 4 5	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make
2 3 4 5 6	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his	2 3 4 5 6	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the
2 3 4 5 6 7	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic	2 3 4 5 6 7	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't simply a division of six rivers, three by three, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly precluded on grounds of fundamental change of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't simply a division of six rivers, three by three, but rather driven by substantive considerations.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly precluded on grounds of fundamental change of circumstance.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't simply a division of six rivers, three by three, but rather driven by substantive considerations. The Treaty delimited in close and careful detail the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly precluded on grounds of fundamental change of circumstance. Whereas a fundamental change of circumstance which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't simply a division of six rivers, three by three, but rather driven by substantive considerations. The Treaty delimited in close and careful detail the rights and the entitlements and the duties and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly precluded on grounds of fundamental change of circumstance. Whereas a fundamental change of circumstance which has occurred with regard to the circumstances that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't simply a division of six rivers, three by three, but rather driven by substantive considerations. The Treaty delimited in close and careful detail the rights and the entitlements and the duties and obligations of both parties in respect of the waters of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly precluded on grounds of fundamental change of circumstance. Whereas a fundamental change of circumstance which has occurred with regard to the circumstances that existed at the time of the conclusion of [a] treaty, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't simply a division of six rivers, three by three, but rather driven by substantive considerations. The Treaty delimited in close and careful detail the rights and the entitlements and the duties and obligations of both parties in respect of the waters of these six rivers, and a balance was struck and a bargain	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly precluded on grounds of fundamental change of circumstance. Whereas a fundamental change of circumstance which has occurred with regard to the circumstances that existed at the time of the conclusion of [a] treaty, but which was not foreseen by the parties to that treaty,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't simply a division of six rivers, three by three, but rather driven by substantive considerations. The Treaty delimited in close and careful detail the rights and the entitlements and the duties and obligations of both parties in respect of the waters of these six rivers, and a balance was struck and a bargain was reached. The threat of a further rupture between	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly precluded on grounds of fundamental change of circumstance. Whereas a fundamental change of circumstance which has occurred with regard to the circumstances that existed at the time of the conclusion of [a] treaty, but which was not foreseen by the parties to that treaty, while that fundamental change of circumstances may, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't simply a division of six rivers, three by three, but rather driven by substantive considerations. The Treaty delimited in close and careful detail the rights and the entitlements and the duties and obligations of both parties in respect of the waters of these six rivers, and a balance was struck and a bargain was reached. The threat of a further rupture between the two partitioned states over the use of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly precluded on grounds of fundamental change of circumstance. Whereas a fundamental change of circumstance which has occurred with regard to the circumstances that existed at the time of the conclusion of [a] treaty, but which was not foreseen by the parties to that treaty, while that fundamental change of circumstances may, in certain tightly limited circumstances, be invoked as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't simply a division of six rivers, three by three, but rather driven by substantive considerations. The Treaty delimited in close and careful detail the rights and the entitlements and the duties and obligations of both parties in respect of the waters of these six rivers, and a balance was struck and a bargain was reached. The threat of a further rupture between the two partitioned states over the use of the transboundary water resources of the Indus Basin was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly precluded on grounds of fundamental change of circumstance. Whereas a fundamental change of circumstance which has occurred with regard to the circumstances that existed at the time of the conclusion of [a] treaty, but which was not foreseen by the parties to that treaty, while that fundamental change of circumstances may, in certain tightly limited circumstances, be invoked as a ground for withdrawing from or terminating a treaty,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't simply a division of six rivers, three by three, but rather driven by substantive considerations. The Treaty delimited in close and careful detail the rights and the entitlements and the duties and obligations of both parties in respect of the waters of these six rivers, and a balance was struck and a bargain was reached. The threat of a further rupture between the two partitioned states over the use of the transboundary water resources of the Indus Basin was thus addressed by the Treaty, and the immediate concerns	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly precluded on grounds of fundamental change of circumstance. Whereas a fundamental change of circumstance which has occurred with regard to the circumstances that existed at the time of the conclusion of [a] treaty, but which was not foreseen by the parties to that treaty, while that fundamental change of circumstances may, in certain tightly limited circumstances, be invoked as a ground for withdrawing from or terminating a treaty, this is expressly excluded in the case of boundary
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't simply a division of six rivers, three by three, but rather driven by substantive considerations. The Treaty delimited in close and careful detail the rights and the entitlements and the duties and obligations of both parties in respect of the waters of these six rivers, and a balance was struck and a bargain was reached. The threat of a further rupture between the two partitioned states over the use of the transboundary water resources of the Indus Basin was thus addressed by the Treaty, and the immediate concerns about a rupture were averted. And the Treaty	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly precluded on grounds of fundamental change of circumstance. Whereas a fundamental change of circumstance which has occurred with regard to the circumstances that existed at the time of the conclusion of [a] treaty, but which was not foreseen by the parties to that treaty, while that fundamental change of circumstances may, in certain tightly limited circumstances, be invoked as a ground for withdrawing from or terminating a treaty, this is expressly excluded in the case of boundary treaties.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't simply a division of six rivers, three by three, but rather driven by substantive considerations. The Treaty delimited in close and careful detail the rights and the entitlements and the duties and obligations of both parties in respect of the waters of these six rivers, and a balance was struck and a bargain was reached. The threat of a further rupture between the two partitioned states over the use of the transboundary water resources of the Indus Basin was thus addressed by the Treaty, and the immediate concerns about a rupture were averted. And the Treaty complemented and completed the delimitation of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly precluded on grounds of fundamental change of circumstance. Whereas a fundamental change of circumstance which has occurred with regard to the circumstances that existed at the time of the conclusion of [a] treaty, but which was not foreseen by the parties to that treaty, while that fundamental change of circumstances may, in certain tightly limited circumstances, be invoked as a ground for withdrawing from or terminating a treaty, this is expressly excluded in the case of boundary treaties. The principle in question is stated in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't simply a division of six rivers, three by three, but rather driven by substantive considerations. The Treaty delimited in close and careful detail the rights and the entitlements and the duties and obligations of both parties in respect of the waters of these six rivers, and a balance was struck and a bargain was reached. The threat of a further rupture between the two partitioned states over the use of the transboundary water resources of the Indus Basin was thus addressed by the Treaty, and the immediate concerns about a rupture were averted. And the Treaty	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly precluded on grounds of fundamental change of circumstance. Whereas a fundamental change of circumstance which has occurred with regard to the circumstances that existed at the time of the conclusion of [a] treaty, but which was not foreseen by the parties to that treaty, while that fundamental change of circumstances may, in certain tightly limited circumstances, be invoked as a ground for withdrawing from or terminating a treaty, this is expressly excluded in the case of boundary treaties.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Chenab, the Jhelum and the Indus the unrestricted use of which, subject to limitation, was accorded to Pakistan. It's, I think, also important to appreciate and Mr Fietta will have more to say about this in his submissions tomorrow that this was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby in half: "You get three; you get three". It reflected, rather, the geographic balance of the catchment of the respective rivers, as well as wider considerations of substance. And Mr Fietta will go into those details. So it wasn't simply a division of six rivers, three by three, but rather driven by substantive considerations. The Treaty delimited in close and careful detail the rights and the entitlements and the duties and obligations of both parties in respect of the waters of these six rivers, and a balance was struck and a bargain was reached. The threat of a further rupture between the two partitioned states over the use of the transboundary water resources of the Indus Basin was thus addressed by the Treaty, and the immediate concerns about a rupture were averted. And the Treaty complemented and completed the delimitation of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Treaty. So it is in every way a cornerstone instrument governing a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the parties. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I make an observation which will be immediately familiar to the public international lawyers on the panel but perhaps not otherwise familiar to other members of the Court, and that is that treaties delimiting boundaries have an almost uniquely special status in international law. It is the one category of international instruments in respect of which withdrawal or termination is expressly precluded on grounds of fundamental change of circumstance. Whereas a fundamental change of circumstance which has occurred with regard to the circumstances that existed at the time of the conclusion of [a] treaty, but which was not foreseen by the parties to that treaty, while that fundamental change of circumstances may, in certain tightly limited circumstances, be invoked as a ground for withdrawing from or terminating a treaty, this is expressly excluded in the case of boundary treaties. The principle in question is stated in

20 (Pages 65 to 68)

	_		44	
11:48	1	Treaties, a provision which is widely accepted as	11:51 1	the highest contention between the two sides.
	2	reflecting customary international law. And it provides	2	THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, this is a question that others
	3	expressly that a fundamental change of circumstance may	3	may want to address in due course, including Ms Webb,
	4	not be invoked as a ground for termination or withdrawal	4	when we get to her presentation about treaty
	5	if the treaty establishes a boundary.	5	interpretation. But it seems to me that the issue of
	6	The principle of the stability of boundary treaties	6	the Treaty seeking stability is one point; it's
	7	was expressed by the International Court of Justice, in	7	a different point whether it is then taken to the level
	8	the Great Hall of Justice just across the way, in a 1962	8	of saying there can't be interpretations of the Treaty
	9	judgment in the Temple of Preah Vihear case between	9	that account for changes over time.
1	10	Cambodia and Thailand. The frequently cited passage	10	I can see the argument that perhaps you're making
1	11	from that judgment addressing this issue could readily	11	that there should be a reason why one can't withdraw,
1	12	have been addressing the Indus Waters Treaty. The same	12	let's say, from the Indus Waters Treaty. It seems less
	13	principle applies.	13	obvious that one would extend the Temple of Preah Vihear
	14	The court said as follows and this is at PLA-101	14	concept to a treaty that is not in fact a boundary
	15	at page 34. There is no need to turn it up, but I will	15	treaty, but instead is seeking to allocate rights in
	16	read the passage into the record. The court said as	16	an area of a boundary, because we certainly have seen
1	17	follows:	17	cases from the International Court of Justice that has
	18	"In general, when two countries establish a frontier	18	looked at those kinds of treaties and viewed them as
	19	between them, one of the primary objects is to achieve	19	ones that are susceptible to an interpretation that
	20	stability and finality. This is impossible if the line	20	doesn't fix things as of the date the treaty was
	21	so established can, at any moment, and on the basis of	21	adopted.
	22	a continuously available process, be called in question,	22	So that's maybe more of an observation than
	23	and its rectification claimed, whenever any inaccuracy	23	a question, although maybe the question would be: how
	24	by reference to a clause in the parent treaty is	24	far do we go in this idea that it's a Treaty designed
2	25	discovered. Such a process could continue indefinitely,	25	for stability?
		Page 69		Page 71
11:50	1	and finality would never be reached so long as possible	11:53 1	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, thank you for that. I have no
11:50	1 2	errors still remained to be discovered. Such	11:53 1 2	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point,
11:50		errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be		doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when
11:50	2	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious."	2	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event.
11:50	2 3	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of	2 3	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and
11:50	2 3 4	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was	2 3 4	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be
11:50	2 3 4 5 6 7	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing	2 3 4 5 6 7	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the
11:50	2 3 4 5 6	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be
1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the
1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made.
1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability
1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would
1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the origin of the Treaty and the dispute between the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would not get us into, perhaps, the mangle that you're sort of
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 11 12 13 14	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the origin of the Treaty and the dispute between the parties, which turned on, arose from, the 1947 partition	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would not get us into, perhaps, the mangle that you're sort of anticipating: is this something that has simply
1 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 10 111 112 113 144 115	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the origin of the Treaty and the dispute between the parties, which turned on, arose from, the 1947 partition of the land, but a partition of the land that failed to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would not get us into, perhaps, the mangle that you're sort of anticipating: is this something that has simply crystallised the words on the page? And that is that
1 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 111 112 13 14 15 16 17	a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the origin of the Treaty and the dispute between the parties, which turned on, arose from, the 1947 partition of the land, but a partition of the land that failed to divide the use of the waters that flowed across that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would not get us into, perhaps, the mangle that you're sort of anticipating: is this something that has simply crystallised the words on the page? And that is that you get many treaties which are, to use the jargon,
1 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 111 112 13 14 14 15 16 17 18	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the origin of the Treaty and the dispute between the parties, which turned on, arose from, the 1947 partition of the land, but a partition of the land that failed to divide the use of the waters that flowed across that land.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would not get us into, perhaps, the mangle that you're sort of anticipating: is this something that has simply crystallised the words on the page? And that is that you get many treaties which are, to use the jargon, characterised as living instruments: they evolve with
1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 111 122 13 144 15 16 17 18	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the origin of the Treaty and the dispute between the parties, which turned on, arose from, the 1947 partition of the land, but a partition of the land that failed to divide the use of the waters that flowed across that land. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the Indus	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would not get us into, perhaps, the mangle that you're sort of anticipating: is this something that has simply crystallised the words on the page? And that is that you get many treaties which are, to use the jargon, characterised as living instruments: they evolve with the changing circumstances of the day.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 111 112 113 144 115 116 117 118 119 120	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the origin of the Treaty and the dispute between the parties, which turned on, arose from, the 1947 partition of the land, but a partition of the land that failed to divide the use of the waters that flowed across that land. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the Indus Waters Treaty is not simply akin to a treaty	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would not get us into, perhaps, the mangle that you're sort of anticipating: is this something that has simply crystallised the words on the page? And that is that you get many treaties which are, to use the jargon, characterised as living instruments: they evolve with the changing circumstances of the day. What we say is that this is not a living instrument.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 111 112 113 144 115 116 117 118 119 119 119 119 119 119 119 119 119	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the origin of the Treaty and the dispute between the parties, which turned on, arose from, the 1947 partition of the land, but a partition of the land that failed to divide the use of the waters that flowed across that land. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the Indus Waters Treaty is not simply akin to a treaty establishing a boundary. Its very essence is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would not get us into, perhaps, the mangle that you're sort of anticipating: is this something that has simply crystallised the words on the page? And that is that you get many treaties which are, to use the jargon, characterised as living instruments: they evolve with the changing circumstances of the day. What we say is that this is not a living instrument. There may be elements of the Treaty that, quite
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 111 112 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 21 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the origin of the Treaty and the dispute between the parties, which turned on, arose from, the 1947 partition of the land, but a partition of the land that failed to divide the use of the waters that flowed across that land. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the Indus Waters Treaty is not simply akin to a treaty establishing a boundary. Its very essence is the delimitation of the territorial rights of the parties	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would not get us into, perhaps, the mangle that you're sort of anticipating: is this something that has simply crystallised the words on the page? And that is that you get many treaties which are, to use the jargon, characterised as living instruments: they evolve with the changing circumstances of the day. What we say is that this is not a living instrument. There may be elements of the Treaty that, quite properly, have to evolve through an interpretative
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 111 112 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 21 22 22 23	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the origin of the Treaty and the dispute between the parties, which turned on, arose from, the 1947 partition of the land, but a partition of the land that failed to divide the use of the waters that flowed across that land. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the Indus Waters Treaty is not simply akin to a treaty establishing a boundary. Its very essence is the delimitation of the territorial rights of the parties across a divided land. It has a unique and special	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would not get us into, perhaps, the mangle that you're sort of anticipating: is this something that has simply crystallised the words on the page? And that is that you get many treaties which are, to use the jargon, characterised as living instruments: they evolve with the changing circumstances of the day. What we say is that this is not a living instrument. There may be elements of the Treaty that, quite properly, have to evolve through an interpretative approach, and we saw this, for example, by the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 122 123 124	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the origin of the Treaty and the dispute between the parties, which turned on, arose from, the 1947 partition of the land, but a partition of the land that failed to divide the use of the waters that flowed across that land. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the Indus Waters Treaty is not simply akin to a treaty establishing a boundary. Its very essence is the delimitation of the territorial rights of the parties across a divided land. It has a unique and special status. Its purpose was to achieve stability and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would not get us into, perhaps, the mangle that you're sort of anticipating: is this something that has simply crystallised the words on the page? And that is that you get many treaties which are, to use the jargon, characterised as living instruments: they evolve with the changing circumstances of the day. What we say is that this is not a living instrument. There may be elements of the Treaty that, quite properly, have to evolve through an interpretative approach, and we saw this, for example, by the Kishenganga Court. If memory serves me it's a point
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 111 112 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 21 22 22 23	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the origin of the Treaty and the dispute between the parties, which turned on, arose from, the 1947 partition of the land, but a partition of the land that failed to divide the use of the waters that flowed across that land. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the Indus Waters Treaty is not simply akin to a treaty establishing a boundary. Its very essence is the delimitation of the territorial rights of the parties across a divided land. It has a unique and special	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would not get us into, perhaps, the mangle that you're sort of anticipating: is this something that has simply crystallised the words on the page? And that is that you get many treaties which are, to use the jargon, characterised as living instruments: they evolve with the changing circumstances of the day. What we say is that this is not a living instrument. There may be elements of the Treaty that, quite properly, have to evolve through an interpretative approach, and we saw this, for example, by the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 122 123 124	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the origin of the Treaty and the dispute between the parties, which turned on, arose from, the 1947 partition of the land, but a partition of the land that failed to divide the use of the waters that flowed across that land. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the Indus Waters Treaty is not simply akin to a treaty establishing a boundary. Its very essence is the delimitation of the territorial rights of the parties across a divided land. It has a unique and special status. Its purpose was to achieve stability and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would not get us into, perhaps, the mangle that you're sort of anticipating: is this something that has simply crystallised the words on the page? And that is that you get many treaties which are, to use the jargon, characterised as living instruments: they evolve with the changing circumstances of the day. What we say is that this is not a living instrument. There may be elements of the Treaty that, quite properly, have to evolve through an interpretative approach, and we saw this, for example, by the Kishenganga Court. If memory serves me it's a point
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 122 123 124	errors still remained to be discovered. Such a frontier, so far from being stable, would be completely precarious." Of course, the circumstances that the Temple of Preah Vihear case was addressing were different: it was addressing a boundary treaty and it was addressing claims to rectification of that treaty. But the principle of stability and finality that applies to boundary treaties could be read across without change, we say, into the Indus Waters Treaty, not only for its division of the waters and the rights of use of the waters of these transboundary rivers, but because of the origin of the Treaty and the dispute between the parties, which turned on, arose from, the 1947 partition of the land, but a partition of the land that failed to divide the use of the waters that flowed across that land. So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the Indus Waters Treaty is not simply akin to a treaty establishing a boundary. Its very essence is the delimitation of the territorial rights of the parties across a divided land. It has a unique and special status. Its purpose was to achieve stability and finality with respect to an issue that was the source of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	doubt that Professor Webb will come back to that point, and maybe she will disavow what I'm about to say when she does so, but let me say it in any event. There's obviously an important element of truth and accuracy in what you say. For example, it cannot be that aspects of a treaty that, for example, require the allocation of a particular quantum of water, a particular volume of water, will all of a sudden be set in stone, such that if there was a change in the volume of water, there could be no adjustment made. I think the point that we're making about stability and finality is perhaps slightly different, and would not get us into, perhaps, the mangle that you're sort of anticipating: is this something that has simply crystallised the words on the page? And that is that you get many treaties which are, to use the jargon, characterised as living instruments: they evolve with the changing circumstances of the day. What we say is that this is not a living instrument. There may be elements of the Treaty that, quite properly, have to evolve through an interpretative approach, and we saw this, for example, by the Kishenganga Court. If memory serves me it's a point that we'll come back to in due course paragraph 112

21 (Pages 69 to 72)

11.54 1	of the final around of the Victorian Court the	11.67 1 of acuitable amountains and between two states 1 d	
11:54		11:57 1 of equitable apportionment between two states, where the	
	elements of this that were addressed.	2 surface water was apportioned, and it was later found	
	So it may be that a treaty evolves through a process	that groundwater withdrawals affect surface flow, and	
	of clarification and interpretation of its particular	4 those apportionments had to be, basically, redone to	
5		5 take into account information that was not known.	
6	,	6 Is international treaty law consistent with that	
	simply be construed as something which rather generally	7 idea?	
8		8 SIR DANIEL: Mr Minear, I will again leave Professor Webb (o to
Ç	1	9 address this in a little bit more detail. I think there	
10	, 31	are going to be limits when it comes to, as it were,	
1:	• •	reopening an evolution of this particular Treaty for	
12	•	those purposes.	
13	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	And the example that you give may very well be	
14	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	an example which is characterised in other ways. What	
1:	e e	happens if all of a sudden there is now an appreciation	
10		of different environmental concerns, or climate change	
1′		17 concerns: do we open up the Treaty to address that?	
18	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	The paragraph of the Kishenganga Court's final award	
19	* * '	that I referred to a moment ago, paragraph 112, in fact	
20		sort of addresses that in the context of the applicable law provision, paragraph 29 of Annexure G, and drew	
2:	8 8		
22		•	
23 24	* * *	may do, through its interpretative process, to draw in new principles, emerging concerns for example,	
25	·	24 new principles, emerging concerns for example, 25 concerns around the mitigation of significant	
2:	If, for example this is not part of the dispute	2. Concerns around the mingation of Significant	
	Page 73	Page 75	
	ì		l
11.50	and India is not serving that 1 !f f 1	11:50 1 anxinonmental house 1:-1 d. C. (C. 1 1:- 1:-	J
11:56 1	and India is not saying that but if, for example,	11:59 1 environmental harm which the Court of Arbitration in	
2	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at	2 Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little	
2 3	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin",	 Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, 	
2 3 4	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in	 Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. 	
2 3 4 5	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960,	 Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously 	
2 3 4 5	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be	 Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to 	
2 3 4 5 6 7	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that.	 Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty 	lv
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to	 Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply 	ly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that	 Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or 	ly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected.	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that	ly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment,	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly.	ly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that	ly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta addresses you more on the wider circumstances of the	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly. And we say that there is a very clear line between those	ly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta addresses you more on the wider circumstances of the Indus Basin. We are not intent on driving the principle	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly. And we say that there is a very clear line between those two divides.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta addresses you more on the wider circumstances of the Indus Basin. We are not intent on driving the principle of stability and finality to, as it were, the nth	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly. And we say that there is a very clear line between those two divides. MR MINEAR: Thank you.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta addresses you more on the wider circumstances of the Indus Basin. We are not intent on driving the principle of stability and finality to, as it were, the nth degree. We just want to make clear that the Indus	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly. And we say that there is a very clear line between those two divides. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Just to follow up on that. As I understan	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta addresses you more on the wider circumstances of the Indus Basin. We are not intent on driving the principle of stability and finality to, as it were, the nth degree. We just want to make clear that the Indus Waters Treaty is not like any other treaty which can	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly. And we say that there is a very clear line between those two divides. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Just to follow up on that. As I understan what the Kishenganga Court was saying is that this was	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta addresses you more on the wider circumstances of the Indus Basin. We are not intent on driving the principle of stability and finality to, as it were, the nth degree. We just want to make clear that the Indus Waters Treaty is not like any other treaty which can simply evolve over time. It is a cornerstone instrument	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly. And we say that there is a very clear line between those two divides. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Just to follow up on that. As I understan what the Kishenganga Court was saying is that this was just a matter of standard treaty interpretation: that	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta addresses you more on the wider circumstances of the Indus Basin. We are not intent on driving the principle of stability and finality to, as it were, the nth degree. We just want to make clear that the Indus Waters Treaty is not like any other treaty which can simply evolve over time. It is a cornerstone instrument in relations between the parties.	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly. And we say that there is a very clear line between those two divides. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Just to follow up on that. As I understan what the Kishenganga Court was saying is that this was just a matter of standard treaty interpretation: that when you had a treaty in front of you with particular	and,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta addresses you more on the wider circumstances of the Indus Basin. We are not intent on driving the principle of stability and finality to, as it were, the nth degree. We just want to make clear that the Indus Waters Treaty is not like any other treaty which can simply evolve over time. It is a cornerstone instrument in relations between the parties. MR MINEAR: I don't want to belabour this point, and perhaps	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly. And we say that there is a very clear line between those two divides. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Just to follow up on that. As I understan what the Kishenganga Court was saying is that this was just a matter of standard treaty interpretation: that when you had a treaty in front of you with particular provisions, there is a certain range in which maybe	and,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta addresses you more on the wider circumstances of the Indus Basin. We are not intent on driving the principle of stability and finality to, as it were, the nth degree. We just want to make clear that the Indus Waters Treaty is not like any other treaty which can simply evolve over time. It is a cornerstone instrument in relations between the parties. MR MINEAR: I don't want to belabour this point, and perhaps this is better addressed by Professor Webb when we get	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly. And we say that there is a very clear line between those two divides. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Just to follow up on that. As I understan what the Kishenganga Court was saying is that this was just a matter of standard treaty interpretation: that when you had a treaty in front of you with particular provisions, there is a certain range in which maybe customary international law would help us understand the	and,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta addresses you more on the wider circumstances of the Indus Basin. We are not intent on driving the principle of stability and finality to, as it were, the nth degree. We just want to make clear that the Indus Waters Treaty is not like any other treaty which can simply evolve over time. It is a cornerstone instrument in relations between the parties. MR MINEAR: I don't want to belabour this point, and perhaps this is better addressed by Professor Webb when we get into treaty interpretation. But what about new	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly. And we say that there is a very clear line between those two divides. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Just to follow up on that. As I understan what the Kishenganga Court was saying is that this was just a matter of standard treaty interpretation: that when you had a treaty in front of you with particular provisions, there is a certain range in which maybe customary international law would help us understand the contours of those provisions, but the objective of the	and,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta addresses you more on the wider circumstances of the Indus Basin. We are not intent on driving the principle of stability and finality to, as it were, the nth degree. We just want to make clear that the Indus Waters Treaty is not like any other treaty which can simply evolve over time. It is a cornerstone instrument in relations between the parties. MR MINEAR: I don't want to belabour this point, and perhaps this is better addressed by Professor Webb when we get into treaty interpretation. But what about new information that comes that changes the context of the Treaty?	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly. And we say that there is a very clear line between those two divides. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Just to follow up on that. As I understan what the Kishenganga Court was saying is that this was just a matter of standard treaty interpretation: that when you had a treaty in front of you with particular provisions, there is a certain range in which maybe customary international law would help us understand the contours of those provisions, but the objective of the Court, the mandate of the Court is to interpret that treaty. It didn't turn so much on the idea that the treaty was a particular type of treaty akin to a peace	and,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta addresses you more on the wider circumstances of the Indus Basin. We are not intent on driving the principle of stability and finality to, as it were, the nth degree. We just want to make clear that the Indus Waters Treaty is not like any other treaty which can simply evolve over time. It is a cornerstone instrument in relations between the parties. MR MINEAR: I don't want to belabour this point, and perhaps this is better addressed by Professor Webb when we get into treaty interpretation. But what about new information that comes that changes the context of the Treaty?	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly. And we say that there is a very clear line between those two divides. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Just to follow up on that. As I understan what the Kishenganga Court was saying is that this was just a matter of standard treaty interpretation: that when you had a treaty in front of you with particular provisions, there is a certain range in which maybe customary international law would help us understand the contours of those provisions, but the objective of the Court, the mandate of the Court is to interpret that treaty. It didn't turn so much on the idea that the	and,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta addresses you more on the wider circumstances of the Indus Basin. We are not intent on driving the principle of stability and finality to, as it were, the nth degree. We just want to make clear that the Indus Waters Treaty is not like any other treaty which can simply evolve over time. It is a cornerstone instrument in relations between the parties. MR MINEAR: I don't want to belabour this point, and perhaps this is better addressed by Professor Webb when we get into treaty interpretation. But what about new information that comes that changes the context of the Treaty? I'm thinking of the experience in the United States	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly. And we say that there is a very clear line between those two divides. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Just to follow up on that. As I understan what the Kishenganga Court was saying is that this was just a matter of standard treaty interpretation: that when you had a treaty in front of you with particular provisions, there is a certain range in which maybe customary international law would help us understand the contours of those provisions, but the objective of the Court, the mandate of the Court is to interpret that treaty. It didn't turn so much on the idea that the treaty was a particular type of treaty akin to a peace treaty or akin to a boundary treaty.	and,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	India were to come along and say, "Let's have a look at the population density in the area of the Indus Basin", and the population density has changed dramatically in India's favour much greater population since 1960, "therefore we want more water, the Treaty should be adjusted for those purposes", we say they can't do that. The principle of stability and finality that applies to the Indus Waters Treaty requires that the bargain that was agreed in that Treaty is respected. We'll come to the reasons for that in just a moment, when I talk about the bargains and when Stephen Fietta addresses you more on the wider circumstances of the Indus Basin. We are not intent on driving the principle of stability and finality to, as it were, the nth degree. We just want to make clear that the Indus Waters Treaty is not like any other treaty which can simply evolve over time. It is a cornerstone instrument in relations between the parties. MR MINEAR: I don't want to belabour this point, and perhaps this is better addressed by Professor Webb when we get into treaty interpretation. But what about new information that comes that changes the context of the Treaty?	Kishenganga said the Court could do, and, a little further along the spectrum, the rewriting of the Treaty, or the writing-out of particular clauses of the Treaty. So I think at the end of the day there is obviously going to be a balance to be struck between the extent to which you can, as it were, properly insulate the Treaty from any subsequent developments, or whether you simply allow developments in customary international law or facts on the ground to be read into the Treaty so that the character of the Treaty changes incomprehensibly. And we say that there is a very clear line between those two divides. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Just to follow up on that. As I understan what the Kishenganga Court was saying is that this was just a matter of standard treaty interpretation: that when you had a treaty in front of you with particular provisions, there is a certain range in which maybe customary international law would help us understand the contours of those provisions, but the objective of the Court, the mandate of the Court is to interpret that treaty. It didn't turn so much on the idea that the treaty was a particular type of treaty akin to a peace	and,

22 (Pages 73 to 76)

12:00 1	Therefore that's why I was pressing you a little bit	12:03 1	periodically made public statements that have caused
2	on: just how far is this point being taken? But I think	2	concern in Pakistan that India may seek to use water as
3	you answered it in saying that you don't think it's	3	a weapon.
4	answering some of these very specific questions; it's	4	The acuteness of these concerns is illustrated by
5	simply the backdrop on which the Court is approaching	5	the fact that indeed this has risen to the level of the
6	the matter.	6	United Nations Security Council. Pakistan, for example,
7	SIR DANIEL: I think that that's right. I recall as well	7	in February 2019, communicated, in letters to the UN
8	though that the Kishenganga Court and I think this is	8	Secretary-General and the President of the Security
9	probably in the interim award, but I don't recall the	9	Council, at a point of heightened tension between the
10	paragraphs in fact made reference to an argument that	10	two countries, its concern about the weaponisation of
11	was perhaps put before them at that stage by	11	water.
12	Professor Crawford, acting for Pakistan, that it was	12	There are two documents in the core bundle and the
13	akin to a treaty of peace. We don't detect from the	13	exhibits which reference this. I don't invite you to
14	submissions that were made to the Kishenganga Court that	14	turn them up because the point is small, but I make it
15	this point was developed in the way that we've developed	15	in any event. These are Exhibits P-565 and P-566, which
16	it. So we do think that it is an important point.	16	are at core bundle tabs 17 and 18.
17	And going, Mr Chairman, to your interpretation of	17	When you come to look at those documents, you will
18	the Kishenganga Court in that paragraph 112, and	18	see and I'm here referencing P-566 at tab 18 you
19	customary international law, again, perhaps my reading	19	will see that Pakistan notes that:
20	of it is slightly different, because the Court, as	20	" senior members of the Indian Government are
21	I recall from that paragraph, was quite clear in saying,	21	threatening to use water as a weapon."
22	"There are some things that we can do by way of	22	And that:
23	interpretation because they are inherent in the Treaty".	23	" [the] long-standing legal arrangements agreed
24	So the mitigation of significant environmental harm is	24	under the Indus Waters Treaty are being imperilled."
25	one. And that's where they spoke about minimum flow and	25	That's document S/2019/172, Exhibit P-566.
	Page 77		Page 79
12:02 1	environmental flow, and it's a point that I'll come	12:05 1	And this anxiety about the weaponisation of water
2	back to.	2	runs very deep in Pakistan, as Mr Akbar noted. As
3	But the Court was also quite clear that customary	3	a downstream riparian, Pakistan is acutely and
4	international law cannot simply be read into the Treaty	4	consistently vulnerable.
5	to change the very status of the Treaty or the character	5	Although this is not an issue of which you are
6	of the Treaty. But again, Professor Webb will either	6	seised, and therefore I address it simply for purposes
7	build on what I have said or disavow me much more	7	of shining a light onto the wider context, you will also
8	eloquently tomorrow.	8	see in your core bundle a number of press reports from
9	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the dispute of	9	February this year reporting on the barrage that India
10	which you are seised in the current phase of the	10	has erected on the Ravi River, one of the Eastern
11	proceedings is not about the withdrawal from or the	11	Rivers, that has the effect of completely stopping the
12	termination of the Treaty. India has periodically made	12	flow of the Ravi River into Pakistan. And you will find
13	posturing noises to this effect, but these are not	13	these reports at Exhibits P-557 to P-561, at the core
14	a subject that you are called upon to address. But the	14	bundle tabs 9 to 13.
15	special character of the Treaty is something I will come	15	For orientation purposes, you will find various maps
16	back to in just a moment.	16	showing the rivers of the Indus Basin in our Memorial at
17	But before I do so, let me come to, Mr Chairman, the	17	page 51 and following. But Mr Fietta is going to be
18	question that you put to Mr Akbar at the end of his	18	taking you to this aspect in a little bit more detail,
	question that you put to wil Akbai at the end of his		8 J
19	submissions: the risk of India's weaponisation of water,	19	so again there is no need to turn up those maps. I just
20		19 20	
	submissions: the risk of India's weaponisation of water,		so again there is no need to turn up those maps. I just
20	submissions: the risk of India's weaponisation of water, and Pakistan's concerns about this.	20	so again there is no need to turn up those maps. I just make two observations. The first observation is that it is, in our view, at
20 21	submissions: the risk of India's weaponisation of water, and Pakistan's concerns about this. The weaponisation of water was most acutely	20 21	so again there is no need to turn up those maps. I just make two observations.
20 21 22	submissions: the risk of India's weaponisation of water, and Pakistan's concerns about this. The weaponisation of water was most acutely demonstrated by the Punjab water dispute of 1948, when	20 21 22	so again there is no need to turn up those maps. I just make two observations. The first observation is that it is, in our view, at the very least questionable whether India's complete
20 21 22 23	submissions: the risk of India's weaponisation of water, and Pakistan's concerns about this. The weaponisation of water was most acutely demonstrated by the Punjab water dispute of 1948, when the supply of water from East Punjab to West Punjab was	20 21 22 23	so again there is no need to turn up those maps. I just make two observations. The first observation is that it is, in our view, at the very least questionable whether India's complete stopping of the flow of the waters of the Ravi into
20 21 22 23 24	submissions: the risk of India's weaponisation of water, and Pakistan's concerns about this. The weaponisation of water was most acutely demonstrated by the Punjab water dispute of 1948, when the supply of water from East Punjab to West Punjab was entirely cut off at a critical juncture in the Pakistani cropping season. Since then, Indian officials have	20 21 22 23 24	so again there is no need to turn up those maps. I just make two observations. The first observation is that it is, in our view, at the very least questionable whether India's complete stopping of the flow of the waters of the Ravi into Pakistan is consistent with the Treaty. India asserts, in justification of its actions, that
20 21 22 23 24	submissions: the risk of India's weaponisation of water, and Pakistan's concerns about this. The weaponisation of water was most acutely demonstrated by the Punjab water dispute of 1948, when the supply of water from East Punjab to West Punjab was entirely cut off at a critical juncture in the Pakistani	20 21 22 23 24	so again there is no need to turn up those maps. I just make two observations. The first observation is that it is, in our view, at the very least questionable whether India's complete stopping of the flow of the waters of the Ravi into Pakistan is consistent with the Treaty.

,			
12:06 1	the waters of the Eastern Rivers are allocated	12:09 1	between India and Pakistan under the Treaty, and that is
2	exclusively to India, and that India is therefore	2	that India's assertive use of the waters of the Eastern
3	permitted by the Treaty to stop all flow of the waters	3	Rivers, without regard to downstream consequences, is
4	of these rivers into Pakistan.	4	rooted in India's appreciation that the Treaty accords
5	Pakistan reads the Treaty and the obligations under	5	to India possessory rights of some sort over the waters
6	the Treaty differently. I note, for example and this	6	of the Eastern Rivers, even to the extent of damming
7	brings me back to the Kishenganga award, although this	7	them up completely. India thus takes an absolutist
8	addressed the Western Rivers, the Neelum-Kishenganga	8	approach to its rights under Article II. India,
9	River that the Kishenganga Court endorsed the	9	however, is rather more permissive when it comes to
10	principles of "environmental flow" and "minimum flow",	10	Pakistan's rights under Article III.
11 12	to require that India ensure a minimum flow along the Kishenganga River after the diversion of that river as	11 12	This plays into Pakistan's concerns about the weaponisation of water, a concern that is rooted in what
13	part of the Kishenganga HEP project.	13	Pakistan sees as an inclination by India to rest
13	The purpose of that minimum flow requirement was to	14	relatively heavily on the rights that will avail India
15	mitigate significant harm to the downstream environment	15	under the Treaty, but to undermine the rights that will
16	of Pakistan, which otherwise would be cut off by the	16	avail Pakistan under the Treaty. And this goes to the
17	diversion of the waters from the Kishenganga River into	17	issue of the bargains at the heart of the Treaty, which
18	what became the Neelum River. You will find this	18	I will come to in a moment.
19	addressed by the Kishenganga Court in its final award at	19	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I appreciate that
20	paragraphs 112 and 115, and there is also an important	20	this may all seem rather abstract in the context of what
21	discussion about the distinction between minimum flow	21	you may perceive as a dispute simply about the
22	and environmental flow in footnote 151 of that final	22	engineering HEP design issues. But I hope, with your
23	award.	23	indulgence, to draw the threads of this together shortly
24	I interpolate here, just for a moment, that our	24	and to show why these issues are central to the
25	reading of the partial award and the final award on this	25	interpretative task of which you are engaged.
	Page 81		Page 83
12:08 1	issue is that there was some evolution in the Court's	12:11 1	I have so far painted the weaponisation concern with
2	thinking between the partial award, which was very	2	a very broad brush: the Punjab water dispute of 1948,
3	conditional, and the final award, which in paragraph 112	3	concerns about statements by Indian leaders about using
4	made a much clearer determination about the extent to	4	water as a weapon, the stopping of the flow of the Ravi.
5	which the Court was competent to read non-Treaty	5	But the reality of the weaponisation issue is far more
6	practices into the Treaty by reference to	6	nuanced, and it takes us to the heart of the issues in
7	an interpretation mandate.	7	dispute between the parties. And it was a point to
8	So in Pakistan's view, while the Treaty is clear	8	which Mr Akbar alluded, leaving me to develop.
9	that India has a right of unrestricted use of the waters	9	India is planning to construct over 200 HEPs on the
10	of the Eastern Rivers, it does not accept that India is,	10	Western Rivers. While that is a small number of dams by
11	per se, permitted to simply stop the flow of those	11	reference to the overall number of large dams in
12	waters altogether.	12	India 5,000-plus it is a very large number of dams
13	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, that's at a very	13	on relatively short stretches of the three Western
14	high level, kind of a legal appreciation. We disagree	14	Rivers that flow, with very little distance, into
15	with India's interpretation of the Treaty. When you	15	Pakistan. And on India's Western Rivers HEP programme,
16	have a look at the media reports both on the Indian and	16 17	there will be cascades of dams on the Western Rivers
17	the Pakistani side, which have been put into the record,	17	which are almost within touching distance of one another.
18 19	they are cast in much more hyperbolic terms: they are cast in terms of "water terrorism". These are not	18 19	
		20	The control of water by an upstream riparian allows the manipulation of water to potential destabilising and
20 21	issues before you in these proceedings, and I stress that I note them simply to provide relevant context and	20 21	damaging effects downstream. Dams are a means of
21	also because they are current developments: this has	21 22	controlling water. A cascade of HEPs upstream affords
23	just been happening over the course of the last months.	23	India a large amount of control over water that is
24	My second observation in respect of this issue	23	essential to Pakistan, as the downstream riparian.
25	perhaps goes more to the appreciation of the bargain	25	The storage of water, the time it takes to
23			-
	Page 82		Page 84
		<u></u>	

12:12 1	accumulate that stored water, has downstream	12:16 1	information relating to the construction of its Western
2	consequences; in the agricultural in the irrigation	2	Rivers run-of-river HEPs. This only heightens
3	season, for example. The release of water and its	3	Pakistan's concern about the potential use of India's
4	volume and timing, particularly when you have a cascade	4	HEP programme to threaten, or even exercise, control
5	of dams, has downstream consequences. The flushing of	5	over the Western Rivers.
6	sediment, rather than sluicing or other approaches to	6	India advances a permissive approach to the
7	sediment management, has downstream consequences. And	7	interpretation of the design criteria of paragraph 8 of
8	a coordinated approach across a cascade of upstream dams	8	[Annexure D of] the Treaty. It seeks to store greater
9	on relatively short stretches of river multiplies these	9	volumes of water in the operating pools of its HEPs, in
10	potential downstream effects manifold.	10	the form of pondage, than the Treaty allows. It seeks
10	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this is the real	11	to construct HEPs with outlets, spillways and power
12	heart of the weaponisation concern. Dams are a means of	12	intakes located in a manner that would enable it to
		13	
13	controlling water. How dams are designed and		manipulate the use of the water in its reservoirs to
14	constructed gives the operator possibilities to	14	•
15	manipulate the flow of water downstream, by the timing	15	permitted to do so, and it refuses to engage with
16	and cadence of that flow, in a manner that could, with	16	Pakistan on alternative designs, on designs that
17	a less than benign intent, cause downstream disaster.	17	Pakistan says would be both efficient and
18	The current and contemplated cascade of HEPs along	18	Treaty-compliant.
19	the Chenab River, for example, could potentially be	19	India wishes to proceed with the design,
20	operated in a manner that would enable the flow of water	20	*
21	to be so controlled by India that the resulting storage	21	reference to its off-the-shelf design and construction
22	of water, by all of these large dams, and the release of	22	regulations applicable to the other 5,000 large dams,
23	water could have significant damaging downstream	23	rather than by reference to the bespoke requirements of
24	effects. Coordinated release could cause downstream	24	the Treaty that were put in place precisely to address
25	flooding. Coordinated storage, and the refilling	25	and accommodate critical downstream concerns of
	Page 85		Page 87
	1 100 00		1 450 07
12:14 1	reservoirs after release, could cause downstream	12:17 1	Pakistan. And this approach comes against the
2	shortages of water at sensitive moments. Approaches to	2	background of stoppages in the flow of water, of threats
3	sediment management that were not attentive to	3	to weaponise water, and of non-compliance with the key
4	downstream effects, or were intentionally blind or	4	cooperation obligations of the Treaty.
5	reckless to them, could have significant deleterious	5	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I hope this makes
6	downstream effects.	6	my previously abstract observations a little bit more
7	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Dr Morris has	7	real. The concern over weaponisation, although it is
8	done some modelling to assess this, and he will address	8	rooted in the Punjab water dispute of 1948 and
9	this further from an engineering perspective. My point	9	statements that have been made subsequently, is
10	from a legal perspective is simple: the Treaty imposes	10	a dispute that is acutely concerned at the way in which
11	constraints on Indian Western run-of-river HEP design,	11	India is interpreting the design elements of the Treaty.
12	construction and operation. The only meaningful	12	Because the way that it does so would allow it
13	verification that the Treaty contemplates is at the	13	potentially to store more water than we say it is
14	design stage, as the construction that is built	14	entitled to, to flush when we say and the Kishenganga
15	thereafter will either allow abuse or it will constrain	15	Court says it was not entitled to, to flush its dams,
16	abuse. Apart from the Treaty's Article IX settlement	16	all with downstream consequences, and against the
17	mechanisms, the Treaty does not establish robust	17	backdrop of a political imperative that is sometimes
18	verification, policing or enforcement mechanisms.	18	articulated in India about these issues. That's the
19	India is absent from these proceedings and it has	19	real concern of weaponisation with which we are
20	set its face against the competence of the Court. For	20	concerned.
21	ten years, India frustrated Pakistan's requests to	21	THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, you've mentioned a couple of
22	undertake tours of inspection of the Kishenganga and	22	times the 1948 incident, and the Memorial of Pakistan
23	Ratle sites, even though such tours of inspection are	23	also refers to it on several occasions. My impression
23 24	expressly mandated in the Treaty. India has	23	is that India has a different approach to that incident.
		25	
25	systematically failed to provide Pakistan with key	23	In particular, as I looked at India's counter-memorial
	Daga 96		Page 88
	Page 86		1 age 66
	rage ou		1 age 66

25 (Pages 85 to 88)

12:19		in the Kishenganga case at paragraph 2.31, it made	12:22 1	and each of those different narratives may have
	2	several points that I'd be interested in your reaction	2	an element of truth in them. I suppose there are only
	3	to, or others', in the course of the week.	3	two points that are critical for our purposes that arise
	4	India notes that the incident occurred after	4	out of the Punjab water dispute.
	5	an agreement between East and West Punjab had expired.	5	One is that that is, if you like, the fons et origo,
	6	And according to India, it was West Punjab that was not	6	that is the provenance of this Treaty, because what it
	7	taking any initiative to renew that agreement, which was	7	showed was that there was a water dispute between the
	8	creating a problem between the provinces. According to	8	two states that had been left undelimited by the
	9	India, the cut-off of the water was then decided at the	9	partition of the land.
	10	Indian provincial level and did not involve the central	10	The second point is, I think, perhaps even more
	11 12	government. The cut-off, according to India, only involved supplies to two canals, and therefore the claim	11 12	important, and that is: whether this was a mistake or
	13	that it cut off in the entirety flows is not correct.	13	a misstep of a provincial government which the Federal Government in Delhi disavowed or not, what it does
	14	The stoppage, according to India, was disapproved by the	13	illustrate, absolutely clearly and unarguably, is that
	15	Indian central government, and after that government	15	an upper riparian can deny water to the lower riparian
	16	became involved, the stoppage was lifted. And all of	16	almost at the press of a button, and that they did so in
	17	this should be understood in the context of the general	17	the course of the cropping season. It was for a period
	18	disruption that partition created that, according to	18	of a month or a number of weeks, but it had dramatic
	19	India, would naturally have certain consequences that	19	downstream effects.
	20	one would have to just work past.	20	The Treaty allocates divisions of water. We say
	21	All to say that I think from India's perspective, at	21	India cannot just cut off water. There are
	22	least as I understand it, this was a relatively	22	vulnerabilities for a downstream riparian which are
	23	localised one-off incident that should not be viewed as	23	addressed by the Treaty. The Treaty is set in stone.
	24	a basis for a systematic understanding of what the 1960	24	This is why we come back to the stability and the
	25	Treaty is all about; and further, shouldn't be viewed as	25	finality of it.
				•
		Page 89		Page 91
12:21	1	a basis for understanding India's general posture in	12:24 1	But as I say, we don't need to relitigate the rights
	2	terms of allowing water to flow into Pakistan.	2	and wrongs of the 1948 dispute because the two
	3	So I welcome any reactions to that, now or later.	3	unarguable points the provenance of the Treaty and
	4	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. To the extent that	4	the power of the upstream riparian are evident
	5	there is a more substantive reaction that needs to be	5	despite the rights and wrongs of it.
	6	made, I think Mr Fietta will make that tomorrow, because	6	So, Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this is the
	7	he is in fact addressing all of this. But I do have	7	context in which the questions of construction of
	8	some immediate reaction, and I appreciate the	8	Article III and paragraph 8, of which you are seised,
	9	opportunity to address this.	9	arise. India, we say, seeks to diminish the primary
	10	With the greatest of respect to our friends	10	rule in Article III let flow, unrestricted use,
	11	opposite, they should be here to be making that	11	non-interference, no storage and to enlarge the scope
	12	argument. And I think we, on our side of the room,	12	of the hydroelectric power exception, and it seeks to do
	13	would be very interested to hear whether they would be	13	so by construing the design criteria in paragraph 8
	14	making that argument now, as it were, 14 years after	14	permissibly, flexibly and without rigour, in a manner
	15	they first made that point in the Kishenganga	15	that would materially increase the volume of water that
	16	proceedings. The very fact that they are not here calls	16	India is permitted to store, and enable India to operate
	17	into question, we say, their good faith in the	17	its HEPs in a manner that has no regard for the
	18	participation of the dispute settlement mechanisms.	18	downstream effects of that operation on the people of
	19	From the way in which you've characterised it, and	19 20	Pakistan. On the basis of permissive designs, thereofter set
	20 21	I recall it, this sounds like mitigation and excuse	20	On the basis of permissive designs, thereafter set
	22	rather than anything else. But the point is a different one. We do not need,	21 22	in concrete and operating in a cascade, the scope for India to weaponise water would be considerable.
	23	on our side of the room, to relitigate the rights and	23	Pakistan would be living constantly in the shadow of
		wrongs of the 1948 Punjah water dispute. That's in the	/4	risk
	24	wrongs of the 1948 Punjab water dispute. That's in the past. There may be competing and different narratives.	24 25	risk. We do not want, on our side of the room, to deny to
		wrongs of the 1948 Punjab water dispute. That's in the past. There may be competing and different narratives,	25	We do not want, on our side of the room, to deny to
	24			

			1
12:26 1	India what it is entitled [to] under the Treaty:	12:29 1	forcefully stated, is that design innovation, in
2		2	accordance with engineering best practices, is not
3	-	3	simply permitted by the Treaty, but is required by the
4	to do is to hold them to the mandatory design criteria	4	Treaty in the service of the Treaty. The design of
5	in paragraph 8, and to not treat the paragraph 8	5	India's run-of-river HEPs on the Western Rivers must be
6	provisions as ambulatory provisions that can be read in	6	"sound" and be capable of "satisfactory" operation.
7	any way in order to enlarge India's storage of water, to	7	Best engineering practices in the service of the Treaty
8	allow the flushing of the reservoirs, with damaging	8	is required. And Professor Webb and Dr Miles will
9	downstream effects and so on. We want to stand on the	9	return to these issues.
10	black letter of the Treaty.	10	This brings me to my third topic: the bargains at
11	The Treaty is not a water-sharing agreement that is	11	the heart of the Treaty, and the constructions of
12	open to evolution in favour of the interests of the	12	Article III and paragraph 8.
13	upper riparian on the basis of a unilateral and	13	Much as I was hoping that I would get finished
14	permissive construction of the HEP design criteria.	14	today, it becomes apparent to me that in fact I'm not
15		15	going to be finishing by lunchtime. I will go as far as
16		16	I can to the lunch break and then probably reconvene
17		17	tomorrow morning, so that we have a clear run for
18	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	18	Mr Shah's evidence.
19		19	You will know from our Memorial our submission that
20		20	there are three bargains between the parties that are
21		21	embodied by the Treaty. And these three bargains are
22	5	22	all fundamental to the settlement that was reached
23	, , , , , ,	23	between the parties in 1960, and their various moving
24		24	parts are integral to the agreement of each party to the
25	As the Kishenganga Court held in the context of its	25	Treaty as a whole.
	Page 93		Page 95
12:27 1		12:30 1	The importance of identifying these distinct
2		2	bargains is that while the dispute between the parties
3		3	of which you are seised may appear on first review to be
4	•	4	a dispute confined to the interpretation of the
5		5	paragraph 8 design criteria with respect to Indian
6	•	6	run-of-river HEPs, it is in reality a broader dispute,
7		7	and one that engages considerations of each of the
8		8	interlocking bargains embodied in the Treaty.
9		9	Once again, this appreciation will not be unfamiliar
10	•	10	to the international lawyers amongst you, but may be
11	•	11 12	less intuitive to those coming from other disciplines. The general rule of treaty interpretation, reflected in
12 13		13	Article 31 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of
14	*	13	Treaties, requires that, for interpretative purposes, it
15		15	is the Treaty as a whole that must be construed; in
16		16	other words, the Treaty in its wider context. That
17		17	includes the preamble, it includes the annexes. The
18		18	object and purpose of the Treaty is also relevant to the
19		19	construction of its moving parts. And the rules on
20	-	20	reference to supplementary materials mandate reference
21	•	21	to preparatory works and the circumstances of conclusion
22		22	of the Treaty.
23		23	Professor Webb will address this further in her
24		24	submissions on treaty interpretation tomorrow; and
25	5 5	25	Ms Rees-Evans will address this in her submissions on
	Page 94		Page 96

27 (Pages 93 to 96)

three interlocking bargains of the Treaty are engaged. And it is the picture painted by the interaction of each of these bargains that will inform the interpretative outcome. 12 We've addressed these bargains in some detail in Pakistan's Memorial, and I won't go over them closely. 13 Pakistan's Memorial, and I won't go over them closely. 14 This is notably in chapter I, at paragraphs 1.10 and following, and then in chapters 7 and 9. 15 following, and then in chapters 7 and 9. 16 Professor Webb will have more to say on one of these bargains in our consciousness. 17 bargains, the Western Rivers hydro bargain, in due course. My purpose at this point is simply to embed the bargains in our consciousness. 20 The first of the bargains is what we have described as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all settlement of the parties' dispute about the allocation of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 parition boundary. I've already addressed that; 22 Idon't propose to say anything more about that now. Page 97 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This is the agreement between the parties that is most visible in the balance struck between the parties' rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 15 We then move to paragraph (1) obligation and right: 16 Western Rivers and shall not permit any interference with these waters, except for" 18 And then we have a number of exception, in but the waters are set to he waters of the Waters Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with these waters and exception. 19 Western Rivers and shall not permit any interference with these waters and seventy any interference with the waters' means: 10 Western Rivers and shall not permit any interference with the waters' means: 11 I I I I	,			
4 these principles, the exercise of construing the design criteria in paragraph 8 is to be undertaken 5 criteria in paragraph 8 is to be undertaken 6 holistically, looking not simply at the terms of a paragraph 8 is to be undertaken 7 paragraph 8 is to be undertaken 8 three interlocking bargains of the Treaty are engaged. 9 And it is the picture painted by the interaction of each 10 of these bargains that will inform the interpretative of these bargains and the vortage of the Treaty are engaged. 12 We've addressed these hargains in some detail in a paragraph (1) and the we've addressed these bargains in some of the set bargains, the Western Rivers 7 and 9 the Standard of the Professor Webb will have more to say on one of these bargains, the Western Rivers by one one of these bargains in our conciousness. 20 The first of the bargain is what we have described as the "peace bargain", and that is the new and that now. Page 97 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have described as the "peace bargain", and that is the conceand-for-all as the peace bargain is our consciousness. 12 The western Rivers and the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with these waters. If think I should take you, at this point, back — so you'll see in [Article] III(2), the generation of hydroelectric pow as per Annexure D. So it's III(2)(d), the generation of hydroelectric pow as per Annexure D. So it's III(2)(d), the generation of hydroelectric pow as per Annexure D. So it's III(2)(d), the generation of hydroelectric pow as per Annexure D. So it's III(2)(d), the generation of hydroelectric pow as per Annexure D. So it's III(2)(d), the generation of hydroelectric pow as per Annexure D. So it's III(2)(d), the generation of hydroelectric pow as per Annexure D. So it's III(2)(d), the generation of hydroel	12:32 1	the travaux préparatoires and the origins of the Treaty,	12:35 1	
4 these principles, the exercise of construing the design 5 criteria in paragraph 8 is to be undertaken 6 holistically, looking not simply at the terms of 7 paragraph 8 but also more broadly. This is where the 8 three interlocking hapgains of the Treaty are engaged. 9 And it is the picture painted by the interaction of each 10 of these bargains that will inform the interpretative 11 outcome. 12 We've addressed these bargains in some detail in 13 Pakistan's Memorial, and I won't go over them closely. 14 This is notably in chapter 1, at paragraphs 1.10 and 15 following, and then in chapters 7 and 9. 16 Professor Webb will have more to say on one of these 17 hargains, the Western Rivers hydro brangin, in due 18 course. My purpose at this point is simply to embed the 19 bargains have the more to say on one of these 19 bargains, the Western Rivers hydro brangins in some consciousness. 20 The first of the bargains is what we have described 21 as the "peace bargain", and that is the once and-for-all 22 settlement of the paragraps that is a smost 23 of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 24 partition boundary. The arready addressed that; 25 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. 26 Page 97 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo 3 reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 4 is the agreement between the parties that is most 5 visible in the balances struck between the parties of rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers 2 and the Western Rivers and shall not permit 2 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 3 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 4 The third bargain is roomed in the rule and the 2 exception that is found in Article III and the 2 exception that is fround in Article III and the 3 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 4 the Western Rivers and shall not permit 5 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 5 directly engaged, but it ca	2	also tomorrow morning.	2	You'll find Article III at page 134 if you're
5 criteria in paragraph 8 is to be undertaken 6 holistically, looking not simply at the terms of 7 paragraph 8 but also more broadly. This is where the 8 three interlocking bargains of the Treaty are engaged. 9 And it is the picture painted by the interaction of each 10 of these bargains that will inform the interpretative outcome. 11 We've addressed these bargains in some detail in 13 Pakistan's Memorial, and I won't go over them closely. 14 This is notably in chapper 1, a prangraph 1.10 and 15 following, and then in chapters 7 and 9. 16 Professor Webb will have more to say on one of these 17 bargains, the Western Rivers hydro bargain, in due 18 course. My purpose at this point is simply to embed the 19 bargains in our consciousness. 20 The first of the bargains is what we have described at 21 as the 'pace bargain', and that is the once-and-for-all 22 settlement of the parties' dispute about the allocation 23 of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 24 partition boundary. The already addressed that; 25 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. 26 Page 97 27 Page 97 28 Page 99 29. 20 The first of the bargains is what we have described as 29 if the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 29 partition boundary. The already addressed that; 20 if the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 21 if the right of the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This is the agreement between the parties that is most 3 is the agreement between the parties that is most 4 is the agreement between the parties that is most 5 visible in the halmoe struck between the parties? 6 rights and obligation to lot flow wall waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit 29 my the right of the users of the Treaty as a whole. This 3 is the agreement between the parties that is most 4 if I law you buck to Article I, paragraph (10) 3 if the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 4 is the agreement between the parties that is most 5 visible in the balance struck between the parties of the statern Rivers 6 rights and obliga	3	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, on the basis of	3	looking at it on your electronic versions. It contains
6 holistically, looking not simply at the terms of 7 paragraph 8 but also more broadly. This is where the 8 three interlocking bargains of the Treaty are engaged. 9 And it is the picture painted by the interaction of each of these bargains that will inform the interpretative of the search of search of the search of search of the search of search of the search	4	these principles, the exercise of construing the design	4	four subparagraphs.
three interlocking bargains of the Treaty are engaged. And it is the picture painted by the interaction of each of these bargains that will inform the interpretative outcome. We've addressed these bargains is some detail in paginate of the western structure of these bargains that will inform the interpretative outcome. We've addressed these bargains is some detail in paginate of the parties of the paginate of	5	criteria in paragraph 8 is to be undertaken	5	Paragraph (1) is the right of unrestricted use:
three interlocking bargains of the Treaty are engaged. And it is the picture painted by the interaction of each of these bargains that will inform the interpretative outcome. We've addressed these bargains in some detail in pagasage of the western structure of these bargains that will inform the interpretative outcome. We've addressed these bargains in some detail in pagasage of the western structure of the bargains in some detail in pagasage of the parties that will inform the interpretative outcome. We've addressed these bargains in some detail in pagasage of the western structure of the pagasage of the pagasa	6		6	
8 three interlocking bargains of the Treaty are engaged. 9 And it is the picture painted by the interaction of each 10 of these bargains that will inform the interpretative of these bargains that will inform the interpretative outcome. 12 We've addressed these bargains in some detail in 13 Pakistaris Memorial, and I won't go over them closely. 14 This is notably in chapter 1, at paragraphs 1.10 and 15 following, and then in chapters 7 and 9. 16 Professor Webb will have more to say on one of these 17 bargains, the Western Rivers Pythot bargain in due 18 course. My purpose at this point is simply to embed the 19 bargains in our consciousness. 20 The first of the bargains is, what we have described as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all 21 as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all 22 settlement of the parties dispute about the allocation 23 of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 24 partition boundary. Twe already addressed that; 25 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. 26 Page 97 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 4 is the agreement between the parties' 5 rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers 7 and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, 8 subject to exception, to India in respect of the waters of the 11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is the one with which we are most 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers. And this bargain is cooted in the rule and the 29 exception, to Pokastin in respect of the waters of the 20 exception, to Pokastin in respect of the waters of the 21 Amexure D of the Treaty, 22 Animal already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I	7		7	those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under
And it is the picture painted by the interaction of each of these hargains that will inform the interpretative outcome. 12 We've addressed these bargains in some detail in 2 We've addressed these bargains in some detail in 3 Paksistan's Memorial, and I won't go over them closely. 14 This is notably in chapter I, at paragraphs 1.10 and 15 following, and then in chapters 7 and 9. 15 Professor Webw will have more to say on one of these bargains, the Western Rivers hydro bargain, in due 18 course. My purpose at this point is simply to embed the bargains in our consciousness. 20 The first of the bargains is what we have described 21 as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all 22 settlement of the parties' dispute about the allocation 23 of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 24 partition boundary. Ive already addressed that; 25 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. 12 Page 97 12.33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This is the agreement between the parties' rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers, and this bargain is captured, 2 subject to exception, to India in respect of the waters of the extern microscope with the waters' means: 4 If I take you back to Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is captured, 2 sessitially, by the terms of Article I and III of the other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers, and this bargain is captured, 2 sessitially, by the terms of Article as the 2 provision, but if I may, I dilete to ask you to call the eather observation to their flow which causes a change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations of water: 2 provision, but if I may, I dilete to ask you to call the eather observation to the florium. 2 in the daily drow, for example, fluctuations of water: 2 in particlar in 15(b): 2 "Any withdrawal			8	obligation to let flow under the provisions of
10 of these bargains that will inform the interpretative outcome. 11 outcome. 12 We've addressed these bargains in some detail in a Pakistan's Memorial, and I won't go over them closely. This is notably in chapter I, at paragraphs 1.10 and following, and then in chapters 7 and 9. The sis motably in chapter I, at paragraphs 1.10 and following, and then in chapters 7 and 9. The professor Webb will have more to say on one of these trapains, the Western Rivers hydro bargain in due course. My purpose at this point is simply to embed the bargains in our consciousness. 10 The first of the bargains is what we have described as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all as the "peace bargain", and that is the broader quid pro quo a reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This is the agreement between the parties of rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: 11 "India shall be under an obligation to let flow all the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters, are you'll see in [Article] III(2); the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters, are you'll see in [Article] III(2)				
11 outcome. 12 We then move to paragraph (1). 13 Pakistan's Memorial, and I won't go over them closely. 14 This is notably in chapter 1, at paragraphs 1.10 and 15 following, and then in chapters 7 and 9. 16 Professor Webb will have more to say on one of these bargains, the Western Rivers hydro bargain, in due 17 bargains, the Western Rivers hydro bargain, in due 18 course. My purpose at this point is simply to embed the bargains in our consciousness. 19 bargains in our consciousness. 20 The first of the bargains is what we have described as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all settlement of the parties' dispute about the allocation of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 partition boundary. I've already addressed that; 22 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. 12 Page 97 12.33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This is the agreement between the parties' or rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers turnstricted rights of use, subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers turnstricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the Eastern Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the Eastern Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the Eastern Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the Eastern Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, and the Western Rivers and the Western Rivers and water an obligation to let flow all the waters of the Western Rivers and shall not permit any interference with these waters, except for" 12				
12 We then move to paragraph (2). And the chapeau paragraph (2) again reinforces the paragraph (1) and londing over them closely. This is notably in chapter 1, at paragraphs 1.10 and 16 Professor Webb will have more to say on one of these bargains, the Western Rivers hydro bargain, in due course. My purpose at this point is simply to embed the bargains to consciousness. 16				
Pakistan's Memorial, and I won't go over them closely. This is notably in chapter 1, at paragraphs 1.10 and 15 following, and then in chapters 7 and 9. Professor Webb will have more to say on one of these bargains, the Western Rivers hydro bargain, in due course. My purpose at this point is simply to embed the bargains in our consciousness. The first of the bargains is what we have described as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all settlement of the parties' dispute about the allocation of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 as the "peace bargain", and that's the broader guid pro quo reflected in the terms of the Treaty say a whole. This is the agreement between the parties that is most visible in the balance struck between the parties' trights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakis this respect of the Eastern Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakis maja in sequence, essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the "Western Rivers and this there was a volume to the "Western Rivers and the Western Rivers and the Mestern Rivers and the Western				
This is notably in chapter 1, at paragraphs 1.10 and following, and then in chapters 7 and 9. Professor Webb will have more to say on one of these bargains, the Western Rivers hydro bargain, in due course. My purpose at this point is simply to embed the bargains in our consciousness. The first of the bargains is what we have described as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all settlement of the parties' dispute about the allocation of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 and the partition boundary. Tve already addressed that: I though a partition boundary. Tve already addressed that: I though a partition boundary. Tve already addressed that: I think is should tax on the parties' dispute about the allocation of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 and the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with these waters, except for" The water have a number of exception, including any interference with these waters, except for" And then we have a number of exception, including any interference with these waters, except for" And then we have a number of exception, including any interference with the waters, except for" And then we have a number of exception, including any interference with the waters of the				
following, and then in chapters 7 and 9. Professor Webb will have more to say on one of these bargains, the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with these waters, except for" The first of the bargains is what we have described as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all settlement of the parties' dispute about the allocation of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 partition boundary. I've already addressed that; I don't propose to say anything more about that now. Page 97 The second bargain is what we have termed the "Treaty bargain", and that is the broader quid pro quo reflected in the terms of the Teaty as a whole. This is the agreement between the parties' fails and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, in India shall be under an obligation to let flow all the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with these waters, with Fill can be waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit as per Annexure D. So it's III(2)(d), the generation of hydroelectric power as an exception. The first of the use of waters across the 1947 partition boundary. I've already addressed that; I don't propose to say anything more about that now. Page 97 Page 99 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo reflected in the terms of the Teaty as a whole. This is the agreement between the parties' a first is most with the seven the parties' and the Western Rivers unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakis in in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers unrestricted rights of use, and this don't water in the first of the parties and the waters of the Western R		•		
16 Professor Webb will have more to say on one of these bargains, the Western Rivers hydro bargain, in due course. My purpose at this point is simply to embed the bargains in our consciousness. 20 The first of the bargains is what we have described 21 as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all 22 settlement of the parties' dispute about the allocation of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 23 of the fights of the use of waters across the 1947 24 partition boundary. I've already addressed that; 25 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. Page 97 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo 3 reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This is the agreement between the parties' 5 visible in the balance struck between the parties' 7 and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern 9 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with these waters, except for" 11: It take you back to Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: 11 Western Rivers and the We				
17 bargains, the Western Rivers hydro bargain, in due 18 course. My purpose at this point is simply to embed the 19 bargains in our consciousness. 20 The first of the bargains is what we have described 21 as the 'peace bargain', and that is the once-and-for-all 22 settlement of the parties' dispute about the allocation 23 of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 24 partition boundary. I've already addressed that; 25 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. Page 97 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 4 is the agreement between the parties that is most 5 visible in the balance struck between the parties' 6 rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers 7 and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, 8 subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern Rivers 9 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, 10 exception, to Pakistan in respect of the Bastern 11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 Then third bargain is the once-and-for-all state of the waters of the Western Rivers and shall not permit any interference with these waters, and shall not permit any interference with these waters, except for" 15 directly bargain, and that is the once-and-for-all state of the waters of the Cartest of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters" 16 If I take you back to Article I paragraph (15) of the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: 17 (a) Any and the Western Rivers means: 28 (a) Any act of withdrawal therefron; or 29 (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume (within the practical range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: 18 the definition of interference, in particular in 15(5): 29				<u> </u>
18 course. My purpose at this point is simply to embed the bargains in our consciousness. 20 The first of the bargains is what we have described 21 as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all 22 settlement of the parties' dispute about the allocation 23 of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 24 partition boundary. Tve already addressed that; 24 I think I should take you, at this point, back so you'll see in [Article] III(2); Page 99 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo 2 reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 3 is the agreement between the parties' 6 rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the Bastern 19 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the Bastern 19 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the Agrant in the defines: 19 Provided however that an obstruction which involves on the third bargain is the one with which we are most directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the often two. This is what we have termed the 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. You will already be very familiar with these 22 Provision, but if I may, I di like to ask you to call 23 " which causes a change in the volume" Any withdrawal obstruction to the parties of the cause a change in the volume" Any withdrawal obstruction to the parties are the control of the parties and the volume of the Particle III and part 3 of 2 Provision, but if I may, I di like to ask you to call 23 " which causes a change in the volume of the Particle III and part 3 of 2 Provision, but if I may, I di like to ask you to call 23 " which causes a change in the volume of the Particle III and part 3 of 2 Provision, but if I may, I di like to ask you to		•		
19 bargains in our consciousness. 20 The first of the bargains is what we have described 21 as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all 22 settlement of the parties' dispute about the allocation 23 of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 24 partition boundary. I've already addressed that; 25 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. Page 97 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo 3 reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 4 is the agreement between the parties that is most 5 visible in the balance struck between the parties' 6 rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers 7 and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, 8 subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern 9 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, 8 subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 10 exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The whave the generation of hydroelectric pow as per Annexure D. So it's III(2)(d), the generation of hydroelectric power as an exception of hydroelectric power as an exception. 14 The we have the generation of hydroelectric power as an exception. 15 I think I should take you, at this point, back so you'll see in [Article] III(2): 16 I take you back to Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, on will see that on page 130. And it there defines: 16 Treaty which waters in the terms of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, 17 Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain', or simply the defined provided however that an obstruction which involves on an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall not be deemed to be an interference"		• •		
20 The first of the bargains is what we have described as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all settlement of the parties' dispute about the allocation of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 24 partition boundary. I've already addressed that; 25 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. Page 97 25 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. Page 97 26 you'll see in [Article] III(2): Page 99 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo 3 reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 4 is the agreement between the parties' 15 visible in the balance struck between the parties' 15 visible in the balance struck between the parties' 16 rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the Eastern 19 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 10 exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 10 ready, but terms of Articles II and III of the 10 ready, but terms of Articles II and III of the 11 ready, supplemented of course by other provisions. The third bargain is the one with which we are most 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will address. And this bargain is roted in the rule and the exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 20 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 23 which causes a change in the volume of the 12 Any withch asses a change in the volume of the 12 Any withch causes a change in the volume of the 12 Any withch causes a change in the volume of the 12 Any withch causes a change in the volume of the 12 Any withch causes a change in the volu				•
21 as the "peace bargain", and that is the once-and-for-all 22 settlement of the parties' dispute about the allocation 23 of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 24 partition boundary. I've already addressed that; 25 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. 25 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. 25 you'll see in [Article] III(2): Page 99 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 3 is the agreement between the parties that is most 2 is the agreement between the parties' 5 visible in the balance struck between the parties' 6 rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the Western Givers: unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the Western Givers: And this bargain is captured, 21 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 3 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is the one with which we are most 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 23 Then we have the generation of hydroelectric power as an exception. hydroelectric power as an exception. Inhivation of hydroelectric power as an exception. I hink is hould take you, at this point, back so you'll see in [Article] III(2): 1 Think is hould take you, at this point, back so you'll see in [Article] III(2): 1 Think is hould take you, at this point, back so you'll see in [Article] III(2): 1 Think is hould take you, at this point, back so you'll see in [Article] III(2): 1 Think is hould take you. at this point, back so you'll see in [Article] III(2): 1 Think is hould take you. at this point, back s				·
22 settlement of the parties' dispute about the allocation 23 of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 24 partition boundary. I've already addressed that; 25 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. Page 97 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This is the agreement between the parties' rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern Page 11 Western Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the Eastern Page 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is to new with which we are most directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the other two. This is what we have described as the "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 23 sper Annexure D. So it's III(2)(d), the generation on hydroelectric power as an exception. 14 I think I should take you, at this point, back so you'll see in [Article] III(2): 15 I think I should take you, at this point, back so you'll see in [Article] III(2): 16 I think I should take you, at this point, back so you'll see in [Article] III(2): 18 the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters" 19 I I think I should take you, at his poult like you'll see in [Article] III(2): 10 the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters" 11 If I take you back to Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, wh				_
23 of the rights of the use of waters across the 1947 24 partition boundary. Ive already addressed that; 25 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. Page 97 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This is the agreement between the parties' to visible in the balance struck between the parties' rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern 8 subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the Eastern 11 Western Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the other two. This is what we have described as the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply 18 the "hydro bargain is rotted in the rule and the exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 23 hydroelectric power as an exception. 14 This I should take you, at this point, back so you'll see in [Article] III(2): 15 the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters 16 the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters 17 If It as all be under an obligation to let flow all any interference with those waters 18 If I take you back to Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: 18 (a) Any act of withdrawal therefrom; or 19 (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume (within the practical range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: 19 Provided however that an obstruction which involves on an insignificant and incidental change in the v				
24 partition boundary. I've already addressed that; 25 I don't propose to say anything more about that now. Page 97 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo 3 reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 4 is the agreement between the parties that is most 5 visible in the balance struck between the parties' 6 rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers 7 and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, 8 subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern 9 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 10 exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is the one with which we are most 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply 18 the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will 19 address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 12 I think I should take you, at this point, back so you'il see in [Article] III(2): Page 99 12:37 1 "India shall be under an obligation to let flow all the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters" 15 If I take, valve be weters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters" 16 If I take you back to Article II on you will all the waters of the Western Rivers. And shall not permit any interference with those waters" 16 If I take you back to Article II on you will all the waters of the Western Rivers. 17 I'I term 'interference with				- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo 3 reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 4 is the agreement between the parties' trights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers 7 and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern 8 subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 10 exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is the one with which we are most directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply 18 the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will 19 address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 25 you'll see in [Article] III(2): Page 99 12:37 1 "India shall be under an obligation to let flow all the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit and				
Page 97 Page 97 Page 99 12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo 3 reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 4 is the agreement between the parties that is most 5 visible in the balance struck between the parties' 6 rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern 9 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 10 exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is the one with which we are most 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 Western Rivers un-of-river hydro bargain", or simply 18 the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 23 " which causes a change in the volume of the				
12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo 3 reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 4 is the agreement between the parties that is most 5 visible in the balance struck between the parties' 6 rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers 7 and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, 8 subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern 9 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to 10 exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is the one with which we are most 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply 18 the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 12:37 1 "India shall be under an obligation to let flow all the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters" 14 the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters" 15 directly on back to Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will any interference with those waters" 16 the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will any interference with those waters" 17 "India shall be under an obligation to let flow all the waters of the Western Rivers" 18 the treaty, which is a definitional section. You will any interference with those waters" 19 (a) Any act of withdrawal therefrom; or causes a change in the volume (within the practical range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: caused by bridge pier	25	I don't propose to say anything more about that now.	25	you'll see in [Article] III(2):
12:33 1 The second bargain is what we have termed the 2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo 3 reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 4 is the agreement between the parties that is most 5 visible in the balance struck between the parties' 6 rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers 7 and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, 8 subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern 9 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to 10 exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is the one with which we are most 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply 18 the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 12:37 1 "India shall be under an obligation to let flow all the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters" 14 the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters" 15 directly on back to Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will any interference with those waters" 16 the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will any interference with those waters" 17 "India shall be under an obligation to let flow all the waters of the Western Rivers" 18 the treaty, which is a definitional section. You will any interference with those waters" 19 (a) Any act of withdrawal therefrom; or causes a change in the volume (within the practical range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: caused by bridge pier		Page 97		Page 99
2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo 3 reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 4 is the agreement between the parties that is most 5 visible in the balance struck between the parties' 6 rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers 7 and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, 8 subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern 9 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 10 exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is the one with which we are most 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply 18 the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will 19 address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 2 the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters" 4 If I take you back to Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will seet that on page 130. And it there defines: 6 see that on page 130. And it there defines: 7 "The term 'interference with the waters' means: 8 (a) Any act of withdrawal therefrom; or 9 (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume (within the practical range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: 12 range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: 13 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall not be deemed to be an				
2 "Treaty bargain", and that's the broader quid pro quo 3 reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 4 is the agreement between the parties that is most 5 visible in the balance struck between the parties' 6 rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers: 7 and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, 8 subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern 9 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to 10 exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is the one with which we are most 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply 18 the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will 19 address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 2 the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit any interference with those waters" 4 If I take you back to Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will seet that on page 130. And it there defines: 8 (a) Any act of withdrawal therefrom; or 9 (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which 10 causes a change in the volume (within the practical range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: 11 range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters: 14 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall not be deemed to be an interference" 15 We are going to be coming back to Artic				
3 reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This 4 is the agreement between the parties that is most 5 visible in the balance struck between the parties' 6 rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers 7 and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, 8 subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern 9 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to 10 exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is the one with which we are most 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply 18 the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will 19 address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 3 any interference with those waters" 4 If I take you back to Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will 5 the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will 5 the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will 5 the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will 6 the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will 7 lif the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will 8 the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will 9 cause that on page 130. And it there defines: 7 "The term 'interference with the waters' means: 8 (a) Any act of withdrawal therefrom; or 9 (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which 10 causes a change in the volume in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux 11 caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall 12 provided however that an obstruction which involves on 13 an insig	12:33 1	The second bargain is what we have termed the	12:37 1	"India shall be under an obligation to let flow all
4 is the agreement between the parties that is most 5 visible in the balance struck between the parties' 6 rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers 7 and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, 8 subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern 9 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to 9 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to 10 exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is the one with which we are most 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply 18 the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will 19 address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 4 If I take you back to Article I, paragraph (15) of the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will the waters' means: (a) Any act of withdrawal therefrom; or "The term 'interference with the waters' means: (a) Any act of withdrawal therefrom; or "The term 'interference with the waters' means: (a) Any act of withdra	2		2	the waters of the Western Rivers, and shall not permit
the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will see that on page 130. And it there defines: the Treaty, which is a definition of which the waters' means: (a) Any act of withdrawal therefrom; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume in the volume of the daily flow of the waters: 12 essentially, by the terms of Articleal III of the 12 Provided however that an obstruction which involves on an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters: 13 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume in the volume in septical range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: 14 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux caused by bridge piers or a tempor	3	reflected in the terms of the Treaty as a whole. This	3	any interference with those waters"
rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. The third bargain is the one with which we are most directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the other two. This is what we have described as the "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of Annexure D of the Treaty. You will already be very familiar with these provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call see that on page 130. And it there defines: "The term 'interference with the waters' means: (a) Any act of withdrawal therefrom; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume (within the practical range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: 12 Provided however that an obstruction which involves on an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall not be deemed to be an interference" We are going to be coming back to Article I(15) quite a lot over the course of these submissions. It's critically important, the definition of interference, in particular in 15(b): "Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" Any withdrawal of water: "Any withdrawal of water: "Any withdrawal of water: " which causes a change in the volume of the	4	is the agreement between the parties that is most	4	If I take you back to Article I, paragraph (15) of
and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. The third bargain is the one with which we are most directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the other two. This is what we have described as the "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of Annexure D of the Treaty. You will already be very familiar with these provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call The term 'interference with the waters' means: (a) Any act of withdrawal therefrom; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume (within the practical range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: Provided however that an obstruction which involves on an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall not be deemed to be an interference" We are going to be coming back to Article I(15) quite a lot over the course of these submissions. It's critically important, the definition of interference, in particular in 15(b): "Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" Any withdrawal of water: " which causes a change in the volume of the	5	visible in the balance struck between the parties'	5	the Treaty, which is a definitional section. You will
subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. The third bargain is the one with which we are most directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the other two. This is what we have described as the "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of Annexure D of the Treaty. You will already be very familiar with these provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call Any act of withdrawal therefrom; or (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which causes a change in the volume (within the practical range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: 12 Provided however that an obstruction which involves on 13 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of 14 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall not be deemed to be an interference" We are going to be coming back to Article I(15) We are going to be coming back to Article I(15) address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 8 (a) Any act of withdrawal distriction to their flow which 24 causes a change in the volume (within the practical 25 Provided however that an obstruction to the daily flow of the waters: 26 (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which 27 (b) Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" 28 (a) Any act of withir the volume (within the practical 29 (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which 30 (a) Any act of withir the volume in the volume in the volume in the volu	6	rights and obligations in respect of the Eastern Rivers	6	see that on page 130. And it there defines:
9 Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to 10 exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the 11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is the one with which we are most 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply 18 the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will 19 address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 9 (b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which 10 causes a change in the volume (within the practical 11 range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: 12 Provided however that an obstruction which involves on 13 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of 14 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux 15 caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall 16 not be deemed to be an interference" 17 We are going to be coming back to Article I(15) 18 quite a lot over the course of these submissions. It's 19 critically important, the definition of interference, in 20 particular in 15(b): 21 Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" 22 Any withdrawal of water: 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 24 Any withdrawal of water: 25 " which causes a change in the volume of the	7	and the Western Rivers: unrestricted rights of use,	7	"The term 'interference with the waters' means:
20 exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. The third bargain is the one with which we are most directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the other two. This is what we have described as the "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of Annexure D of the Treaty. You will already be very familiar with these provisions, and this bargain is necessary to the waters: 10 causes a change in the volume (within the practical range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: 11 range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: 12 Provided however that an obstruction which involves on an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters: 13 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow of the waters: 14 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall not be deemed to be an interference" 15 We are going to be coming back to Article I(15) quite a lot over the course of these submissions. It's critically important, the definition of interference, in particular in 15(b): 20 particular in 15(b): 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 23 "Any withdrawal of water: 24 Any withch causes a change in the volume of the	8	subject to exception, to India in respect of the Eastern	8	(a) Any act of withdrawal therefrom; or
11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is the one with which we are most 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply 18 the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will 19 address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 20 range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: 24 Provided however that an obstruction which involves on 25 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of 26 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux 26 caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall 27 not be deemed to be an interference" 28 We are going to be coming back to Article I(15) 29 quite a lot over the course of these submissions. It's 20 particular in 15(b): 21 Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" 22 Any withdrawal of water: 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 24 The third bargain is captured. 25 Provided however that an obstruction which involves on 26 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of 27 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux 28 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux 29 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux 29 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of 20 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux 29 provision to a temporary by-pass shall 20 provision be deemed to be an interference" 20 Provided however that an obstruction which involves on 20 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of 21 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux 29 provision the volume of 20 provi	9	Rivers; unrestricted rights of use, subject to	9	(b) Any man-made obstruction to their flow which
11 Western Rivers. And this bargain is captured, 12 essentially, by the terms of Articles II and III of the 13 Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. 14 The third bargain is the one with which we are most 15 directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the 16 other two. This is what we have described as the 17 "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply 18 the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will 19 address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 20 range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters: 24 Provided however that an obstruction which involves on 25 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of 26 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux 26 caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall 27 not be deemed to be an interference" 28 We are going to be coming back to Article I(15) 29 quite a lot over the course of these submissions. It's 20 particular in 15(b): 21 Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" 22 Any withdrawal of water: 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 24 The third bargain is captured. 25 Provided however that an obstruction which involves on 26 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of 27 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux 28 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux 29 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux 29 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of 20 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux 29 provision to a temporary by-pass shall 20 provision be deemed to be an interference" 20 Provided however that an obstruction which involves on 20 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of 21 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux 29 provision the volume of 20 provi	10	exception, to Pakistan in respect of the waters of the	10	causes a change in the volume (within the practical
Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. The third bargain is the one with which we are most directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the other two. This is what we have described as the "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of Annexure D of the Treaty. You will already be very familiar with these provisions, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 13 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall not be deemed to be an interference" We are going to be coming back to Article I(15) quite a lot over the course of these submissions. It's critically important, the definition of interference, in particular in 15(b): "Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" Any withdrawal of water: 22 Any withdrawal of water: " which causes a change in the volume of the	11		11	range of measurement) of the daily flow of the waters:
Treaty, supplemented of course by other provisions. The third bargain is the one with which we are most directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the other two. This is what we have described as the "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of Annexure D of the Treaty. You will already be very familiar with these provisions, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 13 an insignificant and incidental change in the volume of the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall not be deemed to be an interference" We are going to be coming back to Article I(15) quite a lot over the course of these submissions. It's critically important, the definition of interference, in particular in 15(b): "Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" Any withdrawal of water: 22 Any withdrawal of water: " which causes a change in the volume of the			12	Provided however that an obstruction which involves only
The third bargain is the one with which we are most directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the other two. This is what we have described as the "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of Annexure D of the Treaty. You will already be very familiar with these provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 14 the daily flow, for example, fluctuations due to afflux caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall not be deemed to be an interference" We are going to be coming back to Article I(15) quite a lot over the course of these submissions. It's critically important, the definition of interference, in particular in 15(b): "Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" Any withdrawal of water: " which causes a change in the volume of the		• •	13	
directly engaged, but it cannot be detached from the other two. This is what we have described as the "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of Annexure D of the Treaty. You will already be very familiar with these provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call at caused by bridge piers or a temporary by-pass shall not be deemed to be an interference" We are going to be coming back to Article I(15) quite a lot over the course of these submissions. It's critically important, the definition of interference, in particular in 15(b): "Any withdrawal of water: Any withdrawal of water: " which causes a change in the volume of the				-
other two. This is what we have described as the "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of Annexure D of the Treaty. You will already be very familiar with these provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 16 not be deemed to be an interference" We are going to be coming back to Article I(15) quite a lot over the course of these submissions. It's critically important, the definition of interference, in particular in 15(b): "Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" Any withdrawal of water: " which causes a change in the volume of the		-		-
17 "Western Rivers run-of-river hydro bargain", or simply 18 the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will 19 address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the 20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 26 The We are going to be coming back to Article II(15) 27 Runie a lot over the course of these submissions. It's 28 critically important, the definition of interference, in 29 particular in 15(b): 20 particular in 15(b): 21 Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" 22 Any withdrawal of water: 23 " which causes a change in the volume of the				
the "hydro bargain" for short, which Professor Webb will address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of Annexure D of the Treaty. You will already be very familiar with these provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 18 quite a lot over the course of these submissions. It's critically important, the definition of interference, in particular in 15(b): "Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" Any withdrawal of water: " which causes a change in the volume of the				
address. And this bargain is rooted in the rule and the exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of Annexure D of the Treaty. You will already be very familiar with these provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 19 critically important, the definition of interference, in 20 particular in 15(b): 21 "Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" 22 Any withdrawal of water: 23 " which causes a change in the volume of the				
20 exception that is found in Article III and Part 3 of 21 Annexure D of the Treaty. 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 20 particular in 15(b): 21 "Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" 22 Any withdrawal of water: 23 " which causes a change in the volume of the				-
Annexure D of the Treaty. 21 "Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" 22 You will already be very familiar with these 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 21 "Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow" 22 Any withdrawal of water: 23 " which causes a change in the volume of the				
You will already be very familiar with these 22 Any withdrawal of water: 23 provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 23 " which causes a change in the volume of the		-		-
provision, but if I may, I'd like to ask you to call 23 " which causes a change in the volume of the				-
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-
Δτ und up, or otherwise we can just fook at it on the 1 Δτ ually how of the waters				
25 screen. I hope we have control of the screen so we can 25 And if I may, just to embed in your consciousness,				-
25 Serven. I hope we have control of the serven so we can 25 And it I may, just to embed in your consciousness,	23	sereen. I hope we have control of the sereen so we can	2.5	1 man, just to emoca in your consciousness,
Page 98 Page 100		Page 98		Page 100

28 (Pages 97 to 100)

12:38 1 just point out the reference to "the daily flow of water", which is a rather important consideration.		
2 water", which is a rather important consideration.	12:41 1	has unrestricted use, subject to the provisions of
•	2	Annexure D.
I then take you back again to Article III.	3	Let me just highlight a point that Professor Webb
4 Article III, paragraph (3) is a rather important	4	will come back to. We see already, by reference to
5 provision because Article III, paragraph (3) actually	5	Article III and to Annexure D, that we've got
6 deals with Eastern Rivers as well:	6	a statement of the rule and we have a statement of
7 "Pakistan shall have the unrestricted use of all	7	an exception. And this is going to be very important
8 waters originating from sources other than the Eastern	8	when it comes to the interpretative approach to the
9 Rivers which are delivered by Pakistan into The Ravi or	9	interpretation of the rule and of the exception. But
The Sutlej, and India shall not make use of these	10	I will leave Professor Webb to address those rather more
11 waters."	11	fully.
So this is a rather interesting provision which goes	12	We then have paragraph 2 of Annexure D, which
back to our concerns around the Eastern Rivers issue:	13	contains a number of definitions, many of which will be
that Pakistan shall have unrestricted use of all the	14	critical for our purposes. I note that there are some
waters from sources other than the Eastern Rivers which	15	definitions that are not given. So, for example,
are delivered by Pakistan into the Ravi and Sutlej,	16	paragraph 2 does not define "settled headwork features"
which are both Eastern Rivers, and India shall not make	17	of the dams, there is no definition of "freeboard",
use of the waters. I don't need to make any submissions	18	there is no definition of "outlets", there is no
on them unless you have questions, but it's	19	definition of "spillways" or "intakes", et cetera.
an interesting provision to highlight.	20	I note also that there are other concepts that are
Then paragraph (4) is also rather important:	21	also not defined because they are evidently intended to
"Except as provided in Annexures D and E, India	22	permit design appreciations to be made. And this comes
shall not store any water of, or construct any storage	23	back, Mr Chairman, to your question of the scope of the
works on, the Western Rivers."	24	interpretive exercise.
So the general rule is: no storage. The only	25	So, for example, terms or phrases that you will be
Page 101		Page 103
12:39 1 exception to the "no storage" provisions are either in	12:43 1	already be familiar with: "sound and economical design",
2 Annexure D or Annexure E. Annexure E addresses storage	2	there is no definition of "sound and economical" here;
dams; Annexure D deals with our run-of-river dams.	3	"satisfactory construction and operation of the works",
4 Now, if I may then invite you to turn to Annexure D,	4	there is no definition of that here.
5 which you will find at page 170 of your electronic	5	I note, just for completeness, that the term
6 version. It's on the screen; you have it in hard copy	6	"works", with a lower-case W, is also not defined,
7 as well. I don't propose to go through these provisions	7	olthough "Ctomogo Wombo" is defined electrican in the
	~	although "Storage Works" is defined elsewhere in the
8 in detail, largely because it would take much too much	8	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage
9 time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing	9	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at
 time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But 	9 10	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the
 time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. 	9 10 11	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have
 time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which 	9 10 11 12	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see
 time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which addresses the scope of application: the "Generation of 	9 10 11 12 13	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see reference to lots of different kinds of works. So there
time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which addresses the scope of application: the "Generation of Hydro-Electric Power by India on the Western Rivers".	9 10 11 12 13 14	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see reference to lots of different kinds of works. So there is no magic in the term "works".
time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which addresses the scope of application: the "Generation of Hydro-Electric Power by India on the Western Rivers". Then there is the subheading "Article III (2)(d)". So	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see reference to lots of different kinds of works. So there is no magic in the term "works". But looking at the definitions in paragraph 2,
time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which addresses the scope of application: the "Generation of Hydro-Electric Power by India on the Western Rivers". Then there is the subheading "Article III (2)(d)". So this is linked to Article III, paragraph (2)(d), the	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see reference to lots of different kinds of works. So there is no magic in the term "works". But looking at the definitions in paragraph 2, I note and again, this is something that
time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which addresses the scope of application: the "Generation of Hydro-Electric Power by India on the Western Rivers". Then there is the subheading "Article III (2)(d)". So this is linked to Article III, paragraph (2)(d), the hydro exception: rather important.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see reference to lots of different kinds of works. So there is no magic in the term "works". But looking at the definitions in paragraph 2, I note and again, this is something that Professor Webb will come back to I note that these
time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which addresses the scope of application: the "Generation of Hydro-Electric Power by India on the Western Rivers". Then there is the subheading "Article III (2)(d)". So this is linked to Article III, paragraph (2)(d), the hydro exception: rather important. Then we have paragraph 1:	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see reference to lots of different kinds of works. So there is no magic in the term "works". But looking at the definitions in paragraph 2, I note and again, this is something that Professor Webb will come back to I note that these are often bespoke definitions for purposes of the
time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which addresses the scope of application: the "Generation of Hydro-Electric Power by India on the Western Rivers". Then there is the subheading "Article III (2)(d)". So this is linked to Article III, paragraph (2)(d), the hydro exception: rather important. Then we have paragraph 1: "The provisions of this Annexure shall apply with	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see reference to lots of different kinds of works. So there is no magic in the term "works". But looking at the definitions in paragraph 2, I note and again, this is something that Professor Webb will come back to I note that these are often bespoke definitions for purposes of the Treaty. So terms such as "Dead Storage Level", defined
time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which addresses the scope of application: the "Generation of Hydro-Electric Power by India on the Western Rivers". Then there is the subheading "Article III (2)(d)". So this is linked to Article III, paragraph (2)(d), the hydro exception: rather important. Then we have paragraph 1: "The provisions of this Annexure shall apply with respect to the use by India of the waters of the Western	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see reference to lots of different kinds of works. So there is no magic in the term "works". But looking at the definitions in paragraph 2, I note and again, this is something that Professor Webb will come back to I note that these are often bespoke definitions for purposes of the Treaty. So terms such as "Dead Storage Level", defined here, "Dead Storage" and "Dead Storage Level" in
time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which addresses the scope of application: the "Generation of Hydro-Electric Power by India on the Western Rivers". Then there is the subheading "Article III (2)(d)". So this is linked to Article III, paragraph (2)(d), the hydro exception: rather important. Then we have paragraph 1: "The provisions of this Annexure shall apply with respect to the use by India of the waters of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydro-electric power under	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see reference to lots of different kinds of works. So there is no magic in the term "works". But looking at the definitions in paragraph 2, I note and again, this is something that Professor Webb will come back to I note that these are often bespoke definitions for purposes of the Treaty. So terms such as "Dead Storage Level", defined here, "Dead Storage" and "Dead Storage Level" in paragraph 2(a), or "Pondage", defined in paragraph 2(c),
time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which addresses the scope of application: the "Generation of Hydro-Electric Power by India on the Western Rivers". Then there is the subheading "Article III (2)(d)". So this is linked to Article III, paragraph (2)(d), the hydro exception: rather important. Then we have paragraph 1: "The provisions of this Annexure shall apply with respect to the use by India of the waters of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydro-electric power under the provisions of Article III (2)(d) and, subject to the	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see reference to lots of different kinds of works. So there is no magic in the term "works". But looking at the definitions in paragraph 2, I note and again, this is something that Professor Webb will come back to I note that these are often bespoke definitions for purposes of the Treaty. So terms such as "Dead Storage Level", defined here, "Dead Storage" and "Dead Storage Level" in paragraph 2(a), or "Pondage", defined in paragraph 2(c), or, very importantly, "Firm Power", described in
time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which addresses the scope of application: the "Generation of Hydro-Electric Power by India on the Western Rivers". Then there is the subheading "Article III (2)(d)". So this is linked to Article III, paragraph (2)(d), the hydro exception: rather important. Then we have paragraph 1: "The provisions of this Annexure shall apply with respect to the use by India of the waters of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydro-electric power under the provisions of Article III (2)(d) and, subject to the provisions of this Annexure, such use shall be	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see reference to lots of different kinds of works. So there is no magic in the term "works". But looking at the definitions in paragraph 2, I note and again, this is something that Professor Webb will come back to I note that these are often bespoke definitions for purposes of the Treaty. So terms such as "Dead Storage Level" in paragraph 2(a), or "Pondage", defined in paragraph 2(c), or, very importantly, "Firm Power", described in paragraph 2(i), these are bespoke terms of the Treaty.
time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which addresses the scope of application: the "Generation of Hydro-Electric Power by India on the Western Rivers". Then there is the subheading "Article III (2)(d)". So this is linked to Article III, paragraph (2)(d), the hydro exception: rather important. Then we have paragraph 1: "The provisions of this Annexure shall apply with respect to the use by India of the waters of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydro-electric power under the provisions of Article III (2)(d) and, subject to the provisions of this Annexure, such use shall be unrestricted"	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see reference to lots of different kinds of works. So there is no magic in the term "works". But looking at the definitions in paragraph 2, I note and again, this is something that Professor Webb will come back to I note that these are often bespoke definitions for purposes of the Treaty. So terms such as "Dead Storage Level" in paragraph 2(a), or "Pondage", defined in paragraph 2(c), or, very importantly, "Firm Power", described in paragraph 2(i), these are bespoke terms of the Treaty. They are different from the normal engineering use of
time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which addresses the scope of application: the "Generation of Hydro-Electric Power by India on the Western Rivers". Then there is the subheading "Article III (2)(d)". So this is linked to Article III, paragraph (2)(d), the hydro exception: rather important. Then we have paragraph 1: "The provisions of this Annexure shall apply with respect to the use by India of the waters of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydro-electric power under the provisions of Article III (2)(d) and, subject to the provisions of this Annexure, such use shall be	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see reference to lots of different kinds of works. So there is no magic in the term "works". But looking at the definitions in paragraph 2, I note and again, this is something that Professor Webb will come back to I note that these are often bespoke definitions for purposes of the Treaty. So terms such as "Dead Storage Level" in paragraph 2(a), or "Pondage", defined in paragraph 2(c), or, very importantly, "Firm Power", described in paragraph 2(i), these are bespoke terms of the Treaty.
time to do so, and because this is what we will be doing a lot of over the course of the next few days. But I would like just to quickly orientate us all to them. So we have the title [above] paragraph 1, which addresses the scope of application: the "Generation of Hydro-Electric Power by India on the Western Rivers". Then there is the subheading "Article III (2)(d)". So this is linked to Article III, paragraph (2)(d), the hydro exception: rather important. Then we have paragraph 1: "The provisions of this Annexure shall apply with respect to the use by India of the waters of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydro-electric power under the provisions of Article III (2)(d) and, subject to the provisions of this Annexure, such use shall be unrestricted"	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Treaty, but we are not here concerned with storage works. You can see, for example, if you have a look at Appendix D.II I don't invite you to do so at the moment; this is a transcript point but if you have a look at Appendix D.II at paragraph 4, you will see reference to lots of different kinds of works. So there is no magic in the term "works". But looking at the definitions in paragraph 2, I note and again, this is something that Professor Webb will come back to I note that these are often bespoke definitions for purposes of the Treaty. So terms such as "Dead Storage Level" in paragraph 2(a), or "Pondage", defined in paragraph 2(c), or, very importantly, "Firm Power", described in paragraph 2(i), these are bespoke terms of the Treaty. They are different from the normal engineering use of

29 (Pages 101 to 104)

,			
12:44 1	I will leave Professor Webb to address this. But	12:48 1	minimum mean discharge as the formula for calculation
2	I note simply, again as a transcript reference, that if	2	and how it relates to the average discharge on the basis
3	you have a look at our Memorial at paragraph 8.12, or	3	of the given formula.
4	9.34 to 9.36, and again at paragraph 11.8, you will see	4	One point that I would, though, like to note is that
5	that this issue of the bespoke terms is addressed there.	5	it rests on data from the longest available period. You
6	I run through just quickly, to identify important	6	see this towards the end of that subparagraph:
7	terms which my colleagues will come back to, the	7	"The studies will be based on data for as long
8	definition of "Dead Storage" in paragraph (a); the	8	a period as available but may be limited to the latest
9	definition of "Live Storage" in paragraph (b); the	9	5 years in the case of Small Plants"
10	definition of "Pondage" in paragraph (c).	10	We are not concerned with that:
11	I note here that this defines "Pondage" and what	11	" and to the latest 25 years in the case of other
12	it's for. But there is an important question, which	12	Plants"
13	Dr Miles will come on to deal with, and that is: what	13	We are concerned with other plants. So in
14	role, if any, does this definitional provision have to	14	principle, the firm power calculation is to be based on
15	do with the calculation of the maximum allowable pondage	15	the latest 25 years of data, or in fact the longest
16	under paragraph 8(c)? So we've got an important	16	period for which data is available. And again, Dr Miles
17	question of the interaction between the definitional	17	will come back to that.
18	provision in 2(c) and the calculation matrix in	18	Then in paragraph (j), we've got the definition of
19	paragraph 8(c).	19	"Secondary Power".
20	We've then got the definition of "Full Pondage Level" in 2(d); "Surcharge Storage" which you will	20	Now, I would like from that, in this rapid canter through, to jump to Part 3, which is paragraph 8:
21 22	hear a little bit about in the context of freeboard from	21 22	paragraph 8 heads up Part 3. And you will see that the
23	Dr Miles in paragraph (e). Other provisions: (f),	23	heading of Part 3 is "New Run-of-River Plants". So
23	"Operating Pool"; the definition of a "Run-of-River	23 24	that's what we are concerned with: new run-of-river
25	Plant" as a plant "without Live Storage except for	25	plants. And the chapeau of paragraph 8 is the essential
23	Traine as a plant without Live Storage except for	23	plants. And the chapeau of paragraph 8 is the essential
	Page 105		Page 107
12:46 1	Pondage", for our purposes, in paragraph (g); the issue	12:49 1	starting point:
2	of the "Regulating Basin" in paragraph (h), which is not	2	"Except as provided for in Paragraph 18"
3	relevant for our purposes.	3	We are not concerned with paragraph 18:
4	And then, just so you can underline it or put a mark	4	" the design"
5	against it now, there is the definition of "Firm Power"	5	And just to draw your attention, this is focused on
6	in paragraph 2(i). You will hear a lot about this. And	6	the design of the plant. This is not focused on the
7	the definition of "Firm Power" is integral to the	7	construction or on the operation; this is at the nascent
8	calculation of pondage because that is written into the	8	stage.
9	very core of paragraph 8(c): it says "for [the purposes	9	" the design of any new Run-of-River Plant
10	of] Firm Power". So you will have from Dr Miles, and	10	shall conform to the following criteria:"
11	perhaps from others, a quite close look at the	11	These are mandatory criteria: not "may conform" or
12	definition of "Firm Power", and how it is to be	12	not "shall be informed by", but "shall conform". So the
13	calculated, and you will see that at the heart of our	13	chapeau to paragraph 8 makes it quite clear that the
14	arguments on pondage.	14	design of a new run-of-river plant "shall conform" to
15	Dr Blackmore, I wasn't sure whether you are itching	15	the new enumerated criteria.
16	to come in on that point, or whether I just note your	16	Just to identify what the shape of Part 3 is, and
17	elevated interest, and you will come back with Dr Miles	17	then I'll come back to paragraph 8, it deals with
18	in due course.	18	a number of different elements. So we've got
19	DR BLACKMORE: (Inaudible) firmly in my seat!	19	[paragraph] 8, which is the mandatory design criteria.
20	SIR DANIEL: I think that its an example of firm power,	20	We've got then exchange of information and disputes
21	is it?! Yes.	21	about conformity, which are addressed in paragraphs 9 to
22	There are a couple of points that I would note just	22	12. We've got a provision on emergency repairs in
23 24	about firm power, apart from the fact that it's at the heart of the calculation of maximum allowable pondage.	23 24	paragraph 13. We've then got a number of paragraphs in Part 3 which are focused on operation: that's
25	I'm going to leave others to unpack the concept of the	24 25	paragraphs 14 to 17. And then we've got the provisions
23	1 m going to leave offices to unpack the concept of the	23	paragraphs 14 to 17. And then we ve got the provisions
	Page 106		Page 108

30 (Pages 105 to 108)

10.51 1		10.74	
12:51 1	dealing with small plants: that's at paragraphs 18	12:54 1	operation.
2	to 23.	2	I pause on paragraph 16 simply to underscore,
3	But our focus is mostly going to be on paragraph 8. There will be some important discussion to be had about	3	as I've done with respect to paragraph 15, the reference to the period of 24 hours there, because these are
4 5	paragraph 15 and the operational dimension, and how	4 5	peaking plants that operate on the basis of a 24-hour
6	that's relevant to design.	6	cycle. And I note also some of the various flexibility
7	If we have a look again though at paragraph 8, just	7	provisions in paragraph 15, which amount to exceptions,
8	to canter through them. So the mandatory design	8	or operational latitude.
9	criteria are set out in 8(a) through to (g), and (a),	9	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, that's all
10	(c), (d), (e) and (f) are the subject of particular	10	I propose to say about the detail of these provisions.
11	enquiry by the Court. As you will have seen from our	11	You're going to hear a lot more about them in due
12	Memorial, paragraph (b) is also relevant to the	12	course. My purpose here is simply to focus on
13	interpretation of paragraph (a), we say.	13	orientation at the moment, and to refresh our memories,
14	Very quickly, just to run through paragraph (a):	14	but we will be returning to all of this.
15	"The works themselves shall not be capable of	15	With that said, let me, just in the last few moments
16	raising artificially the water level in the Operating	16	that I have for this morning's session, come back to the
17	Pool"	17	third of the bargains that is at the heart of the
18	This is particularly relevant to the issue of	18	Treaty: the Western Rivers hydro bargain.
19	freeboard, but it's more widely relevant to the	19	This is where the Western Rivers hydro bargain is
20	philosophy behind paragraph 8, which I will come to in	20	located: in Article III, paragraphs (1), (2) and (4) of
21	just a moment.	21	the Treaty, which establishes the general rule let
22	Paragraph (b) provides that:	22	flow, unrestricted use, non-interference, no storage
23	"The design of the works shall take account of the	23	and the exceptions in Article III, paragraphs (2)(d) and
24	requirements of Surcharge Storage and Secondary Power."	24	(4), which look forward to Annexure D. The general
25	We then have paragraph (c), which is going to be	25	rule, III(1), III(2) and III(4): let flow, unrestricted
	Page 109		Page 111
10.50		10.55	
	absolutely critical to your task, which addresses the		
12:52 1		12:55 1	use, non-interference, no storage; the exception for
2	calculation of:	2	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and
2 3	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not	2 3	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4).
2 3 4	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power."	2 3 4	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the
2 3 4 5	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of	2 3 4 5	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the
2 3 4 5 6	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i).	2 3 4 5 6	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the
2 3 4 5 6 7	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d):	2 3 4 5 6 7	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which addresses outlets generally, and provides controlling	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means of interpretation. It is not simply that the provisions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which addresses outlets generally, and provides controlling context for the interpretation of paragraphs (e) and (f)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means of interpretation. It is not simply that the provisions of paragraph 8 of Annexure D are not hermetically sealed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which addresses outlets generally, and provides controlling context for the interpretation of paragraphs (e) and (f) as well. Paragraph (e) deals with gated spillways;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means of interpretation. It is not simply that the provisions of paragraph 8 of Annexure D are not hermetically sealed from other parts of the Treaty: it is that the mandatory
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which addresses outlets generally, and provides controlling context for the interpretation of paragraphs (e) and (f) as well. Paragraph (e) deals with gated spillways; paragraph (f) with power intakes; and then paragraph (g)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means of interpretation. It is not simply that the provisions of paragraph 8 of Annexure D are not hermetically sealed from other parts of the Treaty: it is that the mandatory design criteria of paragraph 8 are a cog, a moving cog,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which addresses outlets generally, and provides controlling context for the interpretation of paragraphs (e) and (f) as well. Paragraph (e) deals with gated spillways;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means of interpretation. It is not simply that the provisions of paragraph 8 of Annexure D are not hermetically sealed from other parts of the Treaty: it is that the mandatory
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which addresses outlets generally, and provides controlling context for the interpretation of paragraphs (e) and (f) as well. Paragraph (e) deals with gated spillways; paragraph (f) with power intakes; and then paragraph (g) with special site requirements, which we don't need to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means of interpretation. It is not simply that the provisions of paragraph 8 of Annexure D are not hermetically sealed from other parts of the Treaty: it is that the mandatory design criteria of paragraph 8 are a cog, a moving cog, in the wider mechanism of the Treaty and the balance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which addresses outlets generally, and provides controlling context for the interpretation of paragraphs (e) and (f) as well. Paragraph (e) deals with gated spillways; paragraph (f) with power intakes; and then paragraph (g) with special site requirements, which we don't need to address.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means of interpretation. It is not simply that the provisions of paragraph 8 of Annexure D are not hermetically sealed from other parts of the Treaty: it is that the mandatory design criteria of paragraph 8 are a cog, a moving cog, in the wider mechanism of the Treaty and the balance that was struck between the parties when they signed the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which addresses outlets generally, and provides controlling context for the interpretation of paragraphs (e) and (f) as well. Paragraph (e) deals with gated spillways; paragraph (f) with power intakes; and then paragraph (g) with special site requirements, which we don't need to address. Then just very briefly as you will hear some more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means of interpretation. It is not simply that the provisions of paragraph 8 of Annexure D are not hermetically sealed from other parts of the Treaty: it is that the mandatory design criteria of paragraph 8 are a cog, a moving cog, in the wider mechanism of the Treaty and the balance that was struck between the parties when they signed the Treaty in 1960.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which addresses outlets generally, and provides controlling context for the interpretation of paragraphs (e) and (f) as well. Paragraph (e) deals with gated spillways; paragraph (f) with power intakes; and then paragraph (g) with special site requirements, which we don't need to address. Then just very briefly as you will hear some more about this in due course, and I think it's in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means of interpretation. It is not simply that the provisions of paragraph 8 of Annexure D are not hermetically sealed from other parts of the Treaty: it is that the mandatory design criteria of paragraph 8 are a cog, a moving cog, in the wider mechanism of the Treaty and the balance that was struck between the parties when they signed the Treaty in 1960. Mr Chairman, I have got another big substantive part
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which addresses outlets generally, and provides controlling context for the interpretation of paragraphs (e) and (f) as well. Paragraph (e) deals with gated spillways; paragraph (f) with power intakes; and then paragraph (g) with special site requirements, which we don't need to address. Then just very briefly as you will hear some more about this in due course, and I think it's in the witness statement that's been provided paragraphs 9	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means of interpretation. It is not simply that the provisions of paragraph 8 of Annexure D are not hermetically sealed from other parts of the Treaty: it is that the mandatory design criteria of paragraph 8 are a cog, a moving cog, in the wider mechanism of the Treaty and the balance that was struck between the parties when they signed the Treaty in 1960. Mr Chairman, I have got another big substantive part to go, which I think I will commence tomorrow morning.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which addresses outlets generally, and provides controlling context for the interpretation of paragraphs (e) and (f) as well. Paragraph (e) deals with gated spillways; paragraph (f) with power intakes; and then paragraph (g) with special site requirements, which we don't need to address. Then just very briefly as you will hear some more about this in due course, and I think it's in the witness statement that's been provided paragraphs 9 to 11 deal with the provision of information in respect	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means of interpretation. It is not simply that the provisions of paragraph 8 of Annexure D are not hermetically sealed from other parts of the Treaty: it is that the mandatory design criteria of paragraph 8 are a cog, a moving cog, in the wider mechanism of the Treaty and the balance that was struck between the parties when they signed the Treaty in 1960. Mr Chairman, I have got another big substantive part to go, which I think I will commence tomorrow morning. Obviously I'm happy to take any questions that you may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which addresses outlets generally, and provides controlling context for the interpretation of paragraphs (e) and (f) as well. Paragraph (e) deals with gated spillways; paragraph (f) with power intakes; and then paragraph (g) with special site requirements, which we don't need to address. Then just very briefly as you will hear some more about this in due course, and I think it's in the witness statement that's been provided paragraphs 9 to 11 deal with the provision of information in respect of these design criteria and objection in the case of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means of interpretation. It is not simply that the provisions of paragraph 8 of Annexure D are not hermetically sealed from other parts of the Treaty: it is that the mandatory design criteria of paragraph 8 are a cog, a moving cog, in the wider mechanism of the Treaty and the balance that was struck between the parties when they signed the Treaty in 1960. Mr Chairman, I have got another big substantive part to go, which I think I will commence tomorrow morning. Obviously I'm happy to take any questions that you may have now. But as you will have me back at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which addresses outlets generally, and provides controlling context for the interpretation of paragraphs (e) and (f) as well. Paragraph (e) deals with gated spillways; paragraph (f) with power intakes; and then paragraph (g) with special site requirements, which we don't need to address. Then just very briefly as you will hear some more about this in due course, and I think it's in the witness statement that's been provided paragraphs 9 to 11 deal with the provision of information in respect of these design criteria and objection in the case of concerns about non-conformity.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means of interpretation. It is not simply that the provisions of paragraph 8 of Annexure D are not hermetically sealed from other parts of the Treaty: it is that the mandatory design criteria of paragraph 8 are a cog, a moving cog, in the wider mechanism of the Treaty and the balance that was struck between the parties when they signed the Treaty in 1960. Mr Chairman, I have got another big substantive part to go, which I think I will commence tomorrow morning. Obviously I'm happy to take any questions that you may have now. But as you will have me back at the microphone tomorrow morning I say this to my own
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	calculation of: "The maximum [allowable] Pondage shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." And this is a reference back to the definition of "Firm Power" in paragraph 2(i). Then we have paragraph (d): " no outlets below Dead Storage" As you will have seen from our written Memorial, and as Professor Webb will address in her submissions, the paragraph (d) provision is a headline provision which addresses outlets generally, and provides controlling context for the interpretation of paragraphs (e) and (f) as well. Paragraph (e) deals with gated spillways; paragraph (f) with power intakes; and then paragraph (g) with special site requirements, which we don't need to address. Then just very briefly as you will hear some more about this in due course, and I think it's in the witness statement that's been provided paragraphs 9 to 11 deal with the provision of information in respect of these design criteria and objection in the case of concerns about non-conformity. Paragraph 15 deals with the operation of the works,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	hydropower and limited pondage in III(2)(d) and subparagraph (4). Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I noted at the start of my discussion that these issues, the identification of the three interlocking bargains the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain is central to the interpretative exercise of which you are seised. An appreciation of each of the bargains is required by the general rule of treaty interpretation and the principles of supplementary means of interpretation. It is not simply that the provisions of paragraph 8 of Annexure D are not hermetically sealed from other parts of the Treaty: it is that the mandatory design criteria of paragraph 8 are a cog, a moving cog, in the wider mechanism of the Treaty and the balance that was struck between the parties when they signed the Treaty in 1960. Mr Chairman, I have got another big substantive part to go, which I think I will commence tomorrow morning. Obviously I'm happy to take any questions that you may have now. But as you will have me back at the microphone tomorrow morning I say this to my own dismay you may wish to reflect overnight and come

31 (Pages 109 to 112)

12:57				
12.57	1	happy to take questions on this now before we break for	13:00 1	should be given an opportunity to respond to this in
	2	the lunch break.	2	writing after the hearing. But there is a document that
	3	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I don't think I see	3	we would like to admit there.
	4	any questions from the members, but I have two questions	4	I note also, as I mentioned in my submissions, that
	5	that aren't substantive really in nature.	5	it has just become apparent this morning that the
	6	One is: this afternoon we do have Mr Shah. It's	6	Neutral Expert has posted on the website two documents
	7	possible that we use the entire time; it's possible we	7	from the Neutral Expert proceedings. They are public
	8	don't, and that there is some time left on the table.	8	documents. India of course is comprehensively aware of
	9	So one question is whether you would want to take that	9	them, as it was part of the site visit. But that's the
	10	opportunity to complete your presentation.	10	Neutral Expert's Site Visit Protocol and the press
	11	Then the second question is: I think you were going	11	release. We think that it would be helpful for you to
	12	to make an application with respect to the documents.	12	have those on the record, so we would like to make
	13	SIR DANIEL: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, for	13	a request to include those as well.
	14	reminding me of my fallible memory on the application.	14	Then there is one last point, and that is that
	15	Insofar as the examination of Mr Shah does not take	15	a number of my colleagues will be making submissions
	16	up the whole of the afternoon, I would be very happy to	16	this week in reference to a number of legal authorities
	17	come back this afternoon to complete the submissions,	17	that are in the public domain and are easily accessible,
	18	and that will keep us back on track, so thank you very	18	but they're not formally on the record of these
	19	much for that.	19	proceedings.
	20	In respect of the application, let me say that we	20	We had some discussion of precisely this issue in
	21	would be very happy to make this formally and in	21	the competence hearing. We have not made an application
	22	writing. My recollection though is that in the	22	formally to admit these new legal authorities, publicly
	2324	competence hearing we dealt with some of these things by way of directions from the Chair, once you'd had an	23	available legal authorities, into the proceedings, in
	24 25	opportunity to deliberate. So in a spirit of avoiding	24	reliance, Mr Chairman, on the direction that you gave in
	23	opportunity to denocrate. So in a spirit of avoiding	25	the competence hearing, where you determined that "to
		Page 113		Page 115
12:58	1	a flurry of correspondence, I raise them now.	13:02 1	the extent that the jurisprudence is in the public
	2	We made an application for new materials, which you	2	domain and easily accessible", there should be no
	3	granted, and we've put those new materials in. In	3	"difficulty in not introducing it into the record
	4	respect of one of those exhibits, I think that there is an error or an incompleteness in one of the exhibits, so	4	formally". This is at transcript Day 3, page 5, line 17
	5	ALL METERS OF AN INCOMPLETENESS IN ONE OF The exhibits so	_	
	_	_	5	to page 6, line 2.
	6	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem	6	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is
	7	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering	6 7	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis
	7 8	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality:	6 7 8	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that
	7 8 9	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've	6 7 8 9	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public
	7 8 9 10	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to	6 7 8 9 10	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to
	7 8 9 10 11	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts.	6 7 8 9 10 11	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal
	7 8 9 10 11 12	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing or can we treat this as an application to correct that	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat my application on my feet here as a formal application,
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing or can we treat this as an application to correct that exhibit?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat my application on my feet here as a formal application, but it's not a formal application by reference to
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing or can we treat this as an application to correct that exhibit? Second, there is one new exhibit that we would seek	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat my application on my feet here as a formal application, but it's not a formal application by reference to individual legal authorities.
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing or can we treat this as an application to correct that exhibit? Second, there is one new exhibit that we would seek permission to introduce, and that is simply an oversight	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat my application on my feet here as a formal application, but it's not a formal application by reference to individual legal authorities. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel.
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing or can we treat this as an application to correct that exhibit? Second, there is one new exhibit that we would seek	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat my application on my feet here as a formal application, but it's not a formal application by reference to individual legal authorities.
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing or can we treat this as an application to correct that exhibit? Second, there is one new exhibit that we would seek permission to introduce, and that is simply an oversight on our part. I think for purposes of Dr Morris's	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat my application on my feet here as a formal application, but it's not a formal application by reference to individual legal authorities. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. On all four of those points, we will get back to you
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing or can we treat this as an application to correct that exhibit? Second, there is one new exhibit that we would seek permission to introduce, and that is simply an oversight on our part. I think for purposes of Dr Morris's presentation tomorrow, he would like to be able to refer	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat my application on my feet here as a formal application, but it's not a formal application by reference to individual legal authorities. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. On all four of those points, we will get back to you in the afternoon with the Court's decision. If you
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing or can we treat this as an application to correct that exhibit? Second, there is one new exhibit that we would seek permission to introduce, and that is simply an oversight on our part. I think for purposes of Dr Morris's presentation tomorrow, he would like to be able to refer to a US Army Corps of Engineers regulatory guidance	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat my application on my feet here as a formal application, but it's not a formal application by reference to individual legal authorities. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. On all four of those points, we will get back to you in the afternoon with the Court's decision. If you could, in the meantime, provide to the Permanent Court
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing or can we treat this as an application to correct that exhibit? Second, there is one new exhibit that we would seek permission to introduce, and that is simply an oversight on our part. I think for purposes of Dr Morris's presentation tomorrow, he would like to be able to refer to a US Army Corps of Engineers regulatory guidance letter of 19 August 2005. This is a publicly available	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat my application on my feet here as a formal application, but it's not a formal application by reference to individual legal authorities. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. On all four of those points, we will get back to you in the afternoon with the Court's decision. If you could, in the meantime, provide to the Permanent Court of Arbitration the number of the exhibit that you
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing or can we treat this as an application to correct that exhibit? Second, there is one new exhibit that we would seek permission to introduce, and that is simply an oversight on our part. I think for purposes of Dr Morris's presentation tomorrow, he would like to be able to refer to a US Army Corps of Engineers regulatory guidance letter of 19 August 2005. This is a publicly available document. There would be no hardship at all to India in	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat my application on my feet here as a formal application, but it's not a formal application by reference to individual legal authorities. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. On all four of those points, we will get back to you in the afternoon with the Court's decision. If you could, in the meantime, provide to the Permanent Court of Arbitration the number of the exhibit that you indicated is not complete and that you'd like to
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing or can we treat this as an application to correct that exhibit? Second, there is one new exhibit that we would seek permission to introduce, and that is simply an oversight on our part. I think for purposes of Dr Morris's presentation tomorrow, he would like to be able to refer to a US Army Corps of Engineers regulatory guidance letter of 19 August 2005. This is a publicly available document. There would be no hardship at all to India in having that document admitted. We simply overlooked it. We of course appreciate, both in terms of, Mr Chairman, the Court's directions, but also in terms of the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat my application on my feet here as a formal application, but it's not a formal application by reference to individual legal authorities. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. On all four of those points, we will get back to you in the afternoon with the Court's decision. If you could, in the meantime, provide to the Permanent Court of Arbitration the number of the exhibit that you indicated is not complete and that you'd like to complete; and also the title of the exhibit relating to
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing or can we treat this as an application to correct that exhibit? Second, there is one new exhibit that we would seek permission to introduce, and that is simply an oversight on our part. I think for purposes of Dr Morris's presentation tomorrow, he would like to be able to refer to a US Army Corps of Engineers regulatory guidance letter of 19 August 2005. This is a publicly available document. There would be no hardship at all to India in having that document admitted. We simply overlooked it. We of course appreciate, both in terms of, Mr Chairman,	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat my application on my feet here as a formal application, but it's not a formal application by reference to individual legal authorities. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. On all four of those points, we will get back to you in the afternoon with the Court's decision. If you could, in the meantime, provide to the Permanent Court of Arbitration the number of the exhibit that you indicated is not complete and that you'd like to complete; and also the title of the exhibit relating to the Corps of Engineers, if you could provide that as
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing or can we treat this as an application to correct that exhibit? Second, there is one new exhibit that we would seek permission to introduce, and that is simply an oversight on our part. I think for purposes of Dr Morris's presentation tomorrow, he would like to be able to refer to a US Army Corps of Engineers regulatory guidance letter of 19 August 2005. This is a publicly available document. There would be no hardship at all to India in having that document admitted. We simply overlooked it. We of course appreciate, both in terms of, Mr Chairman, the Court's directions, but also in terms of the practice arising from the competence hearing, that India	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat my application on my feet here as a formal application, but it's not a formal application by reference to individual legal authorities. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. On all four of those points, we will get back to you in the afternoon with the Court's decision. If you could, in the meantime, provide to the Permanent Court of Arbitration the number of the exhibit that you indicated is not complete and that you'd like to complete; and also the title of the exhibit relating to the Corps of Engineers, if you could provide that as well. SIR DANIEL: We will do so. That in fact, I have it in
	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	we would like to correct that. That is I don't seem to have the exhibit reference here, or I'm not gathering it. But it's an article by UZ Alam, "Water Rationality: Mediating The Indus Waters Treaty", and I think we've put in extracts of a number of pages and we omitted to put in some additional extracts. So one question is: do we need to apply in writing or can we treat this as an application to correct that exhibit? Second, there is one new exhibit that we would seek permission to introduce, and that is simply an oversight on our part. I think for purposes of Dr Morris's presentation tomorrow, he would like to be able to refer to a US Army Corps of Engineers regulatory guidance letter of 19 August 2005. This is a publicly available document. There would be no hardship at all to India in having that document admitted. We simply overlooked it. We of course appreciate, both in terms of, Mr Chairman, the Court's directions, but also in terms of the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to page 6, line 2. My question, Mr Chairman, members of the Court is whether you are content for us to proceed on the basis of that direction from the competence hearing that where there are legal authorities that are in the public domain, we are simply permitted to make reference to them or whether you will direct us to make a formal written application. You might also be happy to treat my application on my feet here as a formal application, but it's not a formal application by reference to individual legal authorities. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. On all four of those points, we will get back to you in the afternoon with the Court's decision. If you could, in the meantime, provide to the Permanent Court of Arbitration the number of the exhibit that you indicated is not complete and that you'd like to complete; and also the title of the exhibit relating to the Corps of Engineers, if you could provide that as well.

32 (Pages 113 to 116)

13:03 1	front of me, but it will be easier to provide them to	14:03 1	We will then allow Mr Shah to make an opening
2	Mr Schofield, I think.	2	presentation of not more than 45 minutes as part of his
3	THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine.	3	evidence-in-chief, in which he can elaborate on issues
4	Okay, then I think we are done for this morning.	4	from his witness statement, including any subsequent
5	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, perhaps I might just say this	5	developments since that witness statement was submitted,
6	may have been a matter that you've addressed with the	6	and [he] can make use of hearing materials during [his]
7	Registry as you've granted permission for Mr Shah to	7	presentation, subject to the provisions set forth in
8	make a presentation, he has requested permission to be	8	Procedural Order No. 12.
9	able to make the presentation from the podium, standing	9	After that, the Court will examine Mr Shah. And
10	up. And then I believe that there will be	10	following that examination, Pakistan can undertake
11	an opportunity for a very brief reorganisation of the	11	a re-examination of Mr Shah, confined to the issues
12	room, so that for purposes of your examination, he can	12	arising from the Court's examination.
13	be seated, in case he needs to be seated.	13	With that in mind, Mr Shah and Ms Rees-Evans, please
14	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we understood that that was the	14	proceed.
15	preference and we have no problem with that approach.	15	MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Good afternoon
16	So we will do that in due course.	16	members of the Court.
17	SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much.	17	(2.04 pm)
18	THE CHAIRMAN: So we will break for lunch and we will resume	18	Direct examination by MS REES-EVANS
19	at our usual time, which I believe is at 2 o'clock.	19	Q. Good afternoon, Mr Shah.
20	SIR DANIEL: Perfect. Thank you very much.	20	A. Good afternoon.
21	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel.	21	Q. Please could you confirm for the Court your full name?
22	(1.04 pm)	22	A. Yes. Thank you, Ms Rees-Evans. Thank you, Mr Chairman
23	(Adjourned until 2.00 pm)	23	and the members of the Court. My full name is
24	(2.02 pm)	24	Syed Muhammed Mehar Ali Shah.
25	THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back to everyone. I hope you had	25	Q. And please could you confirm what you have in front of
23	THE CHARMAIN. Welcome back to everyone. Thope you had	23	Q. And picase could you commit what you have in none of
	Page 117		Page 119
14:02 1	a nice lunch break.	14:05 1	you on the stand?
2	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate	2	A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact
2 3	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is	2 3	A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going
2 3 4	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that	2 3 4	A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement.
2 3 4 5	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the	2 3 4 5	A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement.Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with
2 3 4 5 6	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete	2 3 4 5 6	A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement.Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B?
2 3 4 5 6 7	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of	2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is agreeable as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is agreeable as well. There is no need for a more formal application. You	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. Please could you confirm, Mr Shah, whether you have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is agreeable as well. There is no need for a more formal application. You can take that as having been decided by the Court.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. Please could you confirm, Mr Shah, whether you have any corrections to make to your written statement?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is agreeable as well. There is no need for a more formal application. You can take that as having been decided by the Court. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. Please could you confirm, Mr Shah, whether you have any corrections to make to your written statement? A. Yes, two small corrections.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is agreeable as well. There is no need for a more formal application. You can take that as having been decided by the Court. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: So we turn now to the testimony of Mr Shah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. Please could you confirm, Mr Shah, whether you have any corrections to make to your written statement? A. Yes, two small corrections. So the first correction is concerning paragraph 71
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is agreeable as well. There is no need for a more formal application. You can take that as having been decided by the Court. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: So we turn now to the testimony of Mr Shah. (2.03 pm)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. Please could you confirm, Mr Shah, whether you have any corrections to make to your written statement? A. Yes, two small corrections. So the first correction is concerning paragraph 71 of my statement, wherein I said that the frequency of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is agreeable as well. There is no need for a more formal application. You can take that as having been decided by the Court. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: So we turn now to the testimony of Mr Shah. (2.03 pm) MR SYED MUHAMMAD ALI MEHAR SHAH (called)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. Please could you confirm, Mr Shah, whether you have any corrections to make to your written statement? A. Yes, two small corrections. So the first correction is concerning paragraph 71 of my statement, wherein I said that the frequency of the meetings of the Permanent Indus Commission was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is agreeable as well. There is no need for a more formal application. You can take that as having been decided by the Court. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: So we turn now to the testimony of Mr Shah. (2.03 pm) MR SYED MUHAMMAD ALI MEHAR SHAH (called) THE CHAIRMAN: I would just like to recall that it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. Please could you confirm, Mr Shah, whether you have any corrections to make to your written statement? A. Yes, two small corrections. So the first correction is concerning paragraph 71 of my statement, wherein I said that the frequency of the meetings of the Permanent Indus Commission was discontinued after 2018 at a rate of so less than
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is agreeable as well. There is no need for a more formal application. You can take that as having been decided by the Court. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: So we turn now to the testimony of Mr Shah. (2.03 pm) MR SYED MUHAMMAD ALI MEHAR SHAH (called) THE CHAIRMAN: I would just like to recall that it was decided in Procedural Order No. 12 (paragraph 4.1) that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. Please could you confirm, Mr Shah, whether you have any corrections to make to your written statement? A. Yes, two small corrections. So the first correction is concerning paragraph 71 of my statement, wherein I said that the frequency of the meetings of the Permanent Indus Commission was discontinued after 2018 at a rate of so less than twice a year, every year. So while preparing for my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is agreeable as well. There is no need for a more formal application. You can take that as having been decided by the Court. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: So we turn now to the testimony of Mr Shah. (2.03 pm) MR SYED MUHAMMAD ALI MEHAR SHAH (called) THE CHAIRMAN: I would just like to recall that it was decided in Procedural Order No. 12 (paragraph 4.1) that Pakistan may conduct a brief direct examination of not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. Please could you confirm, Mr Shah, whether you have any corrections to make to your written statement? A. Yes, two small corrections. So the first correction is concerning paragraph 71 of my statement, wherein I said that the frequency of the meetings of the Permanent Indus Commission was discontinued after 2018 at a rate of so less than twice a year, every year. So while preparing for my oral testimony today, I have gone back over the record
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is agreeable as well. There is no need for a more formal application. You can take that as having been decided by the Court. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: So we turn now to the testimony of Mr Shah. (2.03 pm) MR SYED MUHAMMAD ALI MEHAR SHAH (called) THE CHAIRMAN: I would just like to recall that it was decided in Procedural Order No. 12 (paragraph 4.1) that Pakistan may conduct a brief direct examination of not more than five minutes, limited to introducing Mr Shah,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. Please could you confirm, Mr Shah, whether you have any corrections to make to your written statement? A. Yes, two small corrections. So the first correction is concerning paragraph 71 of my statement, wherein I said that the frequency of the meetings of the Permanent Indus Commission was discontinued after 2018 at a rate of so less than twice a year, every year. So while preparing for my oral testimony today, I have gone back over the record of the Permanent Indus Commission and confirmed that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is agreeable as well. There is no need for a more formal application. You can take that as having been decided by the Court. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: So we turn now to the testimony of Mr Shah. (2.03 pm) MR SYED MUHAMMAD ALI MEHAR SHAH (called) THE CHAIRMAN: I would just like to recall that it was decided in Procedural Order No. 12 (paragraph 4.1) that Pakistan may conduct a brief direct examination of not more than five minutes, limited to introducing Mr Shah, confirming his written evidence, and identifying any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. Please could you confirm, Mr Shah, whether you have any corrections to make to your written statement? A. Yes, two small corrections. So the first correction is concerning paragraph 71 of my statement, wherein I said that the frequency of the meetings of the Permanent Indus Commission was discontinued after 2018 at a rate of so less than twice a year, every year. So while preparing for my oral testimony today, I have gone back over the record of the Permanent Indus Commission and confirmed that the frequency of the meetings of the Permanent Indus
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is agreeable as well. There is no need for a more formal application. You can take that as having been decided by the Court. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: So we turn now to the testimony of Mr Shah. (2.03 pm) MR SYED MUHAMMAD ALI MEHAR SHAH (called) THE CHAIRMAN: I would just like to recall that it was decided in Procedural Order No. 12 (paragraph 4.1) that Pakistan may conduct a brief direct examination of not more than five minutes, limited to introducing Mr Shah, confirming his written evidence, and identifying any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. Please could you confirm, Mr Shah, whether you have any corrections to make to your written statement? A. Yes, two small corrections. So the first correction is concerning paragraph 71 of my statement, wherein I said that the frequency of the meetings of the Permanent Indus Commission was discontinued after 2018 at a rate of so less than twice a year, every year. So while preparing for my oral testimony today, I have gone back over the record of the Permanent Indus Commission and confirmed that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Before we begin with Mr Shah, I wanted to indicate to the Government of Pakistan that the Court is essentially agreeable on all four of the points that Sir Daniel raised before the lunch break. That is, the exhibit that you'd like to resubmit in a more complete form is agreeable; the new exhibit on the Corps of Engineers document, also agreeable; including in the official record the Neutral Expert documents that are now publicly available is fine; and reference to legal authorities that are in the public domain throughout the proceedings without them actually being in evidence is agreeable as well. There is no need for a more formal application. You can take that as having been decided by the Court. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: So we turn now to the testimony of Mr Shah. (2.03 pm) MR SYED MUHAMMAD ALI MEHAR SHAH (called) THE CHAIRMAN: I would just like to recall that it was decided in Procedural Order No. 12 (paragraph 4.1) that Pakistan may conduct a brief direct examination of not more than five minutes, limited to introducing Mr Shah, confirming his written evidence, and identifying any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. So right in front of me is a declaration for the fact witness and the PowerPoint presentation which I am going to make, along with a script and also my statement. Q. And that is your witness statement submitted with Pakistan's Memorial, Appendix B? A. Yes, that's correct. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. Mr Chairman, I'm assuming it's okay to proceed on the basis of the materials that Mr Shah has in front of him? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. Please could you confirm, Mr Shah, whether you have any corrections to make to your written statement? A. Yes, two small corrections. So the first correction is concerning paragraph 71 of my statement, wherein I said that the frequency of the meetings of the Permanent Indus Commission was discontinued after 2018 at a rate of so less than twice a year, every year. So while preparing for my oral testimony today, I have gone back over the record of the Permanent Indus Commission and confirmed that the frequency of the meetings of the Permanent Indus

33 (Pages 117 to 120)

14:06 1	2015, rather than 2018.	14:10 1	Pakistan.
2	And the second correction is concerning the	2	All told, I have amassed nearly 20 years of
3	paragraph 73 of my written statement, in which, again,	3	experience in the field of water resources engineering,
4	I said in my statement that the frequency of the general	4	and within the framework of the Indus Waters Treaty.
5	tours of inspection was reduced from every five years to	5	I set out my experience more fully in paragraphs 3 to 5
6	one per five years since 2018. So the same was also	6	of my written statement.
7	reduced. Rather, I would say that it would be correct	7	As the members of the Court of Arbitration are
8	to say that since 2014 to 2019, there has been only one	8	aware, my purpose in making this presentation is
9		9	twofold: first, to elaborate on the issues presented in
10	the year 2014/2015 instead of the year 2018 since when	10	my written statement, before I am handed over to you for
11		11	examination; and second, to address the developments
12		12	relevant to my written statement that would be
13	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	13	appropriate for me to address, the developments that
14		14	I have already alluded to in my direct examination just
15	-	15	now by Ms Rees-Evans.
16		16	As you will recall, my written statement is in part
17		17	a statement of expert opinion describing the relevant
18		18	parts of the Treaty and in part a witness statement of
19		19	fact, addressing the gap between what was intended by
20		20	the Treaty and how the Treaty has operated in practice.
21	•	21	My presentation is divided upon the same lines.
22		22	Slide 2. So in that respect, my presentation will
23		23	take the structure now shown on the slide, divided into
24		24	six topics.
25		25	I will be brief on the first topic, of an overview
23		23	will be offer on the first topic, of the overview
	Page 121		Page 123
14:08 1	So if you could read that out now, I would be very	14:11 1	of the Indus Basin and the Indus Waters Treaty, since my
2	grateful.	2	first presentation to the Court outlined these issues,
3	MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman.	3	and the Court will by now be familiar with them.
4	I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience	4	On the topics other than my final topic, India's
5	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and	5	frustration of the Treaty provisions, I express my
6	nothing but the truth.	6	expert opinion in my oral testimony. On the topic of
7	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you, Mr Shah.	7	India's frustration of the Treaty provisions, on which
8	Then, Ms Rees-Evans, if you're completed, then we	8	I will spend some time as part of my presentation,
9	will proceed to your presentation.	9	I will be presenting statements of fact, addressing my
10	MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Can you please display	10	views and experience on how the Treaty is working in
11	the PowerPoint presentation slides, yes. (Pause)	11	
		11	practice.
12	(2.09 pm)		practice. Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the
12 13	(2.09 pm) Presentation by MR SHAH	12	Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the
	(2.09 pm) Presentation by MR SHAH MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court of		Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the Indus Basin and the Treaty.
13 14	Presentation by MR SHAH MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court of	12 13 14	Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the Indus Basin and the Treaty. Mr Chairman and members of the Court, the Treaty is
13	Presentation by MR SHAH	12 13 14 15	Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the Indus Basin and the Treaty. Mr Chairman and members of the Court, the Treaty is concerned with the waters of the Indus system of rivers.
13 14 15	Presentation by MR SHAH MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court of Arbitration. So I would like to invite your attention	12 13 14	Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the Indus Basin and the Treaty. Mr Chairman and members of the Court, the Treaty is concerned with the waters of the Indus system of rivers. It identifies six rivers that make up the Indus system
13 14 15 16	Presentation by MR SHAH MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court of Arbitration. So I would like to invite your attention on the first slide of my PowerPoint presentation. It is	12 13 14 15 16 17	Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the Indus Basin and the Treaty. Mr Chairman and members of the Court, the Treaty is concerned with the waters of the Indus system of rivers. It identifies six rivers that make up the Indus system of rivers in the Indus Basin for the purposes of the
13 14 15 16 17 18	Presentation by MR SHAH MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court of Arbitration. So I would like to invite your attention on the first slide of my PowerPoint presentation. It is an honour indeed to appear before you again as a member of Pakistan's delegation in these proceedings.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the Indus Basin and the Treaty. Mr Chairman and members of the Court, the Treaty is concerned with the waters of the Indus system of rivers. It identifies six rivers that make up the Indus system of rivers in the Indus Basin for the purposes of the Treaty. It divides these rivers into two groups: the
13 14 15 16 17	Presentation by MR SHAH MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court of Arbitration. So I would like to invite your attention on the first slide of my PowerPoint presentation. It is an honour indeed to appear before you again as a member of Pakistan's delegation in these proceedings. I have been Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the Indus Basin and the Treaty. Mr Chairman and members of the Court, the Treaty is concerned with the waters of the Indus system of rivers. It identifies six rivers that make up the Indus system of rivers in the Indus Basin for the purposes of the Treaty. It divides these rivers into two groups: the Eastern and the Western Rivers.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Presentation by MR SHAH MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court of Arbitration. So I would like to invite your attention on the first slide of my PowerPoint presentation. It is an honour indeed to appear before you again as a member of Pakistan's delegation in these proceedings. I have been Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters since 9 February 2018, prior to becoming the PCIW,	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the Indus Basin and the Treaty. Mr Chairman and members of the Court, the Treaty is concerned with the waters of the Indus system of rivers. It identifies six rivers that make up the Indus system of rivers in the Indus Basin for the purposes of the Treaty. It divides these rivers into two groups: the Eastern and the Western Rivers. The Eastern Rivers comprise the Ravi, the Beas and
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Presentation by MR SHAH MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court of Arbitration. So I would like to invite your attention on the first slide of my PowerPoint presentation. It is an honour indeed to appear before you again as a member of Pakistan's delegation in these proceedings. I have been Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters since 9 February 2018, prior to becoming the PCIW, I worked as a water resources engineer. I qualified as	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the Indus Basin and the Treaty. Mr Chairman and members of the Court, the Treaty is concerned with the waters of the Indus system of rivers. It identifies six rivers that make up the Indus system of rivers in the Indus Basin for the purposes of the Treaty. It divides these rivers into two groups: the Eastern and the Western Rivers. The Eastern Rivers comprise the Ravi, the Beas and the Sutlej, whereas the Western Rivers are the Indus,
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Presentation by MR SHAH MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court of Arbitration. So I would like to invite your attention on the first slide of my PowerPoint presentation. It is an honour indeed to appear before you again as a member of Pakistan's delegation in these proceedings. I have been Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters since 9 February 2018, prior to becoming the PCIW, I worked as a water resources engineer. I qualified as a water resources engineer in the year 2004, with	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the Indus Basin and the Treaty. Mr Chairman and members of the Court, the Treaty is concerned with the waters of the Indus system of rivers. It identifies six rivers that make up the Indus system of rivers in the Indus Basin for the purposes of the Treaty. It divides these rivers into two groups: the Eastern and the Western Rivers. The Eastern Rivers comprise the Ravi, the Beas and the Sutlej, whereas the Western Rivers are the Indus, the Jhelum and the Chenab. Each of these flows through
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Presentation by MR SHAH MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court of Arbitration. So I would like to invite your attention on the first slide of my PowerPoint presentation. It is an honour indeed to appear before you again as a member of Pakistan's delegation in these proceedings. I have been Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters since 9 February 2018, prior to becoming the PCIW, I worked as a water resources engineer. I qualified as a water resources engineer in the year 2004, with a master's degree in water resources engineering from	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the Indus Basin and the Treaty. Mr Chairman and members of the Court, the Treaty is concerned with the waters of the Indus system of rivers. It identifies six rivers that make up the Indus system of rivers in the Indus Basin for the purposes of the Treaty. It divides these rivers into two groups: the Eastern and the Western Rivers. The Eastern Rivers comprise the Ravi, the Beas and the Sutlej, whereas the Western Rivers are the Indus, the Jhelum and the Chenab. Each of these flows through India, or Indian-administered Kashmir, and flows in due
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Presentation by MR SHAH MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court of Arbitration. So I would like to invite your attention on the first slide of my PowerPoint presentation. It is an honour indeed to appear before you again as a member of Pakistan's delegation in these proceedings. I have been Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters since 9 February 2018, prior to becoming the PCIW, I worked as a water resources engineer. I qualified as a water resources engineer in the year 2004, with a master's degree in water resources engineering from the Centre of Excellence in Water Resources Engineering,	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the Indus Basin and the Treaty. Mr Chairman and members of the Court, the Treaty is concerned with the waters of the Indus system of rivers. It identifies six rivers that make up the Indus system of rivers in the Indus Basin for the purposes of the Treaty. It divides these rivers into two groups: the Eastern and the Western Rivers. The Eastern Rivers comprise the Ravi, the Beas and the Sutlej, whereas the Western Rivers are the Indus, the Jhelum and the Chenab. Each of these flows through
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Presentation by MR SHAH MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court of Arbitration. So I would like to invite your attention on the first slide of my PowerPoint presentation. It is an honour indeed to appear before you again as a member of Pakistan's delegation in these proceedings. I have been Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters since 9 February 2018, prior to becoming the PCIW, I worked as a water resources engineer. I qualified as a water resources engineer in the year 2004, with a master's degree in water resources engineering from	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the Indus Basin and the Treaty. Mr Chairman and members of the Court, the Treaty is concerned with the waters of the Indus system of rivers. It identifies six rivers that make up the Indus system of rivers in the Indus Basin for the purposes of the Treaty. It divides these rivers into two groups: the Eastern and the Western Rivers. The Eastern Rivers comprise the Ravi, the Beas and the Sutlej, whereas the Western Rivers are the Indus, the Jhelum and the Chenab. Each of these flows through India, or Indian-administered Kashmir, and flows in due course into Pakistan, before emptying into the
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Presentation by MR SHAH MR SHAH: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the Court of Arbitration. So I would like to invite your attention on the first slide of my PowerPoint presentation. It is an honour indeed to appear before you again as a member of Pakistan's delegation in these proceedings. I have been Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters since 9 February 2018, prior to becoming the PCIW, I worked as a water resources engineer. I qualified as a water resources engineer in the year 2004, with a master's degree in water resources engineering from the Centre of Excellence in Water Resources Engineering,	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Slide 3. I begin with a brief introduction to the Indus Basin and the Treaty. Mr Chairman and members of the Court, the Treaty is concerned with the waters of the Indus system of rivers. It identifies six rivers that make up the Indus system of rivers in the Indus Basin for the purposes of the Treaty. It divides these rivers into two groups: the Eastern and the Western Rivers. The Eastern Rivers comprise the Ravi, the Beas and the Sutlej, whereas the Western Rivers are the Indus, the Jhelum and the Chenab. Each of these flows through India, or Indian-administered Kashmir, and flows in due course into Pakistan, before emptying into the

34 (Pages 121 to 124)

		Ī	
14:13 1	A further major tributary of the Indus system of	14:16 1	and the Commission will endeavour to resolve the
2	rivers is the Kabul River, which rises in Afghanistan	2	questions by agreement.
3	and then eventually joins the River Indus in Pakistan.	3	Slide 8. Article VII of the Treaty records the
4	It is not regulated by the Treaty, however.	4	parties' intentions to cooperate to the fullest extent
5	Slide 4. The Treaty is made up of three principal	5	possible. While the intention to cooperate referred to
6	components: the preamble, twelve articles and	6	in this provision applies to both parties, in most
7	eight annexures, Annexures A to H. These are listed on	7	circumstances successful implementation of the Treaty
8	this screen and the following slide, and at paragraph 13	8	depends upon action taken or, for that matter, not
9	of my statement.	9	taken by India, as the upstream riparian.
10	Slide 5. As the Court will well know by now, among	10	The nature of the cooperation required between the
11	the annexures, the most important for present purposes	11	parties is set out in Article VII(1). There are several
12 13	is Annexure D, which sets out detailed provisions regulating the generation of hydroelectric power by	12 13	important aspects to this cooperation. In particular, Article VII(1) records the parties' "intention to
13	India on the Western Rivers. I will return to this in	13	co-operate, by mutual agreement", to achieve the optimum
15	the second half of my presentation today.	15	development of the rivers.
16	Before doing so, I now turn to elaborate on the	16	This extends, under subparagraph (c), to cooperation
17	provisions of the Treaty relevant to two of the common	17	"in undertaking engineering works on the Rivers",
18	themes that permeate it: (1) the requirements of	18	defined in the Treaty. As I said in my written
19	cooperation and transparency; (2) the importance of	19	statement, this provision is very broad in scope.
20	information-sharing.	20	Slide 9. I will now address the importance of
21	Slide 6. Turning first to the requirement of	21	information-sharing under the Treaty. The obligations
22	cooperation and transparency.	22	set out in the Treaty in relation to information-sharing
23	One of the central principles of the Treaty, the	23	lie at the heart of the Treaty and the parties'
24	preamble recognises the commitment by both the	24	obligation to cooperate. Both parties are under
25	parties so that is Pakistan and India that the	25	an obligation to share information.
23	•	23	an obligation to share information.
	Page 125		Page 127
14:14 1	Treaty be implemented "in a spirit of goodwill and	14:17 1	Slide 10. So I set out in my statement a number of
2	friendship" and in a cooperative spirit. The Permanent	2	examples of information-sharing obligations under the
3	Indus Commission has a critical role in this respect.	3	Treaty. They are listed on this slide. They address
4	As Article VIII(4) states:	4	a range of matters arising from the management and
5	"The purpose and functions of the Commission shall	5	utilisation of the Indus Rivers.
6	be to establish and maintain co-operative arrangements	6	Article VII(1)(a) recognises the importance of
7	for the implementation of [the] Treaty, [and] to promote	7	hydrological observation, and provides for
8	co-operation between the Parties in the development of	8	information-sharing in relation to it.
9	the waters of the Rivers"	9	Article VI(1) provides for the regular exchange of
10	As part of that function, the Treaty places	10	data with respect to the flow in and utilisation of the
11	extensive information-sharing and cooperation	11	waters of the rivers. It provides that each party must
12	responsibilities on the parties and their respective	12	collate certain data on a daily basis, and transmit it
13	representatives, the two Commissioners. These are set	13	monthly to the other party.
14	out in Article VIII of the Treaty.	14	The provision of the data envisaged by Article VI(1)
15	Slide 7. The key responsibilities of the Commission	15	enables both parties to ascertain the natural pattern of
16	include, most notably, the obligation to facilitate	16	flows. It also facilitates monitoring of alterations to
17	general and special tours of inspection; to meet	17	the natural flows of these rivers, including any
18	"regularly"; to "report on its work", and submit its	18	significant extractions of water from the river flows,
19	reports to the two Governments of Pakistan and India;	19	for example as a result of interventions by the other
20	and overall, to "promote cooperation".	20	party. This information is particularly important for
21	The Commission also has an important role in	21	Pakistan, as the downstream riparian.
22	relation to the resolution of disputes or, to	22	Article VI(2), Chairman and members of the Court,
23 24	paraphrase the Treaty, "questions which arise between the Parties" under Article IX. The Commission is the	23	enables a party to request further data about the
24 25	first forum in which such questions must be examined,	24 25	hydrology of any of the rivers, or the canal or the
23	ms. forum in which such questions must be examined,	23	reservoir operations connected with these rivers, which
	Page 126		Page 128

35 (Pages 125 to 128)

ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE IX AND ANNEXURE G OF THE INDUS WATERS TREATY 1960 Day 1 -- Hearing on the Merits, First Phase Monday, 8 Monday, 8 July 2024

14:19 1	is not expressly addressed in Article VI(1).	14:22 1	Annexure D, hydroelectric plants in operation or under
2	Snow and rainfall data are a good example of the	2	construction as on the effective date being one of the
3	type of data that are not specifically envisaged in	3	four categories of the hydroelectric plants, as we saw
4	Article VI(1), but could be requested by a party under	4	just on the previous slides. Third is concerning the
5	the second paragraph of Article VI. An example of when	5	information-sharing under paragraphs 9, 12 and 13 of
6	Pakistan requested rainfall data from India is set out	6	Annexure D, new run-of-river plants. And fourth, the
7	in my predecessor's letter of 31 May 2017, which is at	7	information-sharing under paragraph 19 of Annexure D,
8	Exhibit P-0567 and is in your core bundle. I don't	8	concerning the small plants.
9	propose to take you to it for now.	9	The information-sharing under paragraphs 5 and 6 of
10	Paragraphs 5 and 6 of Annexure B set out certain	10	Annexure D is addressed in my statement at paragraphs 54
11	information which Pakistan must provide to India on	11	to 57, and information-sharing relating to small plants
12	an annual basis, where the waters of the Eastern Rivers	12	is addressed at paragraphs 67 to 68. I will focus in
13	are being used for agricultural use, as specified in	13	this presentation on information-sharing in respect of
13		13	planned interference with the waters and in relation to
15	Annexure B to the Treaty. To the best of my knowledge, Pakistan has provided this information as required since	15	new run-of-river plants, which are of most direct
	•	16	relevance in the context of the present dispute.
16	1960, without fail.	17	Slide 15. The term "interference with the waters"
17	Article IV(8) imposes an obligation of communication on both India and Pakistan in relation to the provision		
18	•	18	appears in a number of places in the Treaty, most
19	of information about extraordinary discharges of water	19	notably in Article II, subparagraph (2) and Article III,
20	from reservoirs and flood flows which may affect the other party. This information should be communicated as	20	subparagraph (2), regarding the Eastern and the Western
21	, ·	21	Rivers, respectively, and Article VII(2), regarding
22	far in advance as practicable. This is a particularly	22	plans to construct engineering works on the rivers.
23	important provision for Pakistan, as downstream	23	Chairman, members of the Court, Article I,
24	riparian. I will return to this provision later in my	24	paragraph (15) defines the "interference with the
25	presentation, in relation to one of the two updates	25	waters" to mean "Any act of withdrawal [of water]" or
	Page 129		Page 131
14:21 1	I wish to make to my written statement.	14:24 1	"Any man-made obstruction to [the] flow [of water] which
14:21 1 2	Slide 11. In addition to the more general	14:24 1 2	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of
	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some		causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and
2	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also	2	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental".
2 3	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in	2 3	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause
2 3 4	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for	2 3 4	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of
2 3 4 5 6 7	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under	2 3 4 5	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that Pakistan can check that the design of a proposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect Pakistan materially. If it so considers, India is under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that Pakistan can check that the design of a proposed run-of-river plant meets the applicable requirements.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect Pakistan materially. If it so considers, India is under a general obligation to notify Pakistan of its plans.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that Pakistan can check that the design of a proposed run-of-river plant meets the applicable requirements. In turn, the provision of information enables Pakistan,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect Pakistan materially. If it so considers, India is under a general obligation to notify Pakistan of its plans. It must supply available information to enable Pakistan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that Pakistan can check that the design of a proposed run-of-river plant meets the applicable requirements. In turn, the provision of information enables Pakistan, if necessary, to object to such designs.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect Pakistan materially. If it so considers, India is under a general obligation to notify Pakistan of its plans. It must supply available information to enable Pakistan to assess the nature, magnitude and effect of the work.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that Pakistan can check that the design of a proposed run-of-river plant meets the applicable requirements. In turn, the provision of information enables Pakistan, if necessary, to object to such designs. Slide 13, which is concerning the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect Pakistan materially. If it so considers, India is under a general obligation to notify Pakistan of its plans. It must supply available information to enable Pakistan to assess the nature, magnitude and effect of the work. And importantly, Mr Chairman and members of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that Pakistan can check that the design of a proposed run-of-river plant meets the applicable requirements. In turn, the provision of information enables Pakistan, if necessary, to object to such designs. Slide 13, which is concerning the information-sharing in relation to planned works. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect Pakistan materially. If it so considers, India is under a general obligation to notify Pakistan of its plans. It must supply available information to enable Pakistan to assess the nature, magnitude and effect of the work. And importantly, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, if certain works would cause interference, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that Pakistan can check that the design of a proposed run-of-river plant meets the applicable requirements. In turn, the provision of information enables Pakistan, if necessary, to object to such designs. Slide 13, which is concerning the information-sharing in relation to planned works. And now I move to slide 14.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect Pakistan materially. If it so considers, India is under a general obligation to notify Pakistan of its plans. It must supply available information to enable Pakistan to assess the nature, magnitude and effect of the work. And importantly, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, if certain works would cause interference, but India considers that such interference would not affect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that Pakistan can check that the design of a proposed run-of-river plant meets the applicable requirements. In turn, the provision of information enables Pakistan, if necessary, to object to such designs. Slide 13, which is concerning the information-sharing in relation to planned works. And now I move to slide 14. So what does the Treaty require in relation to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect Pakistan materially. If it so considers, India is under a general obligation to notify Pakistan of its plans. It must supply available information to enable Pakistan to assess the nature, magnitude and effect of the work. And importantly, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, if certain works would cause interference, but India considers that such interference would not affect Pakistan materially, Pakistan can still request data
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that Pakistan can check that the design of a proposed run-of-river plant meets the applicable requirements. In turn, the provision of information enables Pakistan, if necessary, to object to such designs. Slide 13, which is concerning the information-sharing in relation to planned works. And now I move to slide 14. So what does the Treaty require in relation to planned works? There are four main aspects to this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect Pakistan materially. If it so considers, India is under a general obligation to notify Pakistan of its plans. It must supply available information to enable Pakistan to assess the nature, magnitude and effect of the work. And importantly, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, if certain works would cause interference, but India considers that such interference would not affect Pakistan materially, Pakistan can still request data from India, and it can request data regarding the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that Pakistan can check that the design of a proposed run-of-river plant meets the applicable requirements. In turn, the provision of information enables Pakistan, if necessary, to object to such designs. Slide 13, which is concerning the information-sharing in relation to planned works. And now I move to slide 14. So what does the Treaty require in relation to planned works? There are four main aspects to this. First, information-sharing in the event of planned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect Pakistan materially. If it so considers, India is under a general obligation to notify Pakistan of its plans. It must supply available information to enable Pakistan to assess the nature, magnitude and effect of the work. And importantly, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, if certain works would cause interference, but India considers that such interference would not affect Pakistan materially, Pakistan can still request data from India, and it can request data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work, according to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that Pakistan can check that the design of a proposed run-of-river plant meets the applicable requirements. In turn, the provision of information enables Pakistan, if necessary, to object to such designs. Slide 13, which is concerning the information-sharing in relation to planned works. And now I move to slide 14. So what does the Treaty require in relation to planned works? There are four main aspects to this. First, information-sharing in the event of planned interference with the waters, under Article VII(2).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect Pakistan materially. If it so considers, India is under a general obligation to notify Pakistan of its plans. It must supply available information to enable Pakistan to assess the nature, magnitude and effect of the work. And importantly, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, if certain works would cause interference, but India considers that such interference would not affect Pakistan materially, Pakistan can still request data from India, and it can request data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work, according to the second sentence of Article VII, paragraph (2).
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that Pakistan can check that the design of a proposed run-of-river plant meets the applicable requirements. In turn, the provision of information enables Pakistan, if necessary, to object to such designs. Slide 13, which is concerning the information-sharing in relation to planned works. And now I move to slide 14. So what does the Treaty require in relation to planned works? There are four main aspects to this. First, information-sharing in the event of planned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect Pakistan materially. If it so considers, India is under a general obligation to notify Pakistan of its plans. It must supply available information to enable Pakistan to assess the nature, magnitude and effect of the work. And importantly, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, if certain works would cause interference, but India considers that such interference would not affect Pakistan materially, Pakistan can still request data from India, and it can request data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work, according to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that Pakistan can check that the design of a proposed run-of-river plant meets the applicable requirements. In turn, the provision of information enables Pakistan, if necessary, to object to such designs. Slide 13, which is concerning the information-sharing in relation to planned works. And now I move to slide 14. So what does the Treaty require in relation to planned works? There are four main aspects to this. First, information-sharing in the event of planned interference with the waters, under Article VII(2). Second, information-sharing under paragraphs 5 and 6 of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect Pakistan materially. If it so considers, India is under a general obligation to notify Pakistan of its plans. It must supply available information to enable Pakistan to assess the nature, magnitude and effect of the work. And importantly, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, if certain works would cause interference, but India considers that such interference would not affect Pakistan materially, Pakistan can still request data from India, and it can request data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work, according to the second sentence of Article VII, paragraph (2). So India is therefore, once again, under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Slide 11. In addition to the more general information-sharing obligations under the Treaty, some of which I have just highlighted, there are also extensive information-sharing obligations on India in relation to its use of the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power generation. These arise under Annexure D of the Treaty. Slide 12. As the Court will recall, Annexure D addresses four categories of run-of-river plants, shown now on the slide. Information-sharing lies at the heart of Annexure D, again, in relation to each of the four categories of plant. This is critical to ensure that Pakistan can check that the design of a proposed run-of-river plant meets the applicable requirements. In turn, the provision of information enables Pakistan, if necessary, to object to such designs. Slide 13, which is concerning the information-sharing in relation to planned works. And now I move to slide 14. So what does the Treaty require in relation to planned works? There are four main aspects to this. First, information-sharing in the event of planned interference with the waters, under Article VII(2).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	causes a change in the volume of the daily flow of water[]" which is other than "insignificant and incidental". An obvious example of an activity that would cause interference with the waters is the construction work of a new run-of-river hydroelectric plant. The obligations to share information in the event of planned interference with the waters are set out in Article VII(2) of the Treaty. It requires India to consider whether any planned engineering works would cause interference with the waters. It requires India to consider whether such interference would affect Pakistan materially. If it so considers, India is under a general obligation to notify Pakistan of its plans. It must supply available information to enable Pakistan to assess the nature, magnitude and effect of the work. And importantly, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, if certain works would cause interference, but India considers that such interference would not affect Pakistan materially, Pakistan can still request data from India, and it can request data regarding the nature, magnitude and effect of the work, according to the second sentence of Article VII, paragraph (2).

36 (Pages 129 to 132)

14:26	1	an obligation at the planning stage to supply Pakistan	14:29 1	result in a material change in the information which was
	2	with information regarding the planned interferences.	2	previously provided to Pakistan, whether before or after
	3	The only constraints on the data which must be provided	3	the plant comes into operation, paragraph 12; second,
	4	to Pakistan in such cases are that the data is available	4	where it has been necessary for India to carry out
	5	and that it would enable Pakistan to assess the nature,	5	repairs or alterations in the event of an emergency,
	6	magnitude and effect of the work.	6	like in paragraph 13. So even immaterial alterations
	7	I turn now to information-sharing under Annexure D.	7	must be communicated to Pakistan, albeit that they do
	8	Part 3 of Annexure D lays down restrictions on the	8	not have to be communicated before being made, as in
	9	design, operation and construction of new run-of-river	9	paragraph 25.
	10	plants. It also sets out India's obligations to provide	10	Slide 18. The architecture of information-sharing
	11	data to Pakistan in relation to its designs of such	11	under Annexure D, as I said before, enables Pakistan to
	12	plants.	12	check that the design of India's proposed run-of-river
	13	There is an extensive list of information-sharing	13	plant meets the applicable requirements and, if
	14	requirements on India as regards its use of the	14	necessary, to object to such designs.
	15	Western Rivers for the purposes of the generation of	15	Paragraphs 10 and 11 of Annexure D define the way
	16	hydroelectric power. The most relevant requirements for	16	that disagreements regarding India's proposed
	17	present purposes are found in paragraphs 9, 12 and 13 of	17	construction of a new run-of-river plant should be
	18	Annexure D. These are the provisions applicable to new	18	resolved. Pursuant to paragraph 10, Pakistan has
	19	run-of-river hydroelectric plants.	19	three months to identify and communicate any objections
	20	Slide 16. Paragraph 9 of Annexure D identifies	20	which it might have in relation to the information
	21	India's obligation to share information about the design	21	received from India under paragraphs 9 or 13, and
	22	of any new run-of-river plant on the Western Rivers. As	22	two months in relation to any objections arising from
	23	paragraph 9 explains, the purpose of this	23	information received from India under paragraph 12.
	24	information-sharing is:	24	Where Pakistan raises an objection, paragraph 11
	25	"To enable Pakistan to satisfy itself that the	25	applies. And in that case, either party may proceed to
		Page 133		Page 135
		1 age 133		1 age 133
14:27	1	design of a Plant conforms to the criteria mentioned in	14:30 1	have the question resolved, in accordance with the
	2	paragraph 8 [of Annexure D to the Treaty]"	2	dispute settlement provisions of Article IX.
	3	There are five categories of information that must	3	Slide 19. I now turn to my final topic: India's
	4	be supplied by India. They are defined in Appendix II	4	frustration of the Treaty provisions. As part of this
	5	to Annexure D. They are: (1) the location of the plant;	5	topic, I will provide my views and experience on how the
	6	(2) the hydrologic data; (3) the hydraulic data; (4)	6	Treaty has been implemented in practice, and the ways in
	7	particulars of design; and (5) general information.	7	which India's failure to comply with the terms of the
	8	The Treaty requires India to provide this	8	Treaty has eroded the effectiveness of the Commission
	9	information to Pakistan at least six months in advance	9	and the Treaty itself. In this respect, I will be
	10	of the beginning of construction of river works	10	setting out the two updates that I have to my written
	11	connected with the plant. However, as I explained in my	11	statement, based on recent developments.
	12	statement, India's practice is to delay the provision of	12	Slide 20. Turning first to the impact of India's
	13	such information, as opposed to being proactively	13	conduct on the functioning of the Permanent Indus
	14	transparent. It does not give the Commission adequate	14	Commission.
	15	opportunity to examine the question which may	15	As I see it, there have been four main ways in which
	16	potentially arise out of the information it provides.	16	India has impeded the function of the Commission in
	17	So in my view, this has been one of the important	17	recent years: (1) through a reduction in the nature and
	18	contributing factors in the differences or disputes that	18	frequency of the Commission meetings; (2) through
	19	have arisen between the parties.	19	a dramatic reduction in the frequency of the general
	20	Slide 17. Paragraphs 12 and 13 of Annexure D also	20	tours of inspection; (3) through ignoring or providing
	21	impose a continuing obligation on India to furnish	21	spurious excuses for failing to facilitate special tours
	22	information to Pakistan in the event of any changes in	22	of inspection; and (4) through frustrating the
			23	resolution of questions at the level of the
	23	the information previously provided to Pakistan.		_
	23 24	This is required in two cases: first, if any	24	Permanent Indus Commission.
	23	* * *		_
	23 24	This is required in two cases: first, if any	24	Permanent Indus Commission. Slide 21. Commission meetings must be held
	23 24	This is required in two cases: first, if any proposed design alterations to a run-of-river plant	24	Permanent Indus Commission.

14:32 1	regularly, and at least annually, under paragraph 5 of	14:36 1	review and modify the Treaty according to Article XII,
2	Article VIII of the Treaty. Since the Treaty entered	2	paragraph 3.
3	into force, the Commissioners have been meeting	3	A few days later, on 10 June, The Times of India
4	regularly, twice a year, almost every year. This	4	reported that "India may host a Pakistan delegation this
5	practice was discontinued around 2015/2016. Meetings	5	month for a meeting of the Permanent Indus Commission",
6	are limited to just once a year, and last not more than	6	and that "The 2 countries are currently in touch to
7	two days. Meanwhile, India is engaged in more HEP	7	finalise the dates for the proposed visit in the third
8	construction on the Western Rivers than ever before.	8	week of this month". That is at Exhibit P-570. This
9	I cited correspondence in footnote 5 of my written	9	came as a surprise to me, as I had heard nothing from
10	statement showing the most recent example of how India's	10	the Indian Commissioner formally through correspondence
11	conduct has led to the parties' failure to hold regular	11	to suggest that he was ready imminently to hold the
12	Commission meetings on at least an annual basis.	12	119th meeting of the Commission.
13	The last Commission meeting was held in India at the	13	Still no dates have been agreed for the 119th
14	end of May 2022. Two months later, I wrote to my Indian	14	meeting. The annual report for the year 1 April 2023 to
15	counterpart to propose dates in August and an agenda for	15	31 March 2024 has still not been finalised.
16	the 119th PIC meeting, to be held in Pakistan. That is	16	Slide 23. The practice of undertaking general tours
17	in Exhibit P-0218.	17	of inspection pursuant to Article VIII(4)(c) has also
18	I received no response. And I wrote again at the	18	fallen apart, and is no different from the previous
19	beginning of September 2022 emphasising that it was	19	situation of the meetings of the Commission.
20	essential to meet frequently to resolve the outstanding	20	General tours of inspection used to happen
21	issues. That is in Exhibit P-0219. I once again urged	21	frequently, even multiple times per year. The
22	my counterpart to indicate dates in October 2022 for	22	Commission used to inspect at least one or sometimes
23	holding the 119th meeting.	23	two rivers every year, so that over five years it would
24	In the face of ongoing silence from India, I wrote	24	visit each river in the Indus Basin. However, after
25	again in mid-November 2022, which is at Exhibit P-0220;	25	2014 and 2015, there has only been one general tour of
	Page 137		Page 139
14:34 1	in May 2023, which is at Exhibit P-0328; and		
14:34 1	in may 2025, which is at Eathort 1-0520, and	14:38 1	inspection, and that tour was conducted in 2019.
14.34 1	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329.	14:38 1 2	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our
	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide		My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to
2	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement.	2 3 4	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us
2 3	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide	2 3	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in
2 3 4	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th	2 3 4	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184,
2 3 4 5	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024.	2 3 4 5	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted
2 3 4 5 6	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568.	2 3 4 5 6	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually finalised and signed during the annual meetings of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was "an unprecedented state of affairs". I emphasised that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually finalised and signed during the annual meetings of the Commission. My 29 May letter was therefore an attempt	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was "an unprecedented state of affairs". I emphasised that: "Holding of Meetings and Tours of Inspection are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually finalised and signed during the annual meetings of the Commission. My 29 May letter was therefore an attempt to seek to finalise the annual report over email,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was "an unprecedented state of affairs". I emphasised that: "Holding of Meetings and Tours of Inspection are considered to be one of the main indicators of [the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually finalised and signed during the annual meetings of the Commission. My 29 May letter was therefore an attempt to seek to finalise the annual report over email, because we were not being allowed to meet at the level	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was "an unprecedented state of affairs". I emphasised that: "Holding of Meetings and Tours of Inspection are considered to be one of the main indicators of [the successful] implementation of the Treaty; any disruption
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually finalised and signed during the annual meetings of the Commission. My 29 May letter was therefore an attempt to seek to finalise the annual report over email, because we were not being allowed to meet at the level of the PIC.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was "an unprecedented state of affairs". I emphasised that: "Holding of Meetings and Tours of Inspection are considered to be one of the main indicators of [the successful] implementation of the Treaty; any disruption [to them, I said] would lead to believe that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually finalised and signed during the annual meetings of the Commission. My 29 May letter was therefore an attempt to seek to finalise the annual report over email, because we were not being allowed to meet at the level of the PIC. The Indian Commissioner responded on 31 May 2024.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was "an unprecedented state of affairs". I emphasised that: "Holding of Meetings and Tours of Inspection are considered to be one of the main indicators of [the successful] implementation of the Treaty; any disruption [to them, I said] would lead to believe that the implementation of the Treaty has become stand still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually finalised and signed during the annual meetings of the Commission. My 29 May letter was therefore an attempt to seek to finalise the annual report over email, because we were not being allowed to meet at the level of the PIC. The Indian Commissioner responded on 31 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0569. Instead of offering any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was "an unprecedented state of affairs". I emphasised that: "Holding of Meetings and Tours of Inspection are considered to be one of the main indicators of [the successful] implementation of the Treaty; any disruption [to them, I said] would lead to believe that the implementation of the Treaty has become stand still [and would therefore be] a very serious matter of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually finalised and signed during the annual meetings of the Commission. My 29 May letter was therefore an attempt to seek to finalise the annual report over email, because we were not being allowed to meet at the level of the PIC. The Indian Commissioner responded on 31 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0569. Instead of offering any dates for the 119th PIC meeting or indicating the Indian	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was "an unprecedented state of affairs". I emphasised that: "Holding of Meetings and Tours of Inspection are considered to be one of the main indicators of [the successful] implementation of the Treaty; any disruption [to them, I said] would lead to believe that the implementation of the Treaty has become stand still [and would therefore be] a very serious matter of concern [to Pakistan]."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually finalised and signed during the annual meetings of the Commission. My 29 May letter was therefore an attempt to seek to finalise the annual report over email, because we were not being allowed to meet at the level of the PIC. The Indian Commissioner responded on 31 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0569. Instead of offering any dates for the 119th PIC meeting or indicating the Indian Commissioner's comments on or agreement to the annual	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was "an unprecedented state of affairs". I emphasised that: "Holding of Meetings and Tours of Inspection are considered to be one of the main indicators of [the successful] implementation of the Treaty; any disruption [to them, I said] would lead to believe that the implementation of the Treaty has become stand still [and would therefore be] a very serious matter of concern [to Pakistan]." India subsequently proposed a general tour of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually finalised and signed during the annual meetings of the Commission. My 29 May letter was therefore an attempt to seek to finalise the annual report over email, because we were not being allowed to meet at the level of the PIC. The Indian Commissioner responded on 31 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0569. Instead of offering any dates for the 119th PIC meeting or indicating the Indian Commissioner's comments on or agreement to the annual report, a draft of which was shared by me with him,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was "an unprecedented state of affairs". I emphasised that: "Holding of Meetings and Tours of Inspection are considered to be one of the main indicators of [the successful] implementation of the Treaty; any disruption [to them, I said] would lead to believe that the implementation of the Treaty has become stand still [and would therefore be] a very serious matter of concern [to Pakistan]." India subsequently proposed a general tour of inspection that has been scheduled to take place on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually finalised and signed during the annual meetings of the Commission. My 29 May letter was therefore an attempt to seek to finalise the annual report over email, because we were not being allowed to meet at the level of the PIC. The Indian Commissioner responded on 31 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0569. Instead of offering any dates for the 119th PIC meeting or indicating the Indian Commissioner's comments on or agreement to the annual report, a draft of which was shared by me with him, Mr Pal referred only to India's notices to Pakistan to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was "an unprecedented state of affairs". I emphasised that: "Holding of Meetings and Tours of Inspection are considered to be one of the main indicators of [the successful] implementation of the Treaty; any disruption [to them, I said] would lead to believe that the implementation of the Treaty has become stand still [and would therefore be] a very serious matter of concern [to Pakistan]." India subsequently proposed a general tour of inspection that has been scheduled to take place on the River Chenab in October 2018. Its letter is at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually finalised and signed during the annual meetings of the Commission. My 29 May letter was therefore an attempt to seek to finalise the annual report over email, because we were not being allowed to meet at the level of the PIC. The Indian Commissioner responded on 31 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0569. Instead of offering any dates for the 119th PIC meeting or indicating the Indian Commissioner's comments on or agreement to the annual report, a draft of which was shared by me with him,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was "an unprecedented state of affairs". I emphasised that: "Holding of Meetings and Tours of Inspection are considered to be one of the main indicators of [the successful] implementation of the Treaty; any disruption [to them, I said] would lead to believe that the implementation of the Treaty has become stand still [and would therefore be] a very serious matter of concern [to Pakistan]." India subsequently proposed a general tour of inspection that has been scheduled to take place on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually finalised and signed during the annual meetings of the Commission. My 29 May letter was therefore an attempt to seek to finalise the annual report over email, because we were not being allowed to meet at the level of the PIC. The Indian Commissioner responded on 31 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0569. Instead of offering any dates for the 119th PIC meeting or indicating the Indian Commissioner's comments on or agreement to the annual report, a draft of which was shared by me with him, Mr Pal referred only to India's notices to Pakistan to enter into government-to-government negotiations to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was "an unprecedented state of affairs". I emphasised that: "Holding of Meetings and Tours of Inspection are considered to be one of the main indicators of [the successful] implementation of the Treaty; any disruption [to them, I said] would lead to believe that the implementation of the Treaty has become stand still [and would therefore be] a very serious matter of concern [to Pakistan]." India subsequently proposed a general tour of inspection that has been scheduled to take place on the River Chenab in October 2018. Its letter is at Exhibit P-0190. India claimed that local elections
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	February 2024, which is at Exhibit P-0329. It is in this respect that I would like to provide the first update to my statement. Slide 22. After two years of silence from India in the face of my requests to fix the date for the 119th PIC meeting, I wrote again to India on 29 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0568. India's failure, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, to agree dates for the 119th PIC meeting meant that the Commission had not finalised the annual report for the year starting from 1 April 2023 and ending at 31 March 2024. Such annual reports are usually finalised and signed during the annual meetings of the Commission. My 29 May letter was therefore an attempt to seek to finalise the annual report over email, because we were not being allowed to meet at the level of the PIC. The Indian Commissioner responded on 31 May 2024. That is at Exhibit P-0569. Instead of offering any dates for the 119th PIC meeting or indicating the Indian Commissioner's comments on or agreement to the annual report, a draft of which was shared by me with him, Mr Pal referred only to India's notices to Pakistan to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	My predecessor and I sent multiple letters to our Indian counterparts in an attempt to persuade them to fulfil India's obligation under the Treaty and allow us to carry out the tours of inspection. For example, in my letter of 5 June 2018, which is at Exhibit P-0184, I observed that tours of inspection stood disrupted since the last four years that is September 2014 despite Pakistan's various requests. In my letter of 9 July 2018, Exhibit P-0185, I observed that the Commission had not undertaken "any Tours of Inspection either General or Special on both the sides of the Indus Basin", and that this was "an unprecedented state of affairs". I emphasised that: "Holding of Meetings and Tours of Inspection are considered to be one of the main indicators of [the successful] implementation of the Treaty; any disruption [to them, I said] would lead to believe that the implementation of the Treaty has become stand still [and would therefore be] a very serious matter of concern [to Pakistan]." India subsequently proposed a general tour of inspection that has been scheduled to take place on the River Chenab in October 2018. Its letter is at

38 (Pages 137 to 140)

14:39				
14.57	1	necessitated the postponement. India subsequently	14:43 1	effort to settle disputes promptly. Unfortunately, as
	2	postponed, yes. So this was concerning the postponement	2	you can see from the table on the slide, which provides
	3	of their communicated date of the tour of inspection in	3	eight different cases concerning the time which was
	4	October 2018.	4	consumed in the resolution of the disputes, or some are
	5	I expressed my disappointment in my response of	5	still lingering, efforts to settle have been far from
	6	28 September 2018 and asked for the tour to be	6	prompt.
	7	rearranged as soon as possible. My letter is at	7	The parties' dispute over the KHEP has lasted for
	8	Exhibit P-0192.	8	several years now. Their dispute over Wullar Barrage
	9	The general inspection of the Chenab Basin finally	9	has lasted even longer. Disputes over the other HEPs,
	10	took place at the end of January 2019, and that remains	10	like Dul Hasti and Baglihar, have taken over ten years
	11	the last general tour. So it lasted just four days, and	11	to resolve.
	12	related only to certain sites and works on the Chenab,	12	India attempts to buy time and procrastinate by
	13	as detailed in Exhibit P-0201.	13	avoiding holding regular meetings and regular tours of
	14	Our inspection of three out of the four HEPs we	14	inspection; and as I will go on to explain in the next
	15	looked at during the inspection that is the dam sites	15	part of my presentation, it has also done so by failing
	16	of Ratle, Lower Kalnai and Baglihar Dam itself all	16	to provide data in a timely manner. These tactics have
	17	took place within the space of a single day. The	17	intensified over the past decade.
	18	correspondence on this matter is detailed in	18	Slide 25. I now turn to the second way in which
	19	paragraphs 26 to 27 of Pakistan's explanatory note on	19	India's conduct has frustrated the functioning of the
	20	site visit correspondence for the Kishenganga and Ratle	20	Treaty; that is, by its approach to its
	21	Hydroelectric Plants 2014 to 2023, sent to the Court on	21	informing-sharing obligations beyond Article VIII.
	22	9 May 2023.	22	Mr Chairman and members of the Court, India's
	23	Article VIII(4)(b) imposes a separate obligation to	23	failure to provide timely information to Pakistan
	24	undertake promptly, at the request of either	24	regarding the design of a new run-of-river hydropower
	25	Commissioner, a tour of inspection, or what we call	25	plant is one of the main reasons why disputes have
		•		
		Page 141		Page 143
14:41	1	a "special tour of inspection". India has a very poor	14:44 1	arisen under the Treaty. Part of the reason for this is
	2	record in relation to these inspection requests again.	2	that by the time India shares any information with
	3	Even when such tours have taken place, Pakistan has not	3	Pakistan about the construction of a new plant on the
	4	always been able to properly inspect the site. In	4	_
				Western Rivers, its design is already far advanced. In
	5	recent years, my requests for inspections have either		Western Rivers, its design is already far advanced. In some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction
		recent years, my requests for inspections have either been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses	5	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction
	5		5	• •
	5 6	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses	5 6	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be
	5 6 7	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place.	5 6 7	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays
	5 6 7 8	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory	5 6 7 8	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be
	5 6 7 8 9	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan	5 6 7 8 9	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in
	5 6 7 8 9	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian	5 6 7 8 9	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022,	5 6 7 8 9 10	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so.
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022, seeking access to the KHEP in accordance with	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so. There are two main problems with the delayed
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022, seeking access to the KHEP in accordance with Article VIII(4)(d) of the Treaty.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so. There are two main problems with the delayed provision of information. First, it leaves Pakistan,
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022, seeking access to the KHEP in accordance with Article VIII(4)(d) of the Treaty. The only time I received an answer to this topic	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so. There are two main problems with the delayed provision of information. First, it leaves Pakistan, and the Commission itself, with very limited time to
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022, seeking access to the KHEP in accordance with Article VIII(4)(d) of the Treaty. The only time I received an answer to this topic from the Indian Commissioner was during meetings of the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so. There are two main problems with the delayed provision of information. First, it leaves Pakistan, and the Commission itself, with very limited time to discuss that information with India.
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022, seeking access to the KHEP in accordance with Article VIII(4)(d) of the Treaty. The only time I received an answer to this topic from the Indian Commissioner was during meetings of the Commission. In that context, he has claimed that there	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so. There are two main problems with the delayed provision of information. First, it leaves Pakistan, and the Commission itself, with very limited time to discuss that information with India. Second, even if India generally considers that
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022, seeking access to the KHEP in accordance with Article VIII(4)(d) of the Treaty. The only time I received an answer to this topic from the Indian Commissioner was during meetings of the Commission. In that context, he has claimed that there is no hesitation on India's part to have meetings and	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so. There are two main problems with the delayed provision of information. First, it leaves Pakistan, and the Commission itself, with very limited time to discuss that information with India. Second, even if India generally considers that Pakistan has valid concerns about the design, India
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022, seeking access to the KHEP in accordance with Article VIII(4)(d) of the Treaty. The only time I received an answer to this topic from the Indian Commissioner was during meetings of the Commission. In that context, he has claimed that there is no hesitation on India's part to have meetings and tours, and that's it.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so. There are two main problems with the delayed provision of information. First, it leaves Pakistan, and the Commission itself, with very limited time to discuss that information with India. Second, even if India generally considers that Pakistan has valid concerns about the design, India refuses to consider any of Pakistan's concerns with
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022, seeking access to the KHEP in accordance with Article VIII(4)(d) of the Treaty. The only time I received an answer to this topic from the Indian Commissioner was during meetings of the Commission. In that context, he has claimed that there is no hesitation on India's part to have meetings and tours, and that's it. Despite repeated requests, there have been no	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so. There are two main problems with the delayed provision of information. First, it leaves Pakistan, and the Commission itself, with very limited time to discuss that information with India. Second, even if India generally considers that Pakistan has valid concerns about the design, India refuses to consider any of Pakistan's concerns with an open mind. This is because at the stage at which
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022, seeking access to the KHEP in accordance with Article VIII(4)(d) of the Treaty. The only time I received an answer to this topic from the Indian Commissioner was during meetings of the Commission. In that context, he has claimed that there is no hesitation on India's part to have meetings and tours, and that's it. Despite repeated requests, there have been no inspections, general or special, since 2019. The PCIW's	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so. There are two main problems with the delayed provision of information. First, it leaves Pakistan, and the Commission itself, with very limited time to discuss that information with India. Second, even if India generally considers that Pakistan has valid concerns about the design, India refuses to consider any of Pakistan's concerns with an open mind. This is because at the stage at which Pakistan objects, the whole construction schedule has
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022, seeking access to the KHEP in accordance with Article VIII(4)(d) of the Treaty. The only time I received an answer to this topic from the Indian Commissioner was during meetings of the Commission. In that context, he has claimed that there is no hesitation on India's part to have meetings and tours, and that's it. Despite repeated requests, there have been no inspections, general or special, since 2019. The PCIW's request for a special tour of inspection of the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so. There are two main problems with the delayed provision of information. First, it leaves Pakistan, and the Commission itself, with very limited time to discuss that information with India. Second, even if India generally considers that Pakistan has valid concerns about the design, India refuses to consider any of Pakistan's concerns with an open mind. This is because at the stage at which Pakistan objects, the whole construction schedule has already been agreed and things have moved forward. By
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022, seeking access to the KHEP in accordance with Article VIII(4)(d) of the Treaty. The only time I received an answer to this topic from the Indian Commissioner was during meetings of the Commission. In that context, he has claimed that there is no hesitation on India's part to have meetings and tours, and that's it. Despite repeated requests, there have been no inspections, general or special, since 2019. The PCIW's request for a special tour of inspection of the Kishenganga Hydroelectric Plant has been pending since	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so. There are two main problems with the delayed provision of information. First, it leaves Pakistan, and the Commission itself, with very limited time to discuss that information with India. Second, even if India generally considers that Pakistan has valid concerns about the design, India refuses to consider any of Pakistan's concerns with an open mind. This is because at the stage at which Pakistan objects, the whole construction schedule has already been agreed and things have moved forward. By that point, changes in the design will involve huge
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022, seeking access to the KHEP in accordance with Article VIII(4)(d) of the Treaty. The only time I received an answer to this topic from the Indian Commissioner was during meetings of the Commission. In that context, he has claimed that there is no hesitation on India's part to have meetings and tours, and that's it. Despite repeated requests, there have been no inspections, general or special, since 2019. The PCIW's request for a special tour of inspection of the Kishenganga Hydroelectric Plant has been pending since 2014.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so. There are two main problems with the delayed provision of information. First, it leaves Pakistan, and the Commission itself, with very limited time to discuss that information with India. Second, even if India generally considers that Pakistan has valid concerns about the design, India refuses to consider any of Pakistan's concerns with an open mind. This is because at the stage at which Pakistan objects, the whole construction schedule has already been agreed and things have moved forward. By that point, changes in the design will involve huge additional construction costs, and for that matter,
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022, seeking access to the KHEP in accordance with Article VIII(4)(d) of the Treaty. The only time I received an answer to this topic from the Indian Commissioner was during meetings of the Commission. In that context, he has claimed that there is no hesitation on India's part to have meetings and tours, and that's it. Despite repeated requests, there have been no inspections, general or special, since 2019. The PCIW's request for a special tour of inspection of the Kishenganga Hydroelectric Plant has been pending since 2014. Slide 24. Article VIII(4)(b) makes it clear that one of the functions of the Commission is to make every	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so. There are two main problems with the delayed provision of information. First, it leaves Pakistan, and the Commission itself, with very limited time to discuss that information with India. Second, even if India generally considers that Pakistan has valid concerns about the design, India refuses to consider any of Pakistan's concerns with an open mind. This is because at the stage at which Pakistan objects, the whole construction schedule has already been agreed and things have moved forward. By that point, changes in the design will involve huge additional construction costs, and for that matter, other similar issues. In short, India's own conduct in failing to provide
	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	been ignored by India or been met with spurious excuses again to avoid inspections taking place. Pakistan detailed such requests in the explanatory note to which I just referred. In that note, Pakistan observed that I sent 16 letters to the Indian Commissioners between 30 May 2019 and 18 November 2022, seeking access to the KHEP in accordance with Article VIII(4)(d) of the Treaty. The only time I received an answer to this topic from the Indian Commissioner was during meetings of the Commission. In that context, he has claimed that there is no hesitation on India's part to have meetings and tours, and that's it. Despite repeated requests, there have been no inspections, general or special, since 2019. The PCIW's request for a special tour of inspection of the Kishenganga Hydroelectric Plant has been pending since 2014. Slide 24. Article VIII(4)(b) makes it clear that	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	some cases, the preliminary works, such as construction of access roads, stockpiling of construction material, construction of contractor camps, et cetera, may be substantially completed. And essentially India delays providing Pakistan with information until it is in a position to present a fait accompli, or a near fait accompli, if I may say so. There are two main problems with the delayed provision of information. First, it leaves Pakistan, and the Commission itself, with very limited time to discuss that information with India. Second, even if India generally considers that Pakistan has valid concerns about the design, India refuses to consider any of Pakistan's concerns with an open mind. This is because at the stage at which Pakistan objects, the whole construction schedule has already been agreed and things have moved forward. By that point, changes in the design will involve huge additional construction costs, and for that matter, other similar issues.

14:46	timely information reduces the chance that the	14:49 1	is not on the record, but Pakistan would be happy to
2	Commission will be able to reach agreement. That comes	2	share it with the Court.
3	at the detriment not only of Pakistan, but also of the	3	Under Article VI(2), each party is entitled to
۷	Treaty and its spirit.	4	request any data relating to the hydrology of the river,
5	I am firmly of the view that the parties should be	5	to canal or reservoir operation connected with the
ϵ	afforded an early opportunity to consider information	6	rivers, or to any provision of this Treaty. The other
7	and start engaging with each other, even if a project	7	party is required to supply that data, to the extent
8	might not ultimately go ahead. One of the main reasons	8	that these are available.
Ģ	for this view is that certain aspects of the design of	9	In 2007, for example, when I was a technical advisor
10	a river plant which are fixed at an early stage in the	10	to Pakistan's then Commissioner, Pakistan requested
1	design process can generate substantial points of	11	information about sediment concentrations. You can see
12	2 contention.	12	that at Exhibit P-0058. This is one of the types of
13	Sharing information at an early stage would ensure	13	data related to the hydrology of the river. India has
14	that Pakistan would not be caught by surprise before	14	never provided this information to Pakistan.
15	construction of river works is due to commence. In my	15	Article IV(8) requires India to provide Pakistan
10	opinion, information needs to be received much earlier,	16	with information regarding flood flows as far in advance
17	and not just six months before the beginning of the	17	as practicable, in order to enable Pakistan to determine
18	3 construction of the river works connected with the	18	the likely impact of the flood and to make preparations
19	plant. I believe that were India to accept this view	19	to mitigate the flood damages.
20	and cooperate more openly, there would be much less	20	The obligation to communicate flood information
2	scope for discord.	21	under Article IV(8) has been the subject of
22	2 Another factor that contributes to the impairment of	22	correspondence with the ICIW in recent years. It shows
23		23	the change in India's approach to cooperation under the
24	ultimately provided by India under paragraph 9 and	24	Treaty over the years. And when I say "the change
25	Appendix II of Annexure D for new run-of-river HEPs is	25	over the years", I would like to refer to 1989, when the
	D 145		D 147
	Page 145		Page 147
14:47 1	not sufficiently detailed to enable Pakistan to satisfy	14:50 1	Commissioners for India and Pakistan entered into
2	-	2	an agreement on the supply of flood information, which
3	, c	3	is called the 1989 Flood Agreement. This is at
4		4	Exhibit P-0331.
5		5	The 1989 agreement was subsequently renewed every
6	-	6	year for the following two decades, almost. It
7		7	established detailed arrangements for the parties to
8		8	share advanced information about river flows between
9		9	July and October. The practice remained in place until
10		10	the year 2001 initially.
11		11	In 2001, the Indian Commissioner modified, to
12		12	a certain extent, the 1989 agreement arrangements, by
13		13	excluding information regarding the inflows and outflows
14		14	and water levels of Bhakra and Pong Dams on the Sutlej
15	-	15	and Beas Rivers respectively. That modified arrangement
16		16	remained in place until 2018, however, as I explained in
17	-	17	my letter to India of 3 July 2020, which is at
18		18	Exhibit P-0346, and on page 2 of that three-page letter.
19	provided and requesting that the missing data be	10	Exhibit 1 05-10, and on page 2 of that three page fetter.
		19	In 2019, India refused my request to resume the
20	provided.		In 2019, India refused my request to resume the
	provided. In the course of finalising my presentation to you	19	In 2019, India refused my request to resume the supply of flood information according to the 1989
21	provided. In the course of finalising my presentation to you today, India has just responded to the first of these	19 20 21	In 2019, India refused my request to resume the supply of flood information according to the 1989 agreement and Article IV(8). Since 2019, India has only
21 22	provided. In the course of finalising my presentation to you today, India has just responded to the first of these letters, dated 11 March 2021, which is at P-0571, and	19 20 21 22	In 2019, India refused my request to resume the supply of flood information according to the 1989 agreement and Article IV(8). Since 2019, India has only provided flood information to the extent that it
21	provided. In the course of finalising my presentation to you today, India has just responded to the first of these letters, dated 11 March 2021, which is at P-0571, and now, three years on, has purported to provide the	19 20 21	In 2019, India refused my request to resume the supply of flood information according to the 1989 agreement and Article IV(8). Since 2019, India has only provided flood information to the extent that it considers there to have been an extraordinary quantity
21 22 23	provided. In the course of finalising my presentation to you today, India has just responded to the first of these letters, dated 11 March 2021, which is at P-0571, and now, three years on, has purported to provide the missing data referenced in that and my subsequent letter	19 20 21 22 23	In 2019, India refused my request to resume the supply of flood information according to the 1989 agreement and Article IV(8). Since 2019, India has only provided flood information to the extent that it
21 22 23 24	provided. In the course of finalising my presentation to you today, India has just responded to the first of these letters, dated 11 March 2021, which is at P-0571, and now, three years on, has purported to provide the missing data referenced in that and my subsequent letter of 11 June 2021, which is at P-0572. India's response	19 20 21 22 23 24	In 2019, India refused my request to resume the supply of flood information according to the 1989 agreement and Article IV(8). Since 2019, India has only provided flood information to the extent that it considers there to have been an extraordinary quantity of flow. That information is not provided in real time again, and the delay could in some circumstances be
21 22 23 24	provided. In the course of finalising my presentation to you today, India has just responded to the first of these letters, dated 11 March 2021, which is at P-0571, and now, three years on, has purported to provide the missing data referenced in that and my subsequent letter	19 20 21 22 23 24	In 2019, India refused my request to resume the supply of flood information according to the 1989 agreement and Article IV(8). Since 2019, India has only provided flood information to the extent that it considers there to have been an extraordinary quantity of flow. That information is not provided in real time
21 22 23 24	provided. In the course of finalising my presentation to you today, India has just responded to the first of these letters, dated 11 March 2021, which is at P-0571, and now, three years on, has purported to provide the missing data referenced in that and my subsequent letter of 11 June 2021, which is at P-0572. India's response	19 20 21 22 23 24	In 2019, India refused my request to resume the supply of flood information according to the 1989 agreement and Article IV(8). Since 2019, India has only provided flood information to the extent that it considers there to have been an extraordinary quantity of flow. That information is not provided in real time again, and the delay could in some circumstances be

40 (Pages 145 to 148)

ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE IX AND ANNEXURE G OF THE INDUS WATERS TREATY 1960 Day 1 -- Hearing on the Merits, First Phase Monday, 8 Monday, 8 July 2024

14:52 1			
14.34 1	significant, even leading to loss of life or damage to	14:55 1	an emergency endangering the HEP. Moreover, and as
2	property, particularly in the rivers where we do not	2	I have said, no formal notification of the flushing was
3	receive flows, and those are the Ravi and the Sutlej,	3	given to Pakistan. The flushing operation was therefore
4	where the populations have already encroached the	4	in plain disregard of Article I[ix] of the 1978
5	floodplain because of non-availability of the flow.	5	Agreement on Salal.
6	As I explained to the Indian Commissioner in	6	Slide 28 is concerning my concluding remarks. So
7	a letter of 3 July 2020, at Exhibit P-0346, and on its	7	I would like to say a couple of words by way of
8	page 2, the result of India's decision to provide	8	conclusion to my presentation.
9	information only on discharges India considers to be	9	Mr Chairman and members of the Court, I have spent
10	extraordinary deprives Pakistan of its right to receive	10	-
11	information and creates a risk of flood damages in	11	Waters Treaty. I believe in the Treaty and I believe in
12	Pakistan, because Pakistan has been left with no option	12	
13	in terms of configuring its response on the basis of the	13	and India, two nuclear armed states, over water rights
14	advance information concerning the floods. This is	14	
15	contrary to the overall spirit of goodwill and	15	_
16	cooperation under the Treaty, and also according to the	16	S
17	provision which is at paragraph 8 of Article IV.	17	since the end of the Kishenganga arbitration,
18	Slide 26. I wish at this juncture to make the	18	
19	second and final update to my statement concerning	19	my evidence to you that India is not complying with the
20	a recent flushing operation that took place in India,	20	
21	which risked serious downstream consequences for	21	coordination, and it is calling into question the
22	Pakistan.	22	functionality of the Treaty and the Permanent Indus
23	On 28 May 2024, India carried out a flushing	23	Commission itself.
24	operation on the Salal Hydroelectric Plant on the River	24	
25	Chenab, which you can see on the slides. Pakistan found	25	to you; that will be for Pakistan's Deputy Agent and the
	Page 149		Page 151
14:54 1	out about the operation from the public sources,	14:57 1	counsel team. I can merely give evidence as to what I,
14.34 1	including a video report from JKUpdate, which is at	14.57 1	as Pakistan's Commissioner, have observed. And I have
3	Exhibit P-0575, which I have included in the slide and	3	observed a failure of India to comply with its
4	which I would invite you to view.	4	obligations under the Treaty. Were I not to draw it to
5	As I wrote in my letter to India of 28 May, at	5	obligations under the freaty. Were I not to draw it to
	1131 wrote in my letter to main or 20 may, at		your attention. I would be remiss in my duty both to my
6	Exhibit P-0576, not only did India fail to share		your attention, I would be remiss in my duty both to my country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted
6 7	Exhibit P-0576, not only did India fail to share information with me about the extraordinary releases	6	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted
7	information with me about the extraordinary releases	6 7	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life.
7 8	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the	6 7 8	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court.
7 8 9	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is	6 7 8 9	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your
7 8 9 10	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps.	6 7 8	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions
7 8 9	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement	6 7 8 9 10	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your
7 8 9 10 11	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps.	6 7 8 9 10	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short
7 8 9 10 11 12	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement between the two states of India and Pakistan, which is	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short break to perhaps rearrange things, so that you can be
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement between the two states of India and Pakistan, which is at legal authority PLA-0053.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short break to perhaps rearrange things, so that you can be seated while we are asking those questions.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement between the two states of India and Pakistan, which is at legal authority PLA-0053. Mr Chairman, if you may allow me to move on to the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short break to perhaps rearrange things, so that you can be seated while we are asking those questions. So why don't we proceed in the next few minutes to
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement between the two states of India and Pakistan, which is at legal authority PLA-0053. Mr Chairman, if you may allow me to move on to the next slide that is slide 27 Article I(ix) of the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short break to perhaps rearrange things, so that you can be seated while we are asking those questions. So why don't we proceed in the next few minutes to do that, and the Court will consider the questions it
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement between the two states of India and Pakistan, which is at legal authority PLA-0053. Mr Chairman, if you may allow me to move on to the next slide that is slide 27 Article I(ix) of the 1978 agreement is on the slide. It provides that:	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short break to perhaps rearrange things, so that you can be seated while we are asking those questions. So why don't we proceed in the next few minutes to do that, and the Court will consider the questions it wishes to make. (Pause)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement between the two states of India and Pakistan, which is at legal authority PLA-0053. Mr Chairman, if you may allow me to move on to the next slide that is slide 27 Article I(ix) of the 1978 agreement is on the slide. It provides that: "The Dead Storage shall not be depleted except in	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short break to perhaps rearrange things, so that you can be seated while we are asking those questions. So why don't we proceed in the next few minutes to do that, and the Court will consider the questions it wishes to make. (Pause) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, would you like to just give the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement between the two states of India and Pakistan, which is at legal authority PLA-0053. Mr Chairman, if you may allow me to move on to the next slide that is slide 27 Article I(ix) of the 1978 agreement is on the slide. It provides that: "The Dead Storage shall not be depleted except in an unforeseen emergency endangering the safety of the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short break to perhaps rearrange things, so that you can be seated while we are asking those questions. So why don't we proceed in the next few minutes to do that, and the Court will consider the questions it wishes to make. (Pause) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, would you like to just give the witness an admonition that he is sequestered, so that it
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement between the two states of India and Pakistan, which is at legal authority PLA-0053. Mr Chairman, if you may allow me to move on to the next slide that is slide 27 Article I(ix) of the 1978 agreement is on the slide. It provides that: "The Dead Storage shall not be depleted except in an unforeseen emergency endangering the safety of the earth or the concrete dams."	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short break to perhaps rearrange things, so that you can be seated while we are asking those questions. So why don't we proceed in the next few minutes to do that, and the Court will consider the questions it wishes to make. (Pause) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, would you like to just give the witness an admonition that he is sequestered, so that it is quite clear on the record?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement between the two states of India and Pakistan, which is at legal authority PLA-0053. Mr Chairman, if you may allow me to move on to the next slide that is slide 27 Article I(ix) of the 1978 agreement is on the slide. It provides that: "The Dead Storage shall not be depleted except in an unforeseen emergency endangering the safety of the earth or the concrete dams." And that is concerning the Salal Dam.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short break to perhaps rearrange things, so that you can be seated while we are asking those questions. So why don't we proceed in the next few minutes to do that, and the Court will consider the questions it wishes to make. (Pause) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, would you like to just give the witness an admonition that he is sequestered, so that it is quite clear on the record? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. So since we are going to depart from
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement between the two states of India and Pakistan, which is at legal authority PLA-0053. Mr Chairman, if you may allow me to move on to the next slide that is slide 27 Article I(ix) of the 1978 agreement is on the slide. It provides that: "The Dead Storage shall not be depleted except in an unforeseen emergency endangering the safety of the earth or the concrete dams." And that is concerning the Salal Dam. "In that event, India shall give immediate	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short break to perhaps rearrange things, so that you can be seated while we are asking those questions. So why don't we proceed in the next few minutes to do that, and the Court will consider the questions it wishes to make. (Pause) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, would you like to just give the witness an admonition that he is sequestered, so that it is quite clear on the record? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. So since we are going to depart from the room, Mr Shah, I think you know that you are to be
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement between the two states of India and Pakistan, which is at legal authority PLA-0053. Mr Chairman, if you may allow me to move on to the next slide that is slide 27 Article I(ix) of the 1978 agreement is on the slide. It provides that: "The Dead Storage shall not be depleted except in an unforeseen emergency endangering the safety of the earth or the concrete dams." And that is concerning the Salal Dam. "In that event, India shall give immediate information to the Government of Pakistan of the nature	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short break to perhaps rearrange things, so that you can be seated while we are asking those questions. So why don't we proceed in the next few minutes to do that, and the Court will consider the questions it wishes to make. (Pause) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, would you like to just give the witness an admonition that he is sequestered, so that it is quite clear on the record? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. So since we are going to depart from the room, Mr Shah, I think you know that you are to be sequestered, which means you shouldn't have contact with
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement between the two states of India and Pakistan, which is at legal authority PLA-0053. Mr Chairman, if you may allow me to move on to the next slide that is slide 27 Article I(ix) of the 1978 agreement is on the slide. It provides that: "The Dead Storage shall not be depleted except in an unforeseen emergency endangering the safety of the earth or the concrete dams." And that is concerning the Salal Dam. "In that event, India shall give immediate information to the Government of Pakistan of the nature of the emergency"	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short break to perhaps rearrange things, so that you can be seated while we are asking those questions. So why don't we proceed in the next few minutes to do that, and the Court will consider the questions it wishes to make. (Pause) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, would you like to just give the witness an admonition that he is sequestered, so that it is quite clear on the record? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. So since we are going to depart from the room, Mr Shah, I think you know that you are to be sequestered, which means you shouldn't have contact with counsel or representatives from Pakistan. I believe
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement between the two states of India and Pakistan, which is at legal authority PLA-0053. Mr Chairman, if you may allow me to move on to the next slide that is slide 27 Article I(ix) of the 1978 agreement is on the slide. It provides that: "The Dead Storage shall not be depleted except in an unforeseen emergency endangering the safety of the earth or the concrete dams." And that is concerning the Salal Dam. "In that event, India shall give immediate information to the Government of Pakistan of the nature of the emergency" The recent flushing of Salal was undertaken for sediment management purposes. This is plainly not	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short break to perhaps rearrange things, so that you can be seated while we are asking those questions. So why don't we proceed in the next few minutes to do that, and the Court will consider the questions it wishes to make. (Pause) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, would you like to just give the witness an admonition that he is sequestered, so that it is quite clear on the record? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. So since we are going to depart from the room, Mr Shah, I think you know that you are to be sequestered, which means you shouldn't have contact with counsel or representatives from Pakistan. I believe there's even a separate room for you to go to, if need be. But I hope you will follow that admonition, and
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	information with me about the extraordinary releases from Salal HEP, pursuant to Article IV(8), but the operation itself is prohibited. The reason why it is prohibited is not because of the Treaty itself, perhaps. However, Salal is the subject of a special agreement between the two states of India and Pakistan, which is at legal authority PLA-0053. Mr Chairman, if you may allow me to move on to the next slide that is slide 27 Article I(ix) of the 1978 agreement is on the slide. It provides that: "The Dead Storage shall not be depleted except in an unforeseen emergency endangering the safety of the earth or the concrete dams." And that is concerning the Salal Dam. "In that event, India shall give immediate information to the Government of Pakistan of the nature of the emergency" The recent flushing of Salal was undertaken for	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	country and to the Treaty, to which I have devoted a large part of my professional life. Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the Court. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, for your presentation. I believe we transition now to questions from the Court, but I believe we are taking a very short break to perhaps rearrange things, so that you can be seated while we are asking those questions. So why don't we proceed in the next few minutes to do that, and the Court will consider the questions it wishes to make. (Pause) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, would you like to just give the witness an admonition that he is sequestered, so that it is quite clear on the record? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. So since we are going to depart from the room, Mr Shah, I think you know that you are to be sequestered, which means you shouldn't have contact with counsel or representatives from Pakistan. I believe there's even a separate room for you to go to, if need

41 (Pages 149 to 152)

14:59 1	we will see you in just a few minutes.	15:11 1	to perform two or three main functions.
2	(2.59 pm)	2	The first function is to forecast on the seasonal
3	(A short break)	3	basis the water availability, like the cropping season
4	(3.08 pm)	4	water availability. So in Pakistan we have generally
5	THE CHAIRMAN: Alright, Mr Shah, I think we have rearranged	5	two cropping seasons: one is the winter crop season,
6	the furniture and we are now back in session. Again,	6	which we call the Rabi season; and the summer crop
7	thank you for your testimony.	7	season, which we call the Kharif season. So during
8	At this point in the process, we will proceed with	8	these two cropping seasons, the model basically
9	questions from the members of the Court, and in that	9	forecasts the water availability on the basis of the
10	-	10	snow cover and the anticipated rainfall, as well as the
11	Questions from THE COURT	11	water which is available in the storage reservoirs, and
12	DR BLACKMORE: Thank you, Chairman.	12	that water availability is distributed at least on
13	Just for my clarification, I just wanted to know	13	a ten-day interval during the coming cropping season.
14	what the 1978 Salal treaty with is it "Salal"? How	14	Once that is done so that model basically,
15	do you pronounce it?	15	I would say, apportions or, I would say, allocates, as
16		16	per the apportionment defined in the Water Accord,
17	DR BLACKMORE: Yes. So what is that treaty and under what	17	the water during the coming crop season to the four
18	umbrella does it exist?	18	provinces, and then it basically provides the
19	A. Basically, Salal Agreement, which was signed in the year	19	distribution of that water to the four provinces, along
20		20	with the shortages.
21	Indus Waters Treaty, in which, you know, according to	21	So as a matter of fact, this operational model does
22	the provisions of Article IX, the Permanent Indus	22	not deal in the long-term forecasted water availability
23	Commission was basically engaged in the first instance	23	which is connected with the climate change or those
24	to resolve the questions; and subsequently, at the	24	factors.
25	government level, Pakistan's objections were resolved,	25	DR BLACKMORE: So given how critical it is in the Himalayan
	Page 153		Page 155
15:10 1	and then consequently this 1978 agreement was signed.	15:13 1	region for climate change and the future hydrology of
2	So I would say that is under the auspices of the	2	everybody that benefits from water that flows off the
3	Indus Waters Treaty, not a separate something which is	3	Himalayas in all directions, I'm just wondering: is
4	outside of the Indus Waters Treaty.	4	there any plan in Pakistan to develop a predictive model
5	DR BLACKMORE: I just have a general question around the	5	that would take into account the climate change impacts?
6	information that's available to Pakistan: that you can	6	
7	look at the whole of your basin, including the	7	taking into account any potential climate change
8	Kabul River and the six rivers we are talking about	8	impacts, particularly with respect to the rivers which
9	here, the Indus Treaty.	9	are flowing in Pakistan and are the mainstay for the
10	I notice that you have a model of the Indus River.	10	-
11	I'm just trying to understand what you're using that	11	
12	are you using that model?	12	
13	A. Yes, we are.	13	
14	DR BLACKMORE: And what information is that starting to show	14	
15	Pakistan around climate change and future hydrology of	15	
16	the region?	16	
17	A. Thank you, Mr Blackmore. So I would like to clarify	17	
18	that.	18	
19	So we have developed a model, the Government of	19	available from that network.
20	Pakistan has developed a model, in collaboration with	20	For now, for the purpose of water distribution,
21	the CSIRO of the Government of Australia. And that	21	we use those data to forecast the water availability
22	model is basically an operational model; it is not kind	22	particularly for the summer season. And the Government
23	of a long-term forecasting model. And that model is	23	of Pakistan has a dedicated outfit called the Global
24	used for the purposes of the implementation of the Water	24	Change Impact Study Centre, which is one of the outfits
25	Apportionment Accord which we have in Pakistan, in order	25	of the Ministry of Climate Change, that is also
	Dogs 154		Do 22 156
	Page 154		Page 156

,			
15:15 1	entrusted to look into the long-term variations,	15:18 1	And I would also briefly explain or share with you
2	particularly on the flows, and also the other aspects,	2	now that in the 1989 agreement, number one so that
3	like migration and agriculture, et cetera, related to	3	provides the sharing of the data under the three
4	the climate change.	4	different modes of communication: first one was the
5	So they are also doing some work, but that is still	5	radio broadcasts, and the second one was through
6	going on and is not finalised. But we believe that we	6	telegrams, and the third one was telephonic
7	need more resilience in terms of any potential alteration in the flows of the Indus system of rivers.	7	communication. So these were the three modes of
8 9	And for that matter, the Government of Pakistan is	8 9	communication which were agreed upon in the 1989
10	paying full attention, serious attention in terms of	10	agreement. And the most extensive mode which was used in the 1989 agreement was the telephonic communication,
11	construction of the water storages, because the water	11	in which the gauging stations were defined on every
12	storages in Pakistan have been depleted over the years,	12	
13	so during the past five decades, because of the	13	limits were also defined.
14	sedimentation.	14	
15	So now is the time when we feel that we need more	15	you concerning the River Ravi and River Sutlej. So it
16	water storages so that we can have, I would say,	16	
17	adequate resilience against any potential climate change	17	beyond a little less than 1,000 cubic metres per second,
18	impact, and we are constructing some water storages in	18	or 30,000 cusecs, India would start sharing the
19	the country. Thank you.	19	information, starting from 1 July, all along until
20	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.	20	10 October, seamlessly at six-hour intervals, so
21	Dr Buytaert.	21	regardless that would create a flood in Pakistan or not,
22	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you very much, Mr Shah, both for	22	so that Pakistan can configure its response; and then
23	your statement and for the clear presentation. I've got	23	the frequency of the sharing of the information would
24	a couple of questions as well.	24	reduce when the floods would [de]crease.
25	I would like to start with the arrangements for	25	And it comes to: when the flood flows would reach or
	Page 157		Page 159
15:16 1	data-sharing. I think you give a very clear view of how	15:20 1	would exceed 200,000 cusecs for the case of Ravi River
2	the data-sharing as part of the Indus Waters Treaty	2	at Madhopur and Sutlej River at the Ropar headworks, so
3	broke down. You mentioned the 1989 Flood Agreement,	3	India would start providing this information on one-hour
4	which also, if I understand you, stopped in 2018.	5	intervals. And the flood flows would increase beyond
5	Are there any other data-sharing agreements between Pakistan and India, or are those the only two that	6	150,000 at some other points, so India would provide again at one-hour intervals.
6 7	exist?	7	And the other important clause of that agreement was
8	A. Basically there is only one, rather, I would say, and	8	that that 1989 agreement was only for one year. So that
9	that was of 1989. I would like to explain a little bit	9	continued for almost two decades subsequently, on the
10	about that, and then how the two countries went about	10	basis of annual renewal of the same agreement between
11	that.	11	the two Commissioners. And all of a sudden, in 2018 or
12	Basically, the 1989 agreement was a consequence of	12	maybe 2019, the Indian side chose not to renew the 1989
13	a great flood in Pakistan in the year 1988. So I would	13	agreement, and conveyed to Pakistan that, according to
14	say the 1989 agreement was an example of the Permanent	14	their understanding of the Treaty, they would provide
15	Indus Commission when it was working with a relatively	15	Pakistan only when they would feel that the floods have
16	and significantly good spirit of cooperation, that the	16	reached the level of extraordinary discharge. And in
17	two Commissioners did not feel it as a constraint under	17	the absence of that extraordinary [discharge], they will
18		18	
19	the provisions of the Indus Waters Treaty to come up		not, basically, share.
	with a certain agreement, or certain, I would say,	19	So this is a brief of the 1989 agreement. And
20	with a certain agreement, or certain, I would say, arrangements through which the flood information can be	19 20	So this is a brief of the 1989 agreement. And subsequently there has been no agreement.
20 21	with a certain agreement, or certain, I would say, arrangements through which the flood information can be shared by India to Pakistan, with Pakistan.	19 20 21	So this is a brief of the 1989 agreement. And subsequently there has been no agreement. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But have they continued to share data?
20 21 22	with a certain agreement, or certain, I would say, arrangements through which the flood information can be shared by India to Pakistan, with Pakistan. And then when we see the 1989 agreement so	19 20 21 22	So this is a brief of the 1989 agreement. And subsequently there has been no agreement. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But have they continued to share data? A. Yes, they continued providing data, but not in
20 21 22 23	with a certain agreement, or certain, I would say, arrangements through which the flood information can be shared by India to Pakistan, with Pakistan. And then when we see the 1989 agreement so I would like to make a request that you can see the	19 20 21 22 23	So this is a brief of the 1989 agreement. And subsequently there has been no agreement. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But have they continued to share data? A. Yes, they continued providing data, but not in a continuous manner, just in a sporadic manner, when
20 21 22 23 24	with a certain agreement, or certain, I would say, arrangements through which the flood information can be shared by India to Pakistan, with Pakistan. And then when we see the 1989 agreement so I would like to make a request that you can see the details of Pakistan's position in my letter of	19 20 21 22 23 24	So this is a brief of the 1989 agreement. And subsequently there has been no agreement. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But have they continued to share data? A. Yes, they continued providing data, but not in a continuous manner, just in a sporadic manner, when they feel that the flows have exceeded a certain limit,
20 21 22 23	with a certain agreement, or certain, I would say, arrangements through which the flood information can be shared by India to Pakistan, with Pakistan. And then when we see the 1989 agreement so I would like to make a request that you can see the	19 20 21 22 23	So this is a brief of the 1989 agreement. And subsequently there has been no agreement. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But have they continued to share data? A. Yes, they continued providing data, but not in a continuous manner, just in a sporadic manner, when
20 21 22 23 24	with a certain agreement, or certain, I would say, arrangements through which the flood information can be shared by India to Pakistan, with Pakistan. And then when we see the 1989 agreement so I would like to make a request that you can see the details of Pakistan's position in my letter of	19 20 21 22 23 24	So this is a brief of the 1989 agreement. And subsequently there has been no agreement. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But have they continued to share data? A. Yes, they continued providing data, but not in a continuous manner, just in a sporadic manner, when they feel that the flows have exceeded a certain limit,
20 21 22 23 24	with a certain agreement, or certain, I would say, arrangements through which the flood information can be shared by India to Pakistan, with Pakistan. And then when we see the 1989 agreement so I would like to make a request that you can see the details of Pakistan's position in my letter of 3 July 2020, in which I have explained these facts.	19 20 21 22 23 24	So this is a brief of the 1989 agreement. And subsequently there has been no agreement. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: But have they continued to share data? A. Yes, they continued providing data, but not in a continuous manner, just in a sporadic manner, when they feel that the flows have exceeded a certain limit, their own defined limit, on which Pakistan has conveyed

ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE IX AND ANNEXURE G OF THE INDUS WATERS TREATY 1960 Day 1 -- Hearing on the Merits, First Phase Monday, 8 Monday, 8 July 2024

15:22 1	its concerns that this is not a correct way of	15:26 1	and the design of the hydropower dams. Does the lack of
13.22 1	implementation of the Treaty.	13.20 1	data also have a broader impact on water management in
3	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.	3	Pakistan: for example, the ability to issue early flood
4	Is there any other hydrological data-sharing between	4	warnings or to mitigate floods in the Indus rivers?
5	the two countries as part of different agreements or	5	A. Indeed, it is quite a serious thing, you know. So I, as
6	other activities, as far as you are aware?	6	Pakistan's Commissioner for Indus Waters, strongly
7	A. Yes, there are other arrangements of data-sharing, as	7	believe on the wisdom of the framers of the Treaty that
8	I said in my presentation. So the flood data-sharing	8	they thought it very important to make it as part of the
9	comes under Article IV, paragraph 8. And then there is	9	Indus Waters Treaty, this data exchange. And it is for
10	another provision, or a specific article of the Treaty:	10	a certain purpose.
11	that is the Article VI, Exchange of Data.	11	And as you said, if we just take one of the many
12	So under Article VI, India provides the daily data	12	possible uses of the data, as the flood early warning
13	of the gauging stations and canals and its reservoir	13	and issuance of that, so Pakistan is a populous country
14	operations on a monthly basis. But that has also been	14	and we need these data in order to configure our
15	stopped for quite a few months from now. And you will	15	response. Now we have to rely on the other sources
16	see in Pakistan's Memorial and in my statement and the	16	which are available in public domain.
17	relevant exhibits that although we receive those years	17	So as a practice, I would just like to share with
18	from India and we also provide in a similar way, on	18	you that despite the fact that we do not have that 1989
19	a contemporaneous basis, to each other the data of our	19	agreement renewed, but we still develop a flood warning
20	gauging stations but when we see in detail, we see	20	cell in the office of Pakistan Commissioner for Indus
21	that continuous long strings of "NR", which stands for	21	Waters, officially notified with effect from 1 July
22	"not received", would be the data or so-called	22	every year. And we depute the officials who work in
23	"data" which we receive from India.	23	that cell for 24/7, in order to avoid any possibility to
24	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you for your answer.	24	miss any call from Indian side to receive the data.
25	So as I understand it, the process of call it	25	And since we are not receiving the data, so the
	Page 161		Page 163
15:24 1	"deterioration" of data exchange started before you	15:27 1	officials who were working in that flood cell have been
_			8
2	became Commissioner; I think as early as 2014.	2	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on
3	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of	3	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But
3 4	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of	3 4	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal
3 4 5	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and	3 4 5	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the
3 4 5 6	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons	3 4 5 6	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we
3 4 5 6 7	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down?	3 4 5 6 7	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge.
3 4 5 6 7 8	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga	3 4 5 6 7 8	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see the records, which have been fairly shared for the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply available or potentially available on websites, so
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see the records, which have been fairly shared for the benefit of the Court, there is a simple refusal, without	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see the records, which have been fairly shared for the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply available or potentially available on websites, so that Pakistan, as well as anyone else, can consult them?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see the records, which have been fairly shared for the benefit of the Court, there is a simple refusal, without providing any reason why this is. So there is a change	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply available or potentially available on websites, so that Pakistan, as well as anyone else, can consult them? A. Yes, as I said, we tried to access the websites from
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see the records, which have been fairly shared for the benefit of the Court, there is a simple refusal, without providing any reason why this is. So there is a change of heart or a change of pattern, despite Pakistan's	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply available or potentially available on websites, so that Pakistan, as well as anyone else, can consult them? A. Yes, as I said, we tried to access the websites from where we can get the data from the Indian departments
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see the records, which have been fairly shared for the benefit of the Court, there is a simple refusal, without providing any reason why this is. So there is a change of heart or a change of pattern, despite Pakistan's repeated requests and conveying its concerns that it is something which is very, very important and it is part of the implementation of the Treaty, as well as the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply available or potentially available on websites, so that Pakistan, as well as anyone else, can consult them? A. Yes, as I said, we tried to access the websites from where we can get the data from the Indian departments like they have the Bhakra Beas Management Board, so they basically maintain their website but at times we feel that we cannot get the internet access of that site, and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see the records, which have been fairly shared for the benefit of the Court, there is a simple refusal, without providing any reason why this is. So there is a change of heart or a change of pattern, despite Pakistan's repeated requests and conveying its concerns that it is something which is very, very important and it is part of the implementation of the Treaty, as well as the obligation of India. But you can just appreciate that	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply available or potentially available on websites, so that Pakistan, as well as anyone else, can consult them? A. Yes, as I said, we tried to access the websites from where we can get the data from the Indian departments like they have the Bhakra Beas Management Board, so they basically maintain their website but at times we feel that we cannot get the internet access of that site, and at times we see that the specific data is not updated on
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see the records, which have been fairly shared for the benefit of the Court, there is a simple refusal, without providing any reason why this is. So there is a change of heart or a change of pattern, despite Pakistan's repeated requests and conveying its concerns that it is something which is very, very important and it is part of the implementation of the Treaty, as well as the obligation of India. But you can just appreciate that the record is simply silent, except that it basically	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply available or potentially available on websites, so that Pakistan, as well as anyone else, can consult them? A. Yes, as I said, we tried to access the websites from where we can get the data from the Indian departments like they have the Bhakra Beas Management Board, so they basically maintain their website but at times we feel that we cannot get the internet access of that site, and at times we see that the specific data is not updated on that website.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see the records, which have been fairly shared for the benefit of the Court, there is a simple refusal, without providing any reason why this is. So there is a change of heart or a change of pattern, despite Pakistan's repeated requests and conveying its concerns that it is something which is very, very important and it is part of the implementation of the Treaty, as well as the obligation of India. But you can just appreciate that the record is simply silent, except that it basically exhibits straight "no", or straight refusal from India.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply available or potentially available on websites, so that Pakistan, as well as anyone else, can consult them? A. Yes, as I said, we tried to access the websites from where we can get the data from the Indian departments like they have the Bhakra Beas Management Board, so they basically maintain their website but at times we feel that we cannot get the internet access of that site, and at times we see that the specific data is not updated on that website. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see the records, which have been fairly shared for the benefit of the Court, there is a simple refusal, without providing any reason why this is. So there is a change of heart or a change of pattern, despite Pakistan's repeated requests and conveying its concerns that it is something which is very, very important and it is part of the implementation of the Treaty, as well as the obligation of India. But you can just appreciate that the record is simply silent, except that it basically exhibits straight "no", or straight refusal from India. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply available or potentially available on websites, so that Pakistan, as well as anyone else, can consult them? A. Yes, as I said, we tried to access the websites from where we can get the data from the Indian departments like they have the Bhakra Beas Management Board, so they basically maintain their website but at times we feel that we cannot get the internet access of that site, and at times we see that the specific data is not updated on that website. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. Has Pakistan taken any specific measures to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see the records, which have been fairly shared for the benefit of the Court, there is a simple refusal, without providing any reason why this is. So there is a change of heart or a change of pattern, despite Pakistan's repeated requests and conveying its concerns that it is something which is very, very important and it is part of the implementation of the Treaty, as well as the obligation of India. But you can just appreciate that the record is simply silent, except that it basically exhibits straight "no", or straight refusal from India. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. So obviously the data exchange has an impact for	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply available or potentially available on websites, so that Pakistan, as well as anyone else, can consult them? A. Yes, as I said, we tried to access the websites from where we can get the data from the Indian departments like they have the Bhakra Beas Management Board, so they basically maintain their website but at times we feel that we cannot get the internet access of that site, and at times we see that the specific data is not updated on that website. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. Has Pakistan taken any specific measures to safeguard itself or to reduce the reliance on Indian
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see the records, which have been fairly shared for the benefit of the Court, there is a simple refusal, without providing any reason why this is. So there is a change of heart or a change of pattern, despite Pakistan's repeated requests and conveying its concerns that it is something which is very, very important and it is part of the implementation of the Treaty, as well as the obligation of India. But you can just appreciate that the record is simply silent, except that it basically exhibits straight "no", or straight refusal from India. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply available or potentially available on websites, so that Pakistan, as well as anyone else, can consult them? A. Yes, as I said, we tried to access the websites from where we can get the data from the Indian departments like they have the Bhakra Beas Management Board, so they basically maintain their website but at times we feel that we cannot get the internet access of that site, and at times we see that the specific data is not updated on that website. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. Has Pakistan taken any specific measures to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see the records, which have been fairly shared for the benefit of the Court, there is a simple refusal, without providing any reason why this is. So there is a change of heart or a change of pattern, despite Pakistan's repeated requests and conveying its concerns that it is something which is very, very important and it is part of the implementation of the Treaty, as well as the obligation of India. But you can just appreciate that the record is simply silent, except that it basically exhibits straight "no", or straight refusal from India. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. So obviously the data exchange has an impact for your ability, as Commissioner, to evaluate the impact	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply available or potentially available on websites, so that Pakistan, as well as anyone else, can consult them? A. Yes, as I said, we tried to access the websites from where we can get the data from the Indian departments like they have the Bhakra Beas Management Board, so they basically maintain their website but at times we feel that we cannot get the internet access of that site, and at times we see that the specific data is not updated on that website. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. Has Pakistan taken any specific measures to safeguard itself or to reduce the reliance on Indian data; for example, more measurement stations close to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I understand that that obviously has been the remit of your predecessor. But do you have an appreciation of the dynamic with which that deterioration starts, and basically what was happening, what were the main reasons that from 2014 onwards the data exchange broke down? Was that a direct consequence of the Kishenganga proceedings, or was it a combination of factors? A. Professor Buytaert, I would prefer to speak in accordance with what is available on record, rather than to conjecture on my own understanding. And when we see the records, which have been fairly shared for the benefit of the Court, there is a simple refusal, without providing any reason why this is. So there is a change of heart or a change of pattern, despite Pakistan's repeated requests and conveying its concerns that it is something which is very, very important and it is part of the implementation of the Treaty, as well as the obligation of India. But you can just appreciate that the record is simply silent, except that it basically exhibits straight "no", or straight refusal from India. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. So obviously the data exchange has an impact for	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	advised or have been instructed to continuously check on the websites of the Indian concerned departments. But I can share with you what I saw: that in the normal course I would say using the normal means of the internet access, we cannot access those websites and we cannot get the data. So that is quite a big challenge. And then we have to rely on the other internet resources in order to configure our flood early warning response. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. You mentioned internet and websites. Does that mean that some of the data are in the public domain, simply available or potentially available on websites, so that Pakistan, as well as anyone else, can consult them? A. Yes, as I said, we tried to access the websites from where we can get the data from the Indian departments like they have the Bhakra Beas Management Board, so they basically maintain their website but at times we feel that we cannot get the internet access of that site, and at times we see that the specific data is not updated on that website. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. Has Pakistan taken any specific measures to safeguard itself or to reduce the reliance on Indian

44 (Pages 161 to 164)

	ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE IX AND Alearing on the Merits, First Phase	NNEXURE G OF THE INDUS WATERS TREATY 1960 Monday, 8 July 202
15:29 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	the border, or any other way to compensate for the lack of data or the risk that data don't come through from India? A. Yes. So Pakistan has a Pakistan Meteorological Department, which has a specific outfit with the name of the Flood Forecasting Division. So Flood Forecasting Division has been basically entrusted with the mandate to prepare the forecasts and then to disseminate, and they rely on the synoptic charts. So we have our own weather Doppler radars, which are installed at the points closer to the boundary, to the international boundary with India or the Line of Control, and we get so when I say basically what we do is that we have, basically, the three-tiered set-up in Pakistan in terms of preparation of the flood forecasts. First is to get the weather information and have a forecast of the rainfall precipitation in the upper catchments, as well as the catchments in Pakistan, so that we can have a considerably long lag time by way of simulating the rainfall into the runoff, and then have that runoff hydrograph routed throughout our catchments, so that we can get a forecast of at least 18 days before the happening of the event. Then on the second tier, we rely on our weather	15:32 1 The scheme of preparation according to which the 2 Pakistan team which is now present before the Court is 3 such that we have divided the tasks. So I feel that 4 Court can take more benefit if you can get a detailed 5 answer from Dr Morris, sir, during his presentation in 6 due course in the current hearing. So he would be 7 providing you the details on this aspect. 8 PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you very much. I'll stop for now 9 and give my colleagues a chance as well. I might come 10 back later with more questions. 11 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Minear. 12 MR MINEAR: Thank you, Mr Shah for your presentation, I just 13 have a few short questions. 14 First, under Article VII(2), does Pakistan, as 15 a downstream riparian, ever have occasion or obligation 16 to notify India of its engineering works that might 17 materially affect India? 18 A. I don't think so. 19 MR MINEAR: Okay. 20 Second, under Annexure D, Appendix II, does India 21 provide load curves as part of its hydraulic data when 22 providing new dam information? 23 A. About what? 24 MR MINEAR: Does India provide load curves 25 A. Load curves?
15:31 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Doppler radars, which provide us a real-time precipitation, so when that is happening in the upper catchments. So those weather Doppler radars are connected or have been integrated with our early flood warning system, which is a model which basically simulates. On the third tier, we have the stream gauging station, which are basically the automatic gauging stations which are installed right at the entry points of the rivers which are coming from India, so that we can get that information. So by way of moving from the first tier to the third tier, the consequence is that the reliability and,	15:34 1 MR MINEAR: load curves when providing hydraulic data? 2 A. No, never. 3 MR MINEAR: As a partial explanation of India's failure to 4 provide information, has India ever offered the Covid 5 epidemic or other factors such as that as an explanation 6 for its failure to provide information or provide 7 meetings or tours of facilities? 8 A. Yes, [Mr] Minear. So I believe that that is part of the 9 record which Pakistan has shared with the Court. 10 So it was again during my tenure as Pakistani 11 Commissioner for Indus Waters when I have been asking my 12 counterpart, before the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic, 13 to hold a meeting, and that meeting was also agreed in

13 tier, the consequence is that the reliability and, 14 I would say, the accuracy would increase, but the lag

15 time would decrease.

PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you very much. 16

17 Sir Daniel mentioned this morning [that] one of the 18 main concerns of Pakistan is the potential catastrophic

19 consequences of the building of hydropower plants on the

20 Western Rivers. Can I ask for your view on what these

21 consequences are from your perspective, from water

22 resources and flood risk? Can you elaborate on how you

23 see those catastrophic consequences pan out? Where are

24 the main risks that you're concerned about?

A. Thank you, Professor Buytaert.

Page 166

to hold a meeting, and that meeting was also agreed in 13

14 the previous meeting that we are going to hold that

15 meeting in a shorter time. So this was in 2019,

16 I believe, if my memory serves me correctly: that I have

17 been asking before the onset of Covid-19, by way of

18 writing almost ten or eleven letters in a period of

19 eight to nine months, to convey me the dates, and India

20 side did not convey me.

21 And eventually this pandemic broke and the meeting

22 could not take place. And that was perhaps the only

23 occasion when the annual meeting of the Commission could

24 not take place until then. So the current year has

25 become the second year in which the Commission could not

Page 168

15:36 1			
15.50 1	meet.	15:39 1	So it is my opinion.
2	So, yes, basically India refused once on account of	2	MR MINEAR: Thank you.
3	Covid-19 that they could not hold the meeting of the	3	And then one last question: does Pakistan view
4	Indus Commission, but not concerning the tours.	4	India's failure to provide adequate information as
5	MR MINEAR: Thank you.	5	presenting a dispute under Article IX?
6	Were you involved in the Baglihar proceeding?	6	A. Sorry, I could not Pakistan
7	A. Yes, I was involved in Baglihar. While in my previous	7	MR MINEAR: Let me repeat that again.
8	life now I work for the government, so at that time	8	A. Yes.
9	I was working with one of the state-owned consultancy	9	MR MINEAR: Does Pakistan view India's failure to provide
10	firms, NESPAK. So I was a young engineer in that	10	adequate information, does that rise to the level of
11	consultancy firm and I was doing some work concerning	11	a dispute under Article IX?
12	sediment simulation in Baglihar.	12	A. Yes. So as Pakistan Commissioner for Indus Waters,
13	MR MINEAR: Okay. This might be a question that goes beyond	13	I believe that there are a few dimensions to this
14	your experience in that proceeding, but there is	14	question. So when I would like to respond to that, as
15	a statement in the Neutral Expert's determination	15	I already explained in my statement, that how Pakistan
16	(PLA-0002) this appears at 5.1.1 on treaty	16	feels.
17	interpretation. And the sentence is that let me read	17	So I generally believe, as a practising engineer,
18	it in context (paragraph 6):	18	that at times you can also have the differences on
19	"The Treaty also gives a clear indication of the	19	designs or the approach of design. But those
20	rights and obligations of both Pakistan and India.	20	differences can be resolved, or cannot be resolved,
21	Sovereign rights cannot be exercised without	21	provided that a sufficient adequate time is provided.
22	consideration of the limits imposed by the Treaty. In	22	For example, if something has been started, the
23	this context, it is not appropriate for the NE [the	23	construction of a project has been started, and then
24	Neutral Expert] to qualify the Treaty as, inter alia,	24	so we start discussion as whether or not the design is
25	a 'delimitation' or a 'boundary' Treaty."	25	correct or not in accordance with the given criteria, so
	Page 169		Page 171
	1 age 109		1 age 171
15:37 1	Would you know what the basis for that statement	15:41 1	definitely it will be too late in time on the timeline.
2	was? Was the Neutral Expert responding to a position	2	So it is one of the concerns which Pakistan
3	stated by Pakistan, or what was the context for it	_	
,	stated by I division, or what was the content for it	3	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided
4	rejecting that view?	3 4	
5			genuinely feels: that the information which is provided
	rejecting that view?	4	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least
5	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the	4 5	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works,
5 6	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing	4 5 6	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal
5 6 7	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so	4 5 6 7	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if
5 6 7 8	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory.	4 5 6 7 8	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate
5 6 7 8 9	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned,	4 5 6 7 8 9	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely
5 6 7 8 9	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. And one other question concerning Baglihar. The	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different stages in a project construction or project development.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. And one other question concerning Baglihar. The approach that the Pakistan Memorial sets out for	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different stages in a project construction or project development. So you can plan, but that would remain a plan.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. And one other question concerning Baglihar. The approach that the Pakistan Memorial sets out for calculating maximum pondage, was that approach used in	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different stages in a project construction or project development. So you can plan, but that would remain a plan. Following that plan, you do the feasibility study. And
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. And one other question concerning Baglihar. The approach that the Pakistan Memorial sets out for calculating maximum pondage, was that approach used in the Baglihar proceeding?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different stages in a project construction or project development. So you can plan, but that would remain a plan. Following that plan, you do the feasibility study. And after the feasibility study, in which you calculate the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. And one other question concerning Baglihar. The approach that the Pakistan Memorial sets out for calculating maximum pondage, was that approach used in the Baglihar proceeding? A. Well, in Baglihar proceeding it was quite different. So	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different stages in a project construction or project development. So you can plan, but that would remain a plan. Following that plan, you do the feasibility study. And after the feasibility study, in which you calculate the costs and benefits of a project, once that is done, then
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. And one other question concerning Baglihar. The approach that the Pakistan Memorial sets out for calculating maximum pondage, was that approach used in the Baglihar proceeding? A. Well, in Baglihar proceeding it was quite different. So again I would like to state that on pondage, the scheme	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different stages in a project construction or project development. So you can plan, but that would remain a plan. Following that plan, you do the feasibility study. And after the feasibility study, in which you calculate the costs and benefits of a project, once that is done, then you enter into a detailed engineering design in which
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. And one other question concerning Baglihar. The approach that the Pakistan Memorial sets out for calculating maximum pondage, was that approach used in the Baglihar proceeding? A. Well, in Baglihar proceeding it was quite different. So again I would like to state that on pondage, the scheme of things is such that we are going to place before the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different stages in a project construction or project development. So you can plan, but that would remain a plan. Following that plan, you do the feasibility study. And after the feasibility study, in which you calculate the costs and benefits of a project, once that is done, then you enter into a detailed engineering design in which you calculate to the level of the nuts and bolts.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. And one other question concerning Baglihar. The approach that the Pakistan Memorial sets out for calculating maximum pondage, was that approach used in the Baglihar proceeding? A. Well, in Baglihar proceeding it was quite different. So again I would like to state that on pondage, the scheme of things is such that we are going to place before the Court a detailed account of all the previous history of	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different stages in a project construction or project development. So you can plan, but that would remain a plan. Following that plan, you do the feasibility study. And after the feasibility study, in which you calculate the costs and benefits of a project, once that is done, then you enter into a detailed engineering design in which you calculate to the level of the nuts and bolts. And once that is done, and it is decided that so
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. And one other question concerning Baglihar. The approach that the Pakistan Memorial sets out for calculating maximum pondage, was that approach used in the Baglihar proceeding? A. Well, in Baglihar proceeding it was quite different. So again I would like to state that on pondage, the scheme of things is such that we are going to place before the Court a detailed account of all the previous history of the pondage, as well as its Treaty legal interpretation,	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different stages in a project construction or project development. So you can plan, but that would remain a plan. Following that plan, you do the feasibility study. And after the feasibility study, in which you calculate the costs and benefits of a project, once that is done, then you enter into a detailed engineering design in which you calculate to the level of the nuts and bolts. And once that is done, and it is decided that so we have the financing available, we have the government
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. And one other question concerning Baglihar. The approach that the Pakistan Memorial sets out for calculating maximum pondage, was that approach used in the Baglihar proceeding? A. Well, in Baglihar proceeding it was quite different. So again I would like to state that on pondage, the scheme of things is such that we are going to place before the Court a detailed account of all the previous history of the pondage, as well as its Treaty legal interpretation, by way of presenting Pakistan's legal and technical	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different stages in a project construction or project development. So you can plan, but that would remain a plan. Following that plan, you do the feasibility study. And after the feasibility study, in which you calculate the costs and benefits of a project, once that is done, then you enter into a detailed engineering design in which you calculate to the level of the nuts and bolts. And once that is done, and it is decided that so we have the financing available, we have the government approvals available for the project, so we move towards
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. And one other question concerning Baglihar. The approach that the Pakistan Memorial sets out for calculating maximum pondage, was that approach used in the Baglihar proceeding? A. Well, in Baglihar proceeding it was quite different. So again I would like to state that on pondage, the scheme of things is such that we are going to place before the Court a detailed account of all the previous history of the pondage, as well as its Treaty legal interpretation, by way of presenting Pakistan's legal and technical experts in due course of this. So I believe that would	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different stages in a project construction or project development. So you can plan, but that would remain a plan. Following that plan, you do the feasibility study. And after the feasibility study, in which you calculate the costs and benefits of a project, once that is done, then you enter into a detailed engineering design in which you calculate to the level of the nuts and bolts. And once that is done, and it is decided that so we have the financing available, we have the government approvals available for the project, so we move towards the construction stage. And the first step in the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. And one other question concerning Baglihar. The approach that the Pakistan Memorial sets out for calculating maximum pondage, was that approach used in the Baglihar proceeding? A. Well, in Baglihar proceeding it was quite different. So again I would like to state that on pondage, the scheme of things is such that we are going to place before the Court a detailed account of all the previous history of the pondage, as well as its Treaty legal interpretation, by way of presenting Pakistan's legal and technical	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different stages in a project construction or project development. So you can plan, but that would remain a plan. Following that plan, you do the feasibility study. And after the feasibility study, in which you calculate the costs and benefits of a project, once that is done, then you enter into a detailed engineering design in which you calculate to the level of the nuts and bolts. And once that is done, and it is decided that so we have the financing available, we have the government approvals available for the project, so we move towards
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. And one other question concerning Baglihar. The approach that the Pakistan Memorial sets out for calculating maximum pondage, was that approach used in the Baglihar proceeding? A. Well, in Baglihar proceeding it was quite different. So again I would like to state that on pondage, the scheme of things is such that we are going to place before the Court a detailed account of all the previous history of the pondage, as well as its Treaty legal interpretation, by way of presenting Pakistan's legal and technical experts in due course of this. So I believe that would	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different stages in a project construction or project development. So you can plan, but that would remain a plan. Following that plan, you do the feasibility study. And after the feasibility study, in which you calculate the costs and benefits of a project, once that is done, then you enter into a detailed engineering design in which you calculate to the level of the nuts and bolts. And once that is done, and it is decided that so we have the financing available, we have the government approvals available for the project, so we move towards the construction stage. And the first step in the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	rejecting that view? A. Professor Minear, so as I explained, my role in the Baglihar proceeding was strictly limited to providing the [] technical expertise or the technical input, so of course I cannot recollect it from my memory. So far as your particular question is concerned, I believe that of course it is a very important question, so Pakistan's counsel may like to respond to you in due course of this hearing. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. And one other question concerning Baglihar. The approach that the Pakistan Memorial sets out for calculating maximum pondage, was that approach used in the Baglihar proceeding? A. Well, in Baglihar proceeding it was quite different. So again I would like to state that on pondage, the scheme of things is such that we are going to place before the Court a detailed account of all the previous history of the pondage, as well as its Treaty legal interpretation, by way of presenting Pakistan's legal and technical experts in due course of this. So I believe that would be a better opportunity for the members of the Court.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	genuinely feels: that the information which is provided by India to Pakistan, while referring to at least six months before start of construction of river works, so it can be a literal reading of or too much literal reading of the provisions of the Treaty. But then if there is a desire to cooperate and to demonstrate goodwill, so basically nothing stops, we feel genuinely to India to share that information at a much earlier stage, as compared to at least six months before the start of construction of river works. For example, we feel that so there are different stages in a project construction or project development. So you can plan, but that would remain a plan. Following that plan, you do the feasibility study. And after the feasibility study, in which you calculate the costs and benefits of a project, once that is done, then you enter into a detailed engineering design in which you calculate to the level of the nuts and bolts. And once that is done, and it is decided that so we have the financing available, we have the government approvals available for the project, so we move towards the construction stage. And the first step in the construction stage is to prepare the tender drawings so

46 (Pages 169 to 172)

15:42 1 that the project tender can be floated in order to 15:46 1 MR MINEAR: Thank you. 2 procure the contractors. And once the tender drawings 2 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Blackmore. 3 are formed, then the employer or the owner of the 3 DR BLACKMORE: Mr Shah, I'm interested in starting 4 project floats the tender and receives the bid. 4 a conversation about sediment, trying to make a very 5 5 And it is not, you know, always the case that you complex subject relatively simple for the Chairman, 6 receive the competitive bids, or you receive the bids at 6 otherwise he'll be angry with me! 7 7 all; or at times you receive the bids which you know When I look at the number of storage facilities in 8 appears non-responsive, may that be on account of the 8 Pakistan and in India on the Himalayas, they are all 9 9 financial health of the prospective bidder or on account sediment storage facilities, one way or another. They 10 10 of its technical skill. So the procurement of all have a finite life that will be dominated by 11 a contractor also takes a good time. 11 sediment, nothing else. So Tarbela, 48% full of 12 And once you have procured the contractor, then you 12 sediment: have to change the outlet works so that you 13 award the contract to the contractor. And when it comes 13 can continue to operate it as an active storage. 14 to these big projects, so the award of the contract 14 I'm just wondering how you think about sediment 15 again is something which takes some time, because the 15 storage in Indian dams upstream, and whether there are 16 contractor has to submit a bank guarantee and to get the 16 sites that would be attractive, from a Pakistani 17 mobilisation advance and these sort of things. 17 perspective, for India to store sediment, not just in 18 Once that is done, the contractor comes on the site 18 a valley, but something that had a large storage 19 and basically establishes himself on the site. So first 19 capacity that would deflect sediment from being stored 20 20 in Tarbela or other Pakistani facilities. of all, it basically takes the possession of the site, 21 the clear possession of the site, subsequent to which 21 So at the moment we're all talking about sediment 22 the contract provisions start and the obligations of the 22 transport through run-of-river facilities. But if you 23 contractor start. 23 flip that and say, "Okay, we want to lengthen the life 24 So at times, the experience we have in Pakistan, so 24 of Pakistan facilities", is there any way we can store 25 25 sediment in these other dams that is a benefit to getting the possession of the site is again something Page 173 Page 175 15:44 15:48 1 1 which takes time, because of the land acquisition, Pakistan? 2 because of the resettlement of the people. And once 2 Now, I know you're building Diamer-Basha, which will 3 that is done successfully, the contractor basically 3 be a massive sediment trap. But I'm wondering whether 4 4 you've thought through whether there are those starts construction of its camp, bringing its resources, 5 5 its manpower, its machinery, its batching plants, and opportunities within the Indian-controlled part of the 6 then it starts construction of the preparatory works. 6 catchment. 7 So until now, the six months before the start of A. Thank you, Dr Blackmore. Again, I think that Dr Morris 8 8 construction of the river works connected with the will be providing you more detail. But I would also 9 9 plant, that stage has not arisen. So everything is like to share some of the aspects which are more 10 10 being done. And so whatever steps I have shared after relevant to the Pakistani projects vis-à-vis sediments. 11 completion of the detailed engineering design, all along 11 I just want to share with you that if we talk about 12 12 up to the start of the construction of the river works, Tarbela, to the best of my knowledge, there are hardly 13 13 so that is the stage at which the project owner has made any sites in the Indian-Occupied Kashmir on Indus main 14 14 a firm decision that he is going to construct the stem to construct any storage which can reduce the 15 15 sediment transport to Pakistan. It is number one. project. 16 16 And that is the time at which, if we feel that the And the second point is that, you know, it is just 17 project information could be shared with Pakistan, so 17 a matter of time. So even if you develop a storage 18 18 upstream, so there will be a time when that would also there would have been a brighter chance to converge on 19 the designs or on the objections raised by Pakistan, 19 get filled with the sediments, and eventually that 20 20 sediment would start flowing downstream. rather than giving just six months to Pakistan and then 21 expecting that, "Either Pakistan will accept our stance 21 And third is that: yes, the water storage sites are 22 22 or we will go ahead". And by the time Pakistan reaches, limited and you are confronted with a sediment issue. 23 after completing the steps of Article IX, so the project 23 For example, if we see in Jhelum, there is the 24 24 construction had already entered into an advanced stage. Wullar Lake, so that also acts as a sediment trap. So 25 So that is a concern on the part of Pakistan. 25 that is a natural lake. But in case of Chenab, when we Page 176 Page 174

15:49	1	see, that is a river with steep slopes. And if we	15:53 1	a little bit further, in that in your statement and
	2	construct a run-of-river hydroelectric plant,	2	today, you've indicated it would be better for India to
	3	prima facie one can see that those hydroelectric plants	3	share with Pakistan well in advance of six months of
	4	are getting silted up or getting filled with the	4	construction various information. And my question is:
	5	sediments.	5	do you view that as something that's compelled by the
	6	But on the other hand, we also know that those are	6	Treaty, or is it just: this would be a good practical
	7	the run-of-river hydroelectric plants where the primary	7	way of heading off disputes before they arise? Is this
	8	requirement is the head, or primary purpose of the	8	a desire, a preference on your part, or is it your view
	9	construction of a large dam is to create a head, not	9	that the Treaty actually requires India to share on
	10	a storage. Therefore, you know, at times we see that we	10	an earlier basis?
	11	can always construct, we can always go for a choice of	11	A. Thank you, Mr Chairman. So perhaps my counsel team will
	12	a low-height dam with a long tunnel, by way of which we	12	not be very thankful if I share my views, but still
	13	can gain the head, because the storage is not a concern.	13	I would like to share some of my views on that.
	14	So for the run-of-river hydroelectric plants on	14	And that is, you know, since the Government of
	15	steeper slopes, these dams cannot provide the relief.	15	Pakistan has basically entrusted me the duty to
	16	And even with the water storage, as I explained, that is	16	implement the Indus Waters Treaty as part of the
	17	again a matter of time: so perhaps a little later, but	17	Permanent Indus Commission, so as I shared and you
	18	again then you would start receiving the sediments	18	can see in the transcript perhaps [in] response [to]
	19	downstream.	19	one of the questions by Professor Minear, basically,
	20	THE CHAIRMAN: I have a few questions for you, Mr Shah, one	20	I strongly believe that this Treaty is such a treaty
	21	of which builds on a question I think Mr Minear was	21	which is so robust in its nature that as long as the two
	22	asking to you.	22	states are there, this Treaty can perform.
	23	Certainly in your written statement and in your	23	And when I say so, it means that the 1989 Flood
	24	testimony today, you have spoken about India frustrating	24	Agreement is one of the examples, when we see that there
	25	the various provisions of the Treaty dealing with the	25	was a need and both sides felt that there is a scope of
		Page 177		Page 179
15:51	1	functioning of the Commission and with provision of	15:55 1	going forward in terms of preparing more elaborate
	2	information. Indeed, I think you say that India has	2	
	3	failed to comply with the Treaty.	3	goodwill can be demonstrated, which is part and parcel
	4	The question that Mr Minear put to you was whether	4	3 1 1
	5	this is a dispute that's before this Court. Now, you	5	•
	6	may want to deflect this to your counsel. But I think	6	3
	7	what he might have been asking was: when we look at the	7	
	8	seven disputes identified in Pakistan's Amended	8	•
	9	Request for Arbitration, there is not a dispute about	9	3,
	10	information-sharing. And similarly, when you look at	10	
	11	our order on the first phase of the merits, there is not	11	*
	12	a subparagraph in paragraph 35 that talks about	12 13	
	13 14	a dispute or a question relating to information-sharing. So feel free to deflect this question. But I think	13	•
	15	what he was trying to get at is: is this actually	15	
	16	a matter before this Court, as opposed to background	16	• **
	17	information that you thought important for us to have?	17	-
	18	A. So I just would like to share my concluding remarks	18	· · · · · ·
	19	which I just shared with this Court, which can be seen	19	
	20	in the transcript, in which I tried to respond to this	20	
	21	question. And beyond that, I would definitely like	20	
	22	Pakistan's counsel, Sir Daniel, to respond to the Court	22	
	23	on this matter.	23	2.2
	24	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's fine.	24	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	25	Let me pursue the issue of information-sharing	25	1 0
				-
		Page 178		Page 180

15:57		So I believe that the Treaty provides a sufficient	16:01 1	Pakistan's technical experts and they are fully
	2	room, and therefore Pakistan feels that it is something	2	prepared. So today is the first day, and a lot has yet
	3	which needs to be put in place.	3	to come for the benefit of the Court. So I would
	4	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.	4	generally prefer that the Court may wait until those
	5	At paragraph 72 of your statement, and at slide 24	5	experts stand up on their feet before the Court and
	6	today, you had the list of eight projects where	6	provide you, in a systematic manner, the complete
	7	questions have arisen that remain unsettled or that were	7	account of all the history, the bases, what was said by
	8	settled. And that, to me, raises the general issue of	8	India, what was responded by Pakistan, and what are its
	9	how Pakistan and India have interpreted the Treaty over	9	legal dimensions. And so I think that would be more
	10	time, from 1960 to the present.	10	beneficial for the Court, rather than for me to respond
	11	So prior to the point where we get to, say, the	11	to this question.
	12	Baglihar proceeding, was there a common interpretation	12	THE CHAIRMAN: That's absolutely fine. Indeed, some of the
	13	by the two countries with respect to the main issues	13	value of asking these questions on the first day may be
	14	that we're talking about in this proceeding? In other	14	precisely to allow counsel to think about them and
	15	words, was there eventually an acceptance, in the course	15	respond in due course.
	16	of those particular eight projects or others, about	16	Let me pursue it just a little bit further, to ask
	17	where outlets should be located, how pondage should be	17	you whether you think the difficulties you have been
	18	calculated, and so on?	18	experiencing in the Commission have anything to do with
	19	A. So if you ask me as Pakistan Commissioner for Indus	19	the parties either one of them changing their view
	20	Waters, I can only cite one instance, and in that	20	as to issues such as location of outlets, spillways,
	21	instance also the common understanding existed only on	21	calculation of pondage. Is that part of the problem at
	22	one dimension. That was the placement of the spillways	22	all, or have the parties been consistent in their
	23	concerning the Salal Dam. And that was also something	23	positions over time?
	24	which was done after a period of nine years. And	24	A. Perhaps I missed the point between the two. So if you
	25	eventually the Indian side accepted that perhaps the	25	can come again, or I can go through the transcript.
		Page 181		Page 183
1.5			16.00	THE CHAIDMAN III I C. VIII I I V
15:59		correct application of the Treaty is not to have the	16:02 1	THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine, I'll ask it again. It's really
	2	outlets at the bottom, and eventually they plugged those	2	just a general question.
	3	outlets and raised the heights of the gates.	3	You've explained difficulties in the Commission over the recent years, and I'm just wondering: does it have
	4 5	And beyond that, so we could see from the record that invariably both the sides were at loggerheads, and	5	anything to do with either side changing its position
	5 6	that invariably both the sides were at loggerneads, and they did not agree each other's position.	3	AND A THE PART OF THE CALLED A SHARE CHARLES HER DONNER.
			6	
	7		6 7	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's
	7	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the	7	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that
	8	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding,	7 8	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that
	8 9	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were	7 8 9	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred?
	8 9 10	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from	7 8 9 10	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are
	8 9 10 11	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method	7 8 9 10 11	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their
	8 9 10 11 12	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar,	7 8 9 10 11	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically
	8 9 10 11 12 13	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar, and according to India, Pakistan never protested in	7 8 9 10 11	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically not a part of the problem, or that is not the underlying
	8 9 10 11 12	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar, and according to India, Pakistan never protested in those prior instances.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar, and according to India, Pakistan never protested in those prior instances. So again, this may be outside your prepared	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically not a part of the problem, or that is not the underlying reason that the parties are changing their positions. Rather, the parties are basically sticking to their
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar, and according to India, Pakistan never protested in those prior instances. So again, this may be outside your prepared knowledge, and if you want to deflect the question,	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically not a part of the problem, or that is not the underlying reason that the parties are changing their positions.
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar, and according to India, Pakistan never protested in those prior instances. So again, this may be outside your prepared	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically not a part of the problem, or that is not the underlying reason that the parties are changing their positions. Rather, the parties are basically sticking to their position.
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar, and according to India, Pakistan never protested in those prior instances. So again, this may be outside your prepared knowledge, and if you want to deflect the question, that's no problem at all. But looking at India's	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically not a part of the problem, or that is not the underlying reason that the parties are changing their positions. Rather, the parties are basically sticking to their position. THE CHAIRMAN: In the aftermath of the Kishenganga Court of
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar, and according to India, Pakistan never protested in those prior instances. So again, this may be outside your prepared knowledge, and if you want to deflect the question, that's no problem at all. But looking at India's position, at least in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically not a part of the problem, or that is not the underlying reason that the parties are changing their positions. Rather, the parties are basically sticking to their position. THE CHAIRMAN: In the aftermath of the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, I imagine that Pakistan was keeping track
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar, and according to India, Pakistan never protested in those prior instances. So again, this may be outside your prepared knowledge, and if you want to deflect the question, that's no problem at all. But looking at India's position, at least in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to be saying that there had been prior plants where the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically not a part of the problem, or that is not the underlying reason that the parties are changing their positions. Rather, the parties are basically sticking to their position. THE CHAIRMAN: In the aftermath of the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, I imagine that Pakistan was keeping track of what was going on at Kishenganga as the plant was
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar, and according to India, Pakistan never protested in those prior instances. So again, this may be outside your prepared knowledge, and if you want to deflect the question, that's no problem at all. But looking at India's position, at least in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to be saying that there had been prior plants where the same approach they were advocating for had been used and	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically not a part of the problem, or that is not the underlying reason that the parties are changing their positions. Rather, the parties are basically sticking to their position. THE CHAIRMAN: In the aftermath of the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, I imagine that Pakistan was keeping track of what was going on at Kishenganga as the plant was moving forward. I understand that you have incomplete
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar, and according to India, Pakistan never protested in those prior instances. So again, this may be outside your prepared knowledge, and if you want to deflect the question, that's no problem at all. But looking at India's position, at least in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to be saying that there had been prior plants where the same approach they were advocating for had been used and was acquiesced to by Pakistan, and that's why I was wondering if you had any insights into that. A. Thank you, Mr Chairman.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically not a part of the problem, or that is not the underlying reason that the parties are changing their positions. Rather, the parties are basically sticking to their position. THE CHAIRMAN: In the aftermath of the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, I imagine that Pakistan was keeping track of what was going on at Kishenganga as the plant was moving forward. I understand that you have incomplete information. But could you just say a few words about
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar, and according to India, Pakistan never protested in those prior instances. So again, this may be outside your prepared knowledge, and if you want to deflect the question, that's no problem at all. But looking at India's position, at least in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to be saying that there had been prior plants where the same approach they were advocating for had been used and was acquiesced to by Pakistan, and that's why I was wondering if you had any insights into that.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically not a part of the problem, or that is not the underlying reason that the parties are changing their positions. Rather, the parties are basically sticking to their position. THE CHAIRMAN: In the aftermath of the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, I imagine that Pakistan was keeping track of what was going on at Kishenganga as the plant was moving forward. I understand that you have incomplete information. But could you just say a few words about whether or not you think India has acted consistently
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar, and according to India, Pakistan never protested in those prior instances. So again, this may be outside your prepared knowledge, and if you want to deflect the question, that's no problem at all. But looking at India's position, at least in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to be saying that there had been prior plants where the same approach they were advocating for had been used and was acquiesced to by Pakistan, and that's why I was wondering if you had any insights into that. A. Thank you, Mr Chairman.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically not a part of the problem, or that is not the underlying reason that the parties are changing their positions. Rather, the parties are basically sticking to their position. THE CHAIRMAN: In the aftermath of the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, I imagine that Pakistan was keeping track of what was going on at Kishenganga as the plant was moving forward. I understand that you have incomplete information. But could you just say a few words about whether or not you think India has acted consistently with the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration's decision as
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar, and according to India, Pakistan never protested in those prior instances. So again, this may be outside your prepared knowledge, and if you want to deflect the question, that's no problem at all. But looking at India's position, at least in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to be saying that there had been prior plants where the same approach they were advocating for had been used and was acquiesced to by Pakistan, and that's why I was wondering if you had any insights into that. A. Thank you, Mr Chairman. So as I already explained, my contributions have already been provided to Pakistan's counsels and	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically not a part of the problem, or that is not the underlying reason that the parties are changing their positions. Rather, the parties are basically sticking to their position. THE CHAIRMAN: In the aftermath of the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, I imagine that Pakistan was keeping track of what was going on at Kishenganga as the plant was moving forward. I understand that you have incomplete information. But could you just say a few words about whether or not you think India has acted consistently with the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration's decision as it related to the KHEP? A. There were two particular awards: one was concerning the
	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIRMAN: Part of the reason I ask is that in the Indian Counter-Memorial in the Baglihar proceeding, India points to several hydroelectric plants that were constructed prior to Baglihar, and I think it was from 1968 to 1990, where India says it used the same method of pondage calculation that was at issue in Baglihar, and according to India, Pakistan never protested in those prior instances. So again, this may be outside your prepared knowledge, and if you want to deflect the question, that's no problem at all. But looking at India's position, at least in the Baglihar proceeding, it seemed to be saying that there had been prior plants where the same approach they were advocating for had been used and was acquiesced to by Pakistan, and that's why I was wondering if you had any insights into that. A. Thank you, Mr Chairman. So as I already explained, my contributions have	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	about the key issues that have arisen, whether it's spillways or pondage or outlets or freeboard? Is that part of the problem, that there have been changes that have occurred? A. No. I believe no. I believe that both the parties are basically sticking to their position. They have their own way of understanding things, and that is basically not a part of the problem, or that is not the underlying reason that the parties are changing their positions. Rather, the parties are basically sticking to their position. THE CHAIRMAN: In the aftermath of the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, I imagine that Pakistan was keeping track of what was going on at Kishenganga as the plant was moving forward. I understand that you have incomplete information. But could you just say a few words about whether or not you think India has acted consistently with the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration's decision as it related to the KHEP?

49 (Pages 181 to 184)

16:04 1	drawdown flushing, and the other was allowing Pakistan	16:07 1	about the subsequent agreements that were concluded, is
2	a minimum environmental flow.	2	that one element of treaty interpretation, which
3	So far as the implementation of minimum	3	I believe Professor Webb will be dealing with, does deal
4	environmental flow is concerned, India just informed	4	with the subsequent agreement and subsequent practice of
5	Pakistan immediately after the KHEP award that they have	5	the parties in the interpretation of the Treaty. So
6	made provisions in their structure to release the	6	having as much clarity as possible on those issues is of
7	9 cumecs flow on which Pakistan had been asking them to,	7	great help to the Court.
8	"Please afford us an opportunity, as a special tour of	8	I will finish by noting that you had indicated that
9	inspection under Article VIII(4)(d) of the Treaty, so	9	it might be of value to the Court to have India's
10	•	10	response to the two letters that were sent by Pakistan
11		11	in March and June of 2021. I do think it would be
12		12	helpful. I would note that in the decision we took with
13	when I am speaking before you, under Article VIII(4)(d).	13	respect to production of documents, we essentially
14	So far as the prohibition of drawdown below the DSL	14	welcomed all communications between the Commissioners
15	is concerned, that is something which Pakistan's counsel	15	that are of relevance to the Court. So we certainly
16	will explain to you, to which extent that has been	16	would be happy to receive that at any point in time up
17	implemented or not.	17	until, I suppose, September 30. So that would be fine.
18	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, very good.	18	Follow-up questions by anyone here? Seeing none,
19	You had a bit of an exchange, I think, with	19	then let me turn to Ms Rees-Evans and ask her whether
20	Dr Blackmore at the outset about the Salal Agreement of	20	she has re-direct; if she does have re-direct, how much
21	1978, and then you also discussed a bit the data-sharing	21	time she thinks she might need for that re-direct; and
22		22	whether she would prefer to have a break before doing
23		23	the re-direct.
24		24	MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Chairman. If you can just
25		25	give me one minute, we may have one or two questions by
			g
	Page 185		Page 187
16:06 1	A. Yes, that is correct. So those are the [only two] which	16:09 1	way of re-direct, thank you.
2	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is	2	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause)
2 3	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for	2 3	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct.
2 3 4	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew	2 3 4	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the
2 3 4 5	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for	2 3 4 5	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as
2 3 4 5 6	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place.	2 3 4 5 6	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and
2 3 4 5 6 7	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours.
2 3 4 5 6	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these
2 3 4 5 6 7	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what were in the Treaty?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what were in the Treaty?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the references will be sufficient, if you would like us to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what were in the Treaty? A. Mr Chairman, I think your question is quite legal in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the references will be sufficient, if you would like us to do that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what were in the Treaty? A. Mr Chairman, I think your question is quite legal in nature, so I would prefer Pakistan's counsel to respond	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the references will be sufficient, if you would like us to do that. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what were in the Treaty? A. Mr Chairman, I think your question is quite legal in nature, so I would prefer Pakistan's counsel to respond to this question. So far as my understanding is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the references will be sufficient, if you would like us to do that. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. So that was our first point.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what were in the Treaty? A. Mr Chairman, I think your question is quite legal in nature, so I would prefer Pakistan's counsel to respond to this question. So far as my understanding is concerned, I can only appreciate that it is a very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the references will be sufficient, if you would like us to do that. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. So that was our first point. The second question that we have is just in relation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what were in the Treaty? A. Mr Chairman, I think your question is quite legal in nature, so I would prefer Pakistan's counsel to respond to this question. So far as my understanding is concerned, I can only appreciate that it is a very important question for the purposes of the Court. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the references will be sufficient, if you would like us to do that. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. So that was our first point. The second question that we have is just in relation to Professor Murphy's final question, I think.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what were in the Treaty? A. Mr Chairman, I think your question is quite legal in nature, so I would prefer Pakistan's counsel to respond to this question. So far as my understanding is concerned, I can only appreciate that it is a very important question for the purposes of the Court. So I would prefer that Pakistan's counsel should respond to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the references will be sufficient, if you would like us to do that. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. So that was our first point. The second question that we have is just in relation to Professor Murphy's final question, I think. (4.12 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what were in the Treaty? A. Mr Chairman, I think your question is quite legal in nature, so I would prefer Pakistan's counsel to respond to this question. So far as my understanding is concerned, I can only appreciate that it is a very important question for the purposes of the Court. So I would prefer that Pakistan's counsel should respond to that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the references will be sufficient, if you would like us to do that. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. So that was our first point. The second question that we have is just in relation to Professor Murphy's final question, I think. (4.12 pm) Re-direct examination by MS REES-EVANS
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what were in the Treaty? A. Mr Chairman, I think your question is quite legal in nature, so I would prefer Pakistan's counsel to respond to this question. So far as my understanding is concerned, I can only appreciate that it is a very important question for the purposes of the Court. So I would prefer that Pakistan's counsel should respond to that. THE CHAIRMAN: You speak so, well, Mr Shah, I think I forget	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the references will be sufficient, if you would like us to do that. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. So that was our first point. The second question that we have is just in relation to Professor Murphy's final question, I think. (4.12 pm) Re-direct examination by MS REES-EVANS Q. Professor Murphy's question to you was: are there any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what were in the Treaty? A. Mr Chairman, I think your question is quite legal in nature, so I would prefer Pakistan's counsel to respond to this question. So far as my understanding is concerned, I can only appreciate that it is a very important question for the purposes of the Court. So I would prefer that Pakistan's counsel should respond to that. THE CHAIRMAN: You speak so, well, Mr Shah, I think I forget that you are not a lawyer, perhaps! Yes, and I will perhaps wind up by noting that one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the references will be sufficient, if you would like us to do that. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. So that was our first point. The second question that we have is just in relation to Professor Murphy's final question, I think. (4.12 pm) Re-direct examination by MS REES-EVANS Q. Professor Murphy's question to you was: are there any other agreements relating to the Indus Waters Treaty,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what were in the Treaty? A. Mr Chairman, I think your question is quite legal in nature, so I would prefer Pakistan's counsel to respond to this question. So far as my understanding is concerned, I can only appreciate that it is a very important question for the purposes of the Court. So I would prefer that Pakistan's counsel should respond to that. THE CHAIRMAN: You speak so, well, Mr Shah, I think I forget that you are not a lawyer, perhaps!	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the references will be sufficient, if you would like us to do that. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. So that was our first point. The second question that we have is just in relation to Professor Murphy's final question, I think. (4.12 pm) Re-direct examination by MS REES-EVANS Q. Professor Murphy's question to you was: are there any other agreements relating to the Indus Waters Treaty, other than the 1989 Flood Agreement or the Salal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what were in the Treaty? A. Mr Chairman, I think your question is quite legal in nature, so I would prefer Pakistan's counsel to respond to this question. So far as my understanding is concerned, I can only appreciate that it is a very important question for the purposes of the Court. So I would prefer that Pakistan's counsel should respond to that. THE CHAIRMAN: You speak so, well, Mr Shah, I think I forget that you are not a lawyer, perhaps! Yes, and I will perhaps wind up by noting that one reason why I'm asking about the conduct of the parties, the practice of the parties from 1960 onward, and also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the references will be sufficient, if you would like us to do that. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. So that was our first point. The second question that we have is just in relation to Professor Murphy's final question, I think. (4.12 pm) Re-direct examination by MS REES-EVANS Q. Professor Murphy's question to you was: are there any other agreements relating to the Indus Waters Treaty, other than the 1989 Flood Agreement or the Salal Agreement?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	were concluded, out of which the 1989 Flood Agreement is practically no more there, because that was meant for only one year, and that was up to the parties to renew that. So subsequent to 2018, that renewal could not take place. But so far as the Salal Agreement is concerned, so that was of such a nature that once that was implemented, now that is in place. THE CHAIRMAN: And were these agreements concluded in order to provide greater specificity to the obligations under the Treaty, or did they add new obligations beyond what were in the Treaty? A. Mr Chairman, I think your question is quite legal in nature, so I would prefer Pakistan's counsel to respond to this question. So far as my understanding is concerned, I can only appreciate that it is a very important question for the purposes of the Court. So I would prefer that Pakistan's counsel should respond to that. THE CHAIRMAN: You speak so, well, Mr Shah, I think I forget that you are not a lawyer, perhaps! Yes, and I will perhaps wind up by noting that one reason why I'm asking about the conduct of the parties,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds fine. Thank you. (Pause) MS REES-EVANS: We have just two points by way of re-direct. The first relates to Mr Minear's question about the Covid pandemic and how India has cited that as a response to Pakistan's requests to hold a meeting and to hold special and general tours. If we have the ability to project some of these correspondence, we can do that, or Pakistan can provide the Court with references to the specific letters that Mr Shah referenced in his answer to your question. It may be just a simple case of providing you with the references will be sufficient, if you would like us to do that. MR MINEAR: That would be fine, thank you. MS REES-EVANS: Thank you. So that was our first point. The second question that we have is just in relation to Professor Murphy's final question, I think. (4.12 pm) Re-direct examination by MS REES-EVANS Q. Professor Murphy's question to you was: are there any other agreements relating to the Indus Waters Treaty, other than the 1989 Flood Agreement or the Salal Agreement?

50 (Pages 185 to 188)

ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE IX AND ANNEXURE G OF THE INDUS WATERS TREATY 1960 Day 1 -- Hearing on the Merits, First Phase Monday, 8 Monday, 8 July 2024

16:12 1	pursuant to Article IX of the Treaty	16:36 1	There was the issue of sediment, for example, which
2	A. Yes.	2	Dr Blackmore raised: I think Dr Morris will spend some
3	Q which was concluded very early on?	3	time on this. There were quite a number of questions,
4	A. Yes. Yes, thank you, Ms Rees-Evans. So, yes, somehow	4	I think, that go to Professor Webb on treaty
5	that skipped my memory. And I stand corrected. Yes, so	5	interpretation and subsequent practice. There are some
6	there was one.	6	shortform answers that I could give you now, but I'm
7	MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Shah. We have not put that	7	going to refrain from doing so and defer to her.
8	agreement on the record to date, but Pakistan can do	8	There are, though, one or two questions that it
9	that in response to the question, Professor Murphy, that	9	might be useful for me just to at least begin to respond
10	you've raised today.	10	to, because while this is live in the minds of the
11	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do put it on the record. And can	11	members of the Court, it may provide a little bit of
12	you indicate the year in which that agreement was done?	12	further context.
13	MS REES-EVANS: We think it was 1976, but we'll need to	13	Just on the various agreements that have been
14	confirm.	14	reached since 1960 within the framework or under the
15	THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine.	15	framework, or however one might put it, of the Treaty,
16	So I understand then you are finished with your	16	we've got, I think, now three that we've identified.
17	re-direct?	17	And I should say: in at least one case, it's something
18	MS REES-EVANS: Yes, we have no further questions.	18	that we stumbled upon after the competence hearing, and
19	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.	19	it may be that in the document review that we're
20	Then it falls for me to thank you, Mr Shah, for your	20	undertaking at the moment that we stumble upon others.
21	very helpful testimony today before us. Now that you've	21	But there are these three agreements.
22	completed your testimony, you are no longer sequestered.	22	The 1989 agreement, just to be clear, our reading of
23	I believe we should go ahead and take a break,	23	the 1989 agreement is that it was an agreement in
24	a true coffee break, but let me turn to Sir Daniel and	24	implementation of the Treaty.
25	ask him how much time he thinks he may need to complete	25	The 1978 Agreement on Salal was a dam-specific
	D 100		
	Page 189		Page 191
16:13 1	his presentation from this morning.	16:37 1	agreement. The Salal Agreement, which is on the
16:13 1 2	his presentation from this morning. SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the	16:37 1 2	agreement. The Salal Agreement, which is on the record I don't have the exhibit number in my head,
2	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the	2	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head,
2 3	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that	2 3	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from
2 3 4	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit	2 3 4	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both
2 3 4 5	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by	2 3 4 5	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative
2 3 4 5 6	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer.	2 3 4 5 6	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then
2 3 4 5 6 7	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute	2 3 4 5 6 7	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm) (A short break)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty. And then there is the last of the agreements that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm) (A short break)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty. And then there is the last of the agreements that we have been able to identify. As I say, we stumbled
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm) (A short break) (4.35 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Alright, we are back in session. So,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty. And then there is the last of the agreements that we have been able to identify. As I say, we stumbled across it in our document review in Islamabad after you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm) (A short break) (4.35 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Alright, we are back in session. So, Sir Daniel, please continue with your presentation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty. And then there is the last of the agreements that we have been able to identify. As I say, we stumbled across it in our document review in Islamabad after you handed down your Competence Award. And I have to say,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by — if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm) (A short break) (4.35 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Alright, we are back in session. So, Sir Daniel, please continue with your presentation. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty. And then there is the last of the agreements that we have been able to identify. As I say, we stumbled across it in our document review in Islamabad after you handed down your Competence Award. And I have to say, when I saw this, I immediately thought: is this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by — if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm) (A short break) (4.35 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Alright, we are back in session. So, Sir Daniel, please continue with your presentation. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Opening statement on behalf of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty. And then there is the last of the agreements that we have been able to identify. As I say, we stumbled across it in our document review in Islamabad after you handed down your Competence Award. And I have to say, when I saw this, I immediately thought: is this something which should have been drawn to your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm) (A short break) (4.35 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Alright, we are back in session. So, Sir Daniel, please continue with your presentation. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Opening statement on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan (continued)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty. And then there is the last of the agreements that we have been able to identify. As I say, we stumbled across it in our document review in Islamabad after you handed down your Competence Award. And I have to say, when I saw this, I immediately thought: is this something which should have been relevant to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm) (A short break) (4.35 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Alright, we are back in session. So, Sir Daniel, please continue with your presentation. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Opening statement on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan (continued)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty. And then there is the last of the agreements that we have been able to identify. As I say, we stumbled across it in our document review in Islamabad after you handed down your Competence Award. And I have to say, when I saw this, I immediately thought: is this something which should have been relevant to the Competence Award, but I think on review it wasn't.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm) (A short break) (4.35 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Alright, we are back in session. So, Sir Daniel, please continue with your presentation. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Opening statement on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan (continued) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, before I continue with my presentation, I think the Pakistan Commissioner for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty. And then there is the last of the agreements that we have been able to identify. As I say, we stumbled across it in our document review in Islamabad after you handed down your Competence Award. And I have to say, when I saw this, I immediately thought: is this something which should have been drawn to your attention, because it might have been relevant to the Competence Award, but I think on review it wasn't. But it's a 1978 agreement which we've just got in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm) (A short break) (4.35 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Alright, we are back in session. So, Sir Daniel, please continue with your presentation. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Opening statement on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan (continued) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, before I continue with my presentation, I think the Pakistan Commissioner for Indus Waters was happy enough to defer lots of questions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty. And then there is the last of the agreements that we have been able to identify. As I say, we stumbled across it in our document review in Islamabad after you handed down your Competence Award. And I have to say, when I saw this, I immediately thought: is this something which should have been drawn to your attention, because it might have been relevant to the Competence Award, but I think on review it wasn't. But it's a 1978 agreement which we've just got in a rather sort of unsatisfactory typed-up state, and it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm) (A short break) (4.35 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Alright, we are back in session. So, Sir Daniel, please continue with your presentation. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Opening statement on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan (continued) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, before I continue with my presentation, I think the Pakistan Commissioner for Indus Waters was happy enough to defer lots of questions to counsel. There are a lot of questions, of course,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty. And then there is the last of the agreements that we have been able to identify. As I say, we stumbled across it in our document review in Islamabad after you handed down your Competence Award. And I have to say, when I saw this, I immediately thought: is this something which should have been drawn to your attention, because it might have been relevant to the Competence Award, but I think on review it wasn't. But it's a 1978 agreement which we've just got in a rather sort of unsatisfactory typed-up state, and it's an agreement on a clarification of the role of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm) (A short break) (4.35 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Alright, we are back in session. So, Sir Daniel, please continue with your presentation. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Opening statement on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan (continued) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, before I continue with my presentation, I think the Pakistan Commissioner for Indus Waters was happy enough to defer lots of questions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty. And then there is the last of the agreements that we have been able to identify. As I say, we stumbled across it in our document review in Islamabad after you handed down your Competence Award. And I have to say, when I saw this, I immediately thought: is this something which should have been drawn to your attention, because it might have been relevant to the Competence Award, but I think on review it wasn't. But it's a 1978 agreement which we've just got in a rather sort of unsatisfactory typed-up state, and it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm) (A short break) (4.35 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Alright, we are back in session. So, Sir Daniel, please continue with your presentation. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Opening statement on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan (continued) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, before I continue with my presentation, I think the Pakistan Commissioner for Indus Waters was happy enough to defer lots of questions to counsel. There are a lot of questions, of course,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty. And then there is the last of the agreements that we have been able to identify. As I say, we stumbled across it in our document review in Islamabad after you handed down your Competence Award. And I have to say, when I saw this, I immediately thought: is this something which should have been drawn to your attention, because it might have been relevant to the Competence Award, but I think on review it wasn't. But it's a 1978 agreement which we've just got in a rather sort of unsatisfactory typed-up state, and it's an agreement on a clarification of the role of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, subject to the detail of the questions that I might get, I am pretty confident that I will finish them by — if you are prepared to sit until 6 o'clock, I will certainly finish them by 6 o'clock. I expect that I will need another about 45 minutes; but as I say, if I'm going to be responsive to questions, it may be a little bit longer. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we take a 20-minute coffee break and come back at 4.35. And hopefully we'll work our way through your presentation; and if not, we'll resume with it in the morning. Thank you. (4.15 pm) (A short break) (4.35 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: Alright, we are back in session. So, Sir Daniel, please continue with your presentation. SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Opening statement on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan (continued) SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, before I continue with my presentation, I think the Pakistan Commissioner for Indus Waters was happy enough to defer lots of questions to counsel. There are a lot of questions, of course, which require a little bit more detail of unpacking.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	record I don't have the exhibit number in my head, but we've already referred to it (PLA-0053) from recollection, it actually says quite specifically, both in the preambular paragraphs and in one of the operative provisions, that it again is an agreement that is made in the context of the Indus Waters Treaty. And if I recall correctly, Article III of that agreement then says quite specifically: insofar as there are issues that are not covered by this agreement, they will be covered by the Indus Waters Treaty more generally. So it was an agreement that was made, a dam-specific agreement, in the context of the 1960 Treaty. And then there is the last of the agreements that we have been able to identify. As I say, we stumbled across it in our document review in Islamabad after you handed down your Competence Award. And I have to say, when I saw this, I immediately thought: is this something which should have been drawn to your attention, because it might have been relevant to the Competence Award, but I think on review it wasn't. But it's a 1978 agreement which we've just got in a rather sort of unsatisfactory typed-up state, and it's an agreement on a clarification of the role of the Commission under Article IX of the Treaty,

51 (Pages 189 to 192)

16:38 1	paragraph (1). And the reason why I think it was not	16:41 1	with the provisions of this Treaty, that Party shall not
2	relevant to your Competence Award is because it focuses	2	acquire by reason of such use any right, by prescription
3	specifically on the role of the Commission under	3	or otherwise, to a continua[tion] of such use."
4	Article IX(1). As I say, we stumbled upon this after	4	That's obviously going to be relevant to the
5	your Award last year.	5	question of whether subsequent practice or subsequent
6	But we will put that into the record. And of	6	agreement, or just conduct and acquiescence,
7	course, if there are any other agreements that we come	7	crystallises into a changing interpretation. But I'm
8	across, we will make sure that they are disclosed as	8	going to leave that, Mr Chairman, with your permission,
9	part of your PO9 set of issues.	9	to Professor Webb to develop in a little bit more
10	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. That's very helpful.	10	detail.
11	And perhaps to carry it a little bit further, the	11	A further point that I think that I should
12	interest is not just in agreements that we would view as	12	clarify and I hope we won't need to come back to
13	treaties between the two countries, but other kinds of	13	this, because I think the point is absolutely clear
14	agreements that might be reached, to the extent that	14	it goes to a question that both you, Mr Minear, and you,
15	they might be viewed as expressing an interpretation of	15	Chairman, asked, which is whether the problems that
16	the Treaty, would be extremely helpful. That of course	16	Pakistan has with India's failure to provide information
17	makes your task perhaps even harder, to try to capture	17	amount to a dispute. And then I think,
18	any of those sorts of arrangements that are not treaties	18	Professor Murphy, you clarified: whether it amounts to
19	or international agreements. But to the extent that	19	a dispute within the framework of the current disputes
20	they are there, we are interested in them.	20	of which you are seised.
21	SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman.	21	I think I must state absolutely clearly that
22	That brings me to my next point, because we of	22	Pakistan did not, in its Request for Arbitration on
23	course are very alive to the issue of subsequent	23	19 August 2016, raise a dispute about
24	practice and subsequent agreement. For those in, as it	24	information-sharing. It didn't do so then. Of course,
25	were, the zone of the Vienna Convention on the Law of	25	we haven't therefore included it in the Amended Request
	Page 193		Page 195
16.40 1		16.40 1	
16:40 1	Treaties, Article 31, paragraph 2 and paragraph 3, which	16:43 1	for Arbitration, which hewed to the terms of the
2		2	original interest. Nor, as will be abundantly clear,
3	**	3	did we include that as part of the request for relief in
4		4	our Memorial. So it's not part of the petitum of the
5	•	5	case and you haven't addressed it in PO6, Mr Chairman,
6	, 11	6	as you noted.
7	•	7	So the issue of Pakistan's dispute/disagreement with
8		8	India over what we perceive to be India's failure to
9		9	comply with its information-sharing obligations is not
10		10	a dispute with which you are seised and it's not
11 12	* **	11	a dispute that is currently waiting in the wings to go to another court of arbitration.
12.	that there exercises the control of the there were		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	12	
13	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there	13	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will
13 14	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there came a point at which, whether or not there was	13 14	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will come back to address some of the issues of
13 14 15	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there came a point at which, whether or not there was agreement, Pakistan concluded that they would just let	13 14 15	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will come back to address some of the issues of informing-sharing for, I suppose, a couple of reasons:
13 14 15 16	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there came a point at which, whether or not there was agreement, Pakistan concluded that they would just let the matter pass, and the Dul Hasti Dam was then	13 14 15 16	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will come back to address some of the issues of informing-sharing for, I suppose, a couple of reasons: first of all, because it's a very important part of the
13 14 15 16 17	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there came a point at which, whether or not there was agreement, Pakistan concluded that they would just let the matter pass, and the Dul Hasti Dam was then constructed.	13 14 15 16 17	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will come back to address some of the issues of informing-sharing for, I suppose, a couple of reasons: first of all, because it's a very important part of the context of how the Treaty is working; and this was the
13 14 15 16 17	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there came a point at which, whether or not there was agreement, Pakistan concluded that they would just let the matter pass, and the Dul Hasti Dam was then constructed. But in this context, I draw to your attention	13 14 15 16 17 18	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will come back to address some of the issues of informing-sharing for, I suppose, a couple of reasons: first of all, because it's a very important part of the context of how the Treaty is working; and this was the evidence that Mr Shah gave, so it's relevant context to
13 14 15 16 17 18	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there came a point at which, whether or not there was agreement, Pakistan concluded that they would just let the matter pass, and the Dul Hasti Dam was then constructed. But in this context, I draw to your attention because it's going to be very relevant to the issue of	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will come back to address some of the issues of informing-sharing for, I suppose, a couple of reasons: first of all, because it's a very important part of the context of how the Treaty is working; and this was the evidence that Mr Shah gave, so it's relevant context to the operation of the Treaty.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there came a point at which, whether or not there was agreement, Pakistan concluded that they would just let the matter pass, and the Dul Hasti Dam was then constructed. But in this context, I draw to your attention because it's going to be very relevant to the issue of subsequent practice paragraph (14) of Article IV of	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will come back to address some of the issues of informing-sharing for, I suppose, a couple of reasons: first of all, because it's a very important part of the context of how the Treaty is working; and this was the evidence that Mr Shah gave, so it's relevant context to the operation of the Treaty. Second, it goes to the issue of the workability of
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there came a point at which, whether or not there was agreement, Pakistan concluded that they would just let the matter pass, and the Dul Hasti Dam was then constructed. But in this context, I draw to your attention because it's going to be very relevant to the issue of subsequent practice paragraph (14) of Article IV of the Treaty. I don't know whether you can call that up,	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will come back to address some of the issues of informing-sharing for, I suppose, a couple of reasons: first of all, because it's a very important part of the context of how the Treaty is working; and this was the evidence that Mr Shah gave, so it's relevant context to the operation of the Treaty. Second, it goes to the issue of the workability of the Treaty.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there came a point at which, whether or not there was agreement, Pakistan concluded that they would just let the matter pass, and the Dul Hasti Dam was then constructed. But in this context, I draw to your attention because it's going to be very relevant to the issue of subsequent practice paragraph (14) of Article IV of the Treaty. I don't know whether you can call that up, please. It's on page 140. And you'll see that it says	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will come back to address some of the issues of informing-sharing for, I suppose, a couple of reasons: first of all, because it's a very important part of the context of how the Treaty is working; and this was the evidence that Mr Shah gave, so it's relevant context to the operation of the Treaty. Second, it goes to the issue of the workability of the Treaty. But third, it goes perhaps to a wider issue. And
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there came a point at which, whether or not there was agreement, Pakistan concluded that they would just let the matter pass, and the Dul Hasti Dam was then constructed. But in this context, I draw to your attention because it's going to be very relevant to the issue of subsequent practice paragraph (14) of Article IV of the Treaty. I don't know whether you can call that up, please. It's on page 140. And you'll see that it says there, paragraph (14):	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will come back to address some of the issues of informing-sharing for, I suppose, a couple of reasons: first of all, because it's a very important part of the context of how the Treaty is working; and this was the evidence that Mr Shah gave, so it's relevant context to the operation of the Treaty. Second, it goes to the issue of the workability of the Treaty. But third, it goes perhaps to a wider issue. And here perhaps I can simply take you to paragraph 9 of
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there came a point at which, whether or not there was agreement, Pakistan concluded that they would just let the matter pass, and the Dul Hasti Dam was then constructed. But in this context, I draw to your attention because it's going to be very relevant to the issue of subsequent practice paragraph (14) of Article IV of the Treaty. I don't know whether you can call that up, please. It's on page 140. And you'll see that it says there, paragraph (14): "In the event that either Party should develop a use	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will come back to address some of the issues of informing-sharing for, I suppose, a couple of reasons: first of all, because it's a very important part of the context of how the Treaty is working; and this was the evidence that Mr Shah gave, so it's relevant context to the operation of the Treaty. Second, it goes to the issue of the workability of the Treaty. But third, it goes perhaps to a wider issue. And here perhaps I can simply take you to paragraph 9 of Annexure D for just a moment, which I think is on
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there came a point at which, whether or not there was agreement, Pakistan concluded that they would just let the matter pass, and the Dul Hasti Dam was then constructed. But in this context, I draw to your attention because it's going to be very relevant to the issue of subsequent practice paragraph (14) of Article IV of the Treaty. I don't know whether you can call that up, please. It's on page 140. And you'll see that it says there, paragraph (14): "In the event that either Party should develop a use	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will come back to address some of the issues of informing-sharing for, I suppose, a couple of reasons: first of all, because it's a very important part of the context of how the Treaty is working; and this was the evidence that Mr Shah gave, so it's relevant context to the operation of the Treaty. Second, it goes to the issue of the workability of the Treaty. But third, it goes perhaps to a wider issue. And here perhaps I can simply take you to paragraph 9 of
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there came a point at which, whether or not there was agreement, Pakistan concluded that they would just let the matter pass, and the Dul Hasti Dam was then constructed. But in this context, I draw to your attention because it's going to be very relevant to the issue of subsequent practice paragraph (14) of Article IV of the Treaty. I don't know whether you can call that up, please. It's on page 140. And you'll see that it says there, paragraph (14): "In the event that either Party should develop a use	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will come back to address some of the issues of informing-sharing for, I suppose, a couple of reasons: first of all, because it's a very important part of the context of how the Treaty is working; and this was the evidence that Mr Shah gave, so it's relevant context to the operation of the Treaty. Second, it goes to the issue of the workability of the Treaty. But third, it goes perhaps to a wider issue. And here perhaps I can simply take you to paragraph 9 of Annexure D for just a moment, which I think is on
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a lot of discussion within the Commission, and there came a point at which, whether or not there was agreement, Pakistan concluded that they would just let the matter pass, and the Dul Hasti Dam was then constructed. But in this context, I draw to your attention because it's going to be very relevant to the issue of subsequent practice paragraph (14) of Article IV of the Treaty. I don't know whether you can call that up, please. It's on page 140. And you'll see that it says there, paragraph (14): "In the event that either Party should develop a use of the waters of the Rivers which is not in accordance	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	That being said, we have addressed it, and we will come back to address some of the issues of informing-sharing for, I suppose, a couple of reasons: first of all, because it's a very important part of the context of how the Treaty is working; and this was the evidence that Mr Shah gave, so it's relevant context to the operation of the Treaty. Second, it goes to the issue of the workability of the Treaty. But third, it goes perhaps to a wider issue. And here perhaps I can simply take you to paragraph 9 of Annexure D for just a moment, which I think is on page 176.

16:45 1	Paragraph 9 of Annexure D, which Mr Shah referenced,	16:48 1	asking you to rewrite the language of paragraph 9 to
2	says and this is in the context of the design	2	say, "This should be provided eight months or
3	constraints on run-of-river plants:	3	twelve months" we can't ask you to rewrite the
4	"To enable Pakistan to satisfy itself that the	4	Treaty.
5	design of a Plant conforms to the criteria mentioned in	5	But the reason why the appreciation of this issue
6	Paragraph 8, India shall, at least six months in advance	6	I think is rather important is: if I may take you back
7	of the beginning of construction of river works	7	to Article VII, paragraph (2), which you will find on
8	connected with the Plant, communicate to Pakistan, in	8	page 146, the heading of that is "Future Co-operation".
9	writing, the information specified in Appendix II to	9	And Article VII, paragraph (2) says:
10	this Annexure."	10	"If either Party plans to construct any engineering
11	So it's at least six months, and it relates to the	11	works which would cause interference with the waters of
12	conformity with the design of the plant.	12	any of the Rivers, and which, in its opinion, would
13	Paragraph 10 then affords Pakistan:	13	affect the other Party materially, it shall notify the
14	"Within three months of the receipt of	14	other Party of its plans and supply such data
15	information specified in Paragraph 9, Pakistan shall	15	relating to the work as may be available and as would
16	communicate to India, in writing, any objection"	16	enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature,
17	Viewed in the light of the very considerable	17	magnitude and effect of the work."
18	complexity of the engineering documentation that is	18	Our position, plain and simple it's not
19	provided in respect of these dams, this is quite	19	a position which engages any of the disputes that you're
20	a remarkable timetable: that one state has to provide	20	involved in directly, but it may engage questions about
21	everything six months in advance, or at least	21	the ability of the parties to actually have a dialogue
22	six months; but as Mr Shah has indicated, if India	22	about the design criteria in paragraph 8 is that
23	provides that information at all, it's up to the	23	paragraph 9 of Annexure D does not somehow trump and
24	deadline. Pakistan then has an opportunity of only	24	write out of the Treaty Article VII, paragraph (2),
25	three months in which it's got to assess all of the	25	which is also an information-sharing obligation.
	Page 197		Page 199
	Tuge 177		Tuge 1//
16:46 1	technical drawings, absolutely everything, and then go	16:49 1	So India may say to itself, "Well, we can leave [it]
2	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then	2	up until the last moment, up until the six months
2 3	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement	2 3	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design
2 3 4	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements.	2 3 4	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works
2 3 4 5	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can	2 3 4 5	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under
2 3 4 5 6	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see	2 3 4 5 6	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any
2 3 4 5 6 7	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be	2 3 4 5 6 7	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location, pretty straightforward; the hydrologic data, if you just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of context. It may also become relevant to the way in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location, pretty straightforward; the hydrologic data, if you just have a look through those provisions; the hydraulic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of context. It may also become relevant to the way in which you come to view the implementation of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location, pretty straightforward; the hydrologic data, if you just have a look through those provisions; the hydraulic data. And then we've got the particulars of the design:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of context. It may also become relevant to the way in which you come to view the implementation of the obligations in paragraph 8, the design obligations. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location, pretty straightforward; the hydrologic data, if you just have a look through those provisions; the hydraulic data. And then we've got the particulars of the design: "(a) Dimensioned plan showing dam, spillway, intake	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of context. It may also become relevant to the way in which you come to view the implementation of the obligations in paragraph 8, the design obligations. So we are trying, particularly in the absence of our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location, pretty straightforward; the hydrologic data, if you just have a look through those provisions; the hydraulic data. And then we've got the particulars of the design: "(a) Dimensioned plan showing dam, spillway, intake and outlet works	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of context. It may also become relevant to the way in which you come to view the implementation of the obligations in paragraph 8, the design obligations. So we are trying, particularly in the absence of our friends opposite, to give you as holistic a view of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location, pretty straightforward; the hydrologic data, if you just have a look through those provisions; the hydraulic data. And then we've got the particulars of the design: "(a) Dimensioned plan showing dam, spillway, intake and outlet works (b) Type of dam, length and height above mean bed of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of context. It may also become relevant to the way in which you come to view the implementation of the obligations in paragraph 8, the design obligations. So we are trying, particularly in the absence of our friends opposite, to give you as holistic a view of the workability of the Treaty as we can possibly do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location, pretty straightforward; the hydrologic data, if you just have a look through those provisions; the hydraulic data. And then we've got the particulars of the design: "(a) Dimensioned plan showing dam, spillway, intake and outlet works (b) Type of dam, length and height above mean bed of river.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of context. It may also become relevant to the way in which you come to view the implementation of the obligations in paragraph 8, the design obligations. So we are trying, particularly in the absence of our friends opposite, to give you as holistic a view of the workability of the Treaty as we can possibly do. There is a further point, which I will come on to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location, pretty straightforward; the hydrologic data, if you just have a look through those provisions; the hydraulic data. And then we've got the particulars of the design: "(a) Dimensioned plan showing dam, spillway, intake and outlet works (b) Type of dam, length and height above mean bed of river. (c) Cross-section	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of context. It may also become relevant to the way in which you come to view the implementation of the obligations in paragraph 8, the design obligations. So we are trying, particularly in the absence of our friends opposite, to give you as holistic a view of the workability of the Treaty as we can possibly do. There is a further point, which I will come on to address; Mr Minear, it goes to your question. But I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location, pretty straightforward; the hydrologic data, if you just have a look through those provisions; the hydraulic data. And then we've got the particulars of the design: "(a) Dimensioned plan showing dam, spillway, intake and outlet works (b) Type of dam, length and height above mean bed of river. (c) Cross-section (d) Type of spillway, length", and so on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of context. It may also become relevant to the way in which you come to view the implementation of the obligations in paragraph 8, the design obligations. So we are trying, particularly in the absence of our friends opposite, to give you as holistic a view of the workability of the Treaty as we can possibly do. There is a further point, which I will come on to address; Mr Minear, it goes to your question. But I'm going to defer it until I come to it in my, as it were,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location, pretty straightforward; the hydrologic data, if you just have a look through those provisions; the hydraulic data. And then we've got the particulars of the design: "(a) Dimensioned plan showing dam, spillway, intake and outlet works (b) Type of dam, length and height above mean bed of river. (c) Cross-section (d) Type of spillway, length", and so on. So there is a great deal of information that needs	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of context. It may also become relevant to the way in which you come to view the implementation of the obligations in paragraph 8, the design obligations. So we are trying, particularly in the absence of our friends opposite, to give you as holistic a view of the workability of the Treaty as we can possibly do. There is a further point, which I will come on to address; Mr Minear, it goes to your question. But I'm going to defer it until I come to it in my, as it were, scripted remarks, because in fact this question of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location, pretty straightforward; the hydrologic data, if you just have a look through those provisions; the hydraulic data. And then we've got the particulars of the design: "(a) Dimensioned plan showing dam, spillway, intake and outlet works (b) Type of dam, length and height above mean bed of river. (c) Cross-section (d) Type of spillway, length", and so on. So there is a great deal of information that needs to be provided.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of context. It may also become relevant to the way in which you come to view the implementation of the obligations in paragraph 8, the design obligations. So we are trying, particularly in the absence of our friends opposite, to give you as holistic a view of the workability of the Treaty as we can possibly do. There is a further point, which I will come on to address; Mr Minear, it goes to your question. But I'm going to defer it until I come to it in my, as it were, scripted remarks, because in fact this question of whether the parties had changed their position following
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location, pretty straightforward; the hydrologic data, if you just have a look through those provisions; the hydraulic data. And then we've got the particulars of the design: "(a) Dimensioned plan showing dam, spillway, intake and outlet works (b) Type of dam, length and height above mean bed of river. (c) Cross-section (d) Type of spillway, length", and so on. So there is a great deal of information that needs	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of context. It may also become relevant to the way in which you come to view the implementation of the obligations in paragraph 8, the design obligations. So we are trying, particularly in the absence of our friends opposite, to give you as holistic a view of the workability of the Treaty as we can possibly do. There is a further point, which I will come on to address; Mr Minear, it goes to your question. But I'm going to defer it until I come to it in my, as it were, scripted remarks, because in fact this question of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location, pretty straightforward; the hydrologic data, if you just have a look through those provisions; the hydraulic data. And then we've got the particulars of the design: "(a) Dimensioned plan showing dam, spillway, intake and outlet works (b) Type of dam, length and height above mean bed of river. (c) Cross-section (d) Type of spillway, length", and so on. So there is a great deal of information that needs to be provided. I think one of the points that Mr Shah was making is that this is the Treaty that we've got. We are not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of context. It may also become relevant to the way in which you come to view the implementation of the obligations in paragraph 8, the design obligations. So we are trying, particularly in the absence of our friends opposite, to give you as holistic a view of the workability of the Treaty as we can possibly do. There is a further point, which I will come on to address; Mr Minear, it goes to your question. But I'm going to defer it until I come to it in my, as it were, scripted remarks, because in fact this question of whether the parties had changed their position following Baglihar is exactly one which we have on our agenda to deal with, and I will come to it shortly, and we will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	back to raise an objection under paragraph 10. And then paragraph 11 deals with the dispute settlement arrangements. And if you scroll down, or if my colleague can scroll down to take you to Appendix II, you will see there the detail of the information that's to be provided at least six months beforehand. And Mr Shah mentioned this in his evidence, identifying the four categories. But if you have a look at Appendix II, there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided: location, pretty straightforward; the hydrologic data, if you just have a look through those provisions; the hydraulic data. And then we've got the particulars of the design: "(a) Dimensioned plan showing dam, spillway, intake and outlet works (b) Type of dam, length and height above mean bed of river. (c) Cross-section (d) Type of spillway, length", and so on. So there is a great deal of information that needs to be provided. I think one of the points that Mr Shah was making is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	up until the last moment, up until the six months deadline and the provision of the final design specifications or whatever on the dam before the works start", but it is still under an obligation, under VII(2), to provide information in relation to any engineering works that would cause "interference with the waters of". And you'll recall I took you to the definition of that phrase, "interference with the waters of", in [Article] I(15), and these HEPs are undoubtedly an "interference with the waters of". So, once again, we are providing it for purposes of context. It may also become relevant to the way in which you come to view the implementation of the obligations in paragraph 8, the design obligations. So we are trying, particularly in the absence of our friends opposite, to give you as holistic a view of the workability of the Treaty as we can possibly do. There is a further point, which I will come on to address; Mr Minear, it goes to your question. But I'm going to defer it until I come to it in my, as it were, scripted remarks, because in fact this question of whether the parties had changed their position following Baglihar is exactly one which we have on our agenda to

53 (Pages 197 to 200)

16:51	come to it again on Thursday and Friday. But I'll come	16:54 1	the afternoon. And the title of this agreement was
	2 back to that.	2	an agreement "taking into consideration the provisions
	So I think with that, Mr Chairman, unless you or the	3	of the Indus Waters Treaty, 1960, to which both
	members of the Court have any questions arising from	4	Governments are parties", or that was one of the
	what I've just said, I will go back to my scripted	5	headline provisions.
	5 remarks.	6	By that Salal Agreement, the parties agreed on the
	7 THE CHAIRMAN: Please continue.	7	"salient features" of the Salal HEP, including the full
8	SIR DANIEL: My last substantive topic held over from the	8	pondage level, the dead storage level, the operating
	morning is the genesis of the present dispute, the	9	pool, the dead storage capacity, the immovable crest
10		10	level of the spillway, the spillway gates, the level of
1		11	power intakes and the outlet works. It's a pretty short
12		12	agreement, and in one paragraph, Article II, it lists
13		13	all of these and then it indicates the agreement of the
14		14	parties, taking into consideration the provision of the
1:	•	15	Indus Waters Treaty.
10	Insofar as is relevant for this phase of the	16	Now, there were other issues or differences between
1'	proceedings, these issues were revisited in chapter 2 of	17	the parties during this early period. And I'm taking
13	Pakistan's Memorial in this phase of the case. Having	18	sort of latitude when I describe the "early period".
19	regard to question 35(a) of Procedural Order No. 6,	19	It's really a period that runs from, I suppose, 1960
20	Mr Fietta will address you on Wednesday on the	20	through to about 1988, through to the beginnings of the
2	interpretative issues arising out of the Baglihar	21	Kishenganga dispute.
22	determination and the Kishenganga awards.	22	Material differences between the parties, however,
2:	For present purposes, I would like, at this point,	23	began to emerge from, at the very least, 1988, when
24	simply to recall a number of points about the origins of	24	Pakistan first raised questions within the Permanent
2:	the present dispute and the opposition of the parties on	25	Indus Commission regarding the Indian "scheme envisaging
	Page 201		Page 203
16:52	the key issues of which you are seised. Of course,	16:55 1	diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River". And
			diversion of the waters of the Rishengunga River. This
	everything that I'm going to say is buried away in the	2	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently
	everything that I'm going to say is buried away in the documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it	2 3	
	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say,		this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently
	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it	3	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the
:	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief	3 4	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised
:	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar	3 4 5	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the
	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these	3 4 5 6 7 8	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the
	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that.
:	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from
1 1 1	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on
1 1 1	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And
1 1 1 1	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established an allocation of rights of use of water and a framework	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And on 7 February 2006, the PCIW notified the ICIW of the
1 1 1 1 1	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established an allocation of rights of use of water and a framework for the settlement of differences going forward. After	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And on 7 February 2006, the PCIW notified the ICIW of the existence of a dispute with respect to the KHEP.
1 1 1 1 1 1	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established an allocation of rights of use of water and a framework for the settlement of differences going forward. After the initial period following the Treaty's conclusion,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And on 7 February 2006, the PCIW notified the ICIW of the existence of a dispute with respect to the KHEP. Subsequently, by correspondence of 4 February 2008
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established an allocation of rights of use of water and a framework for the settlement of differences going forward. After the initial period following the Treaty's conclusion, the framework of the Treaty enabled the parties to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And on 7 February 2006, the PCIW notified the ICIW of the existence of a dispute with respect to the KHEP. Subsequently, by correspondence of 4 February 2008 from the PCIW to the ICIW, Pakistan identified six
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established an allocation of rights of use of water and a framework for the settlement of differences going forward. After the initial period following the Treaty's conclusion, the framework of the Treaty enabled the parties to address the differences that arose on a cooperative	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And on 7 February 2006, the PCIW notified the ICIW of the existence of a dispute with respect to the KHEP. Subsequently, by correspondence of 4 February 2008 from the PCIW to the ICIW, Pakistan identified six composite questions they were composite questions
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established an allocation of rights of use of water and a framework for the settlement of differences going forward. After the initial period following the Treaty's conclusion, the framework of the Treaty enabled the parties to address the differences that arose on a cooperative basis. And you've heard from Mr Shah about the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And on 7 February 2006, the PCIW notified the ICIW of the existence of a dispute with respect to the KHEP. Subsequently, by correspondence of 4 February 2008 from the PCIW to the ICIW, Pakistan identified six composite questions they were composite questions because there were a number of different parts to each
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established an allocation of rights of use of water and a framework for the settlement of differences going forward. After the initial period following the Treaty's conclusion, the framework of the Treaty enabled the parties to address the differences that arose on a cooperative basis. And you've heard from Mr Shah about the cooperation between the parties that was evident in the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And on 7 February 2006, the PCIW notified the ICIW of the existence of a dispute with respect to the KHEP. Subsequently, by correspondence of 4 February 2008 from the PCIW to the ICIW, Pakistan identified six composite questions they were composite questions because there were a number of different parts to each of the six question that were identified six
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established an allocation of rights of use of water and a framework for the settlement of differences going forward. After the initial period following the Treaty's conclusion, the framework of the Treaty enabled the parties to address the differences that arose on a cooperative basis. And you've heard from Mr Shah about the cooperation between the parties that was evident in the early days.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And on 7 February 2006, the PCIW notified the ICIW of the existence of a dispute with respect to the KHEP. Subsequently, by correspondence of 4 February 2008 from the PCIW to the ICIW, Pakistan identified six composite questions they were composite questions because there were a number of different parts to each of the six question that were identified six composite questions in dispute between the two parties.
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established an allocation of rights of use of water and a framework for the settlement of differences going forward. After the initial period following the Treaty's conclusion, the framework of the Treaty enabled the parties to address the differences that arose on a cooperative basis. And you've heard from Mr Shah about the cooperation between the parties that was evident in the early days. An example of this indeed was the agreement between	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And on 7 February 2006, the PCIW notified the ICIW of the existence of a dispute with respect to the KHEP. Subsequently, by correspondence of 4 February 2008 from the PCIW to the ICIW, Pakistan identified six composite questions they were composite questions because there were a number of different parts to each of the six question that were identified six composite questions in dispute between the two parties. Two of those composite questions were subsequently
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established an allocation of rights of use of water and a framework for the settlement of differences going forward. After the initial period following the Treaty's conclusion, the framework of the Treaty enabled the parties to address the differences that arose on a cooperative basis. And you've heard from Mr Shah about the cooperation between the parties that was evident in the early days. An example of this indeed was the agreement between the parties of 14 April 1978 regarding the Salal plant	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And on 7 February 2006, the PCIW notified the ICIW of the existence of a dispute with respect to the KHEP. Subsequently, by correspondence of 4 February 2008 from the PCIW to the ICIW, Pakistan identified six composite questions they were composite questions because there were a number of different parts to each of the six question that were identified six composite questions in dispute between the two parties. Two of those composite questions were subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration. The
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established an allocation of rights of use of water and a framework for the settlement of differences going forward. After the initial period following the Treaty's conclusion, the framework of the Treaty enabled the parties to address the differences that arose on a cooperative basis. And you've heard from Mr Shah about the cooperation between the parties that was evident in the early days. An example of this indeed was the agreement between the parties of 14 April 1978 regarding the Salal plant constructed on the Chenab River. This is at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And on 7 February 2006, the PCIW notified the ICIW of the existence of a dispute with respect to the KHEP. Subsequently, by correspondence of 4 February 2008 from the PCIW to the ICIW, Pakistan identified six composite questions they were composite questions because there were a number of different parts to each of the six question that were identified six composite questions in dispute between the two parties. Two of those composite questions were subsequently
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established an allocation of rights of use of water and a framework for the settlement of differences going forward. After the initial period following the Treaty's conclusion, the framework of the Treaty enabled the parties to address the differences that arose on a cooperative basis. And you've heard from Mr Shah about the cooperation between the parties that was evident in the early days. An example of this indeed was the agreement between the parties of 14 April 1978 regarding the Salal plant constructed on the Chenab River. This is at Exhibit PLA-53, I think Mr Shah mentioned that;	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And on 7 February 2006, the PCIW notified the ICIW of the existence of a dispute with respect to the KHEP. Subsequently, by correspondence of 4 February 2008 from the PCIW to the ICIW, Pakistan identified six composite questions they were composite questions because there were a number of different parts to each of the six question that were identified six composite questions in dispute between the two parties. Two of those composite questions were subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration. The remaining four composite questions remained unaddressed
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established an allocation of rights of use of water and a framework for the settlement of differences going forward. After the initial period following the Treaty's conclusion, the framework of the Treaty enabled the parties to address the differences that arose on a cooperative basis. And you've heard from Mr Shah about the cooperation between the parties that was evident in the early days. An example of this indeed was the agreement between the parties of 14 April 1978 regarding the Salal plant constructed on the Chenab River. This is at Exhibit PLA-53, I think Mr Shah mentioned that; fortuitous that my submissions have been held over to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And on 7 February 2006, the PCIW notified the ICIW of the existence of a dispute with respect to the KHEP. Subsequently, by correspondence of 4 February 2008 from the PCIW to the ICIW, Pakistan identified six composite questions they were composite questions because there were a number of different parts to each of the six question that were identified six composite questions in dispute between the two parties. Two of those composite questions were subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration. The remaining four composite questions remained unaddressed and unresolved, and in large part this is why we are here.
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	documents on the record; I'm not sure that we've said it in quite the same directness as I'm about to say, boiling down some of the issues that have arisen. And then I will conclude my submissions with a brief observation to the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga awards for these proceedings. As I've already said today, the parties' dispute over water use goes back to the earliest days of their independence in August 1947. The Treaty established an allocation of rights of use of water and a framework for the settlement of differences going forward. After the initial period following the Treaty's conclusion, the framework of the Treaty enabled the parties to address the differences that arose on a cooperative basis. And you've heard from Mr Shah about the cooperation between the parties that was evident in the early days. An example of this indeed was the agreement between the parties of 14 April 1978 regarding the Salal plant constructed on the Chenab River. This is at Exhibit PLA-53, I think Mr Shah mentioned that;	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	this is the origin of the dispute that was subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration, the detail of which is recounted in its partial award at paragraph 140 and following. So when I take this reference of 1988 and quote to you the question raised concerning the "scheme envisaging diversion of the waters of the Kishenganga River", I am referencing the way in which the Kishenganga Court addressed that. After much back-and-forth in the Commission, so from 1988 and following, that dispute crystallised on 7 February 2006. So we have a period of 18 years. And on 7 February 2006, the PCIW notified the ICIW of the existence of a dispute with respect to the KHEP. Subsequently, by correspondence of 4 February 2008 from the PCIW to the ICIW, Pakistan identified six composite questions they were composite questions because there were a number of different parts to each of the six question that were identified six composite questions in dispute between the two parties. Two of those composite questions were subsequently referred to the Kishenganga Court of Arbitration. The remaining four composite questions remained unaddressed and unresolved, and in large part this is why we are

54 (Pages 201 to 204)

1 4 5 7				
16:57	1	If you have a look at Pakistan's Amended Request for	17:00 1	methodology of the calculation of maximum allowable
	2	Arbitration at paragraph 18 I don't invite you to do	2	pondage the parties have remained far apart and
	3	so at the moment this reflects Pakistan's original	3	opposed on all of these headline issues, including on
	4	Request for Arbitration of 2016 these included	4	the approach to the calculation of pondage.
	5	disputes relating to the calculation of pondage, the	5	As an aside, I note that the adjustment in the
	6	placement of the power intakes and the design and height	6	parties' approach to the calculation of pondage occurred
	7	of the sediment outlets and spillways. It is these	7	largely in consequence of the Baglihar pondage
	8	disputes of systemic interpretation that are the subject	8	determination, which India moved very quickly to
	9	of the present dispute of the proceedings.	9	embrace, and the position that India takes today is
	10	So the genesis of this is in fact around about 1988,	10	largely a Baglihar determination position.
	11	when the first disputes arose over Kishenganga. They	11	You will recall that in the Baglihar determination,
	12	went through a fairly lengthy process of evolution and	12	the Neutral Expert disagreed with both parties, provided
	13	crystallisation until 2006-2008, then went to the	13	his own methodology that methodology was
	14	arbitral proceedings in respect of two of the disputes,	14	a methodology which we contest, very heavily contest
	15	and the remaining Kishenganga disputes, in some shape or	15	but reached a conclusion which provided pondage to India
	16	form, have come to you.	16	for Baglihar which was very, very significantly greater
	17	But while these are the direct origins of the	17	than the position that Pakistan contended for and
	18	present dispute, the parties' wider dispute over the	18	approached the position that India advanced.
	19	interpretation of the paragraph 8 design criteria was in	19	Now, the Baglihar determination, over a period of
	20	fact crystallised much before this, in the early 1990s,	20	time including, I have to say, in the context of the
	21	following India's first proposal of the Baglihar HEP.	21	preparation of these submissions, but really from the
	22	The cause of the Baglihar dispute was that India's	22	earliest times also caused Pakistan to revisit and to
	23	Baglihar design proposed a significantly increased	23	slightly modify the approach that it had been taking in
	24	operating pool on the basis of a pondage calculation	24	the Baglihar proceedings, acknowledging the complexity
	25	that Pakistan contested. So this goes back to the early	25	and the variability of the outcome that its Baglihar
		Page 205		Page 207
		1 age 203		1 age 207
16:58	1	1990s. And by correspondence from the PCIW to the ICIW	17:02 1	approach posed.
	2	of 12 August 1992, Pakistan objected to India's Baglihar	2	Just to unpack that a little. You will hear this
	3	design by reference to paragraphs 8(a), 8(b), 8(c), 8(e)	3	you've seen it in our written submissions, but you will
	4	and 8(f) of the Treaty. And you will find this	4	hear this in some detail from Dr Miles.
	5	correspondence at Exhibit P-586.	5	One of the, as it were, guiding principles that we
	6	In a sense, that is the real genesis of the	6	have taken when we've come to present our approach on
	7	paragraph 8 dispute that you have before you.	7	the pondage calculation is that this must have been
	8	Mr Chairman, members of the Court and again,	8	a pondage calculation that was capable of being
	9	I think that this goes, Mr Chairman, perhaps to one of	9	undertaken in 1960, in the period up until 1960; it
	10	the questions that you put to Mr Shah since at least	10	can't be a pondage calculation that has to be driven by
	11	that point, since at least 12 August 1992, Pakistan and	11	supercomputers, or by engineers sitting with laptops
	12	India have been in formal and fundamental dispute about	12	that were not yet invented. It really needed to be
				•
	13	the key questions of interpretation of paragraph 8 of	13	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide
	14	Annexure D of the Treaty.	14	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide rule, or with the maths of the engineers sitting and
	14 15	Annexure D of the Treaty. While the Baglihar Neutral Expert determination of	14 15	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide rule, or with the maths of the engineers sitting and undertaking that calculation.
	14 15 16	Annexure D of the Treaty. While the Baglihar Neutral Expert determination of 12 February 2007 drew a line under the parties'	14 15 16	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide rule, or with the maths of the engineers sitting and undertaking that calculation. In the light of Baglihar and subsequently, as
	14 15 16 17	Annexure D of the Treaty. While the Baglihar Neutral Expert determination of 12 February 2007 drew a line under the parties' differences in respect of the Baglihar HEP, it did not	14 15 16 17	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide rule, or with the maths of the engineers sitting and undertaking that calculation. In the light of Baglihar and subsequently, as Pakistan has come to look at these issues, I think the
	14 15 16 17	Annexure D of the Treaty. While the Baglihar Neutral Expert determination of 12 February 2007 drew a line under the parties' differences in respect of the Baglihar HEP, it did not resolve the dispute between the parties over the wider	14 15 16 17 18	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide rule, or with the maths of the engineers sitting and undertaking that calculation. In the light of Baglihar and subsequently, as Pakistan has come to look at these issues, I think the appreciation that we came to was that there was too
	14 15 16 17 18	Annexure D of the Treaty. While the Baglihar Neutral Expert determination of 12 February 2007 drew a line under the parties' differences in respect of the Baglihar HEP, it did not resolve the dispute between the parties over the wider systemic questions of interpretation of paragraph 8 as	14 15 16 17 18 19	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide rule, or with the maths of the engineers sitting and undertaking that calculation. In the light of Baglihar and subsequently, as Pakistan has come to look at these issues, I think the appreciation that we came to was that there was too great a complexity in the calculation that Pakistan was
	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Annexure D of the Treaty. While the Baglihar Neutral Expert determination of 12 February 2007 drew a line under the parties' differences in respect of the Baglihar HEP, it did not resolve the dispute between the parties over the wider systemic questions of interpretation of paragraph 8 as they applied to other Indian run-of-river HEPs on the	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide rule, or with the maths of the engineers sitting and undertaking that calculation. In the light of Baglihar and subsequently, as Pakistan has come to look at these issues, I think the appreciation that we came to was that there was too great a complexity in the calculation that Pakistan was advancing, and that it also did not arrive at a number
·	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Annexure D of the Treaty. While the Baglihar Neutral Expert determination of 12 February 2007 drew a line under the parties' differences in respect of the Baglihar HEP, it did not resolve the dispute between the parties over the wider systemic questions of interpretation of paragraph 8 as they applied to other Indian run-of-river HEPs on the Western Rivers. And here I come, Mr Minear, to your	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide rule, or with the maths of the engineers sitting and undertaking that calculation. In the light of Baglihar and subsequently, as Pakistan has come to look at these issues, I think the appreciation that we came to was that there was too great a complexity in the calculation that Pakistan was advancing, and that it also did not arrive at a number certain. And if you want to provide an interpretation
:	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Annexure D of the Treaty. While the Baglihar Neutral Expert determination of 12 February 2007 drew a line under the parties' differences in respect of the Baglihar HEP, it did not resolve the dispute between the parties over the wider systemic questions of interpretation of paragraph 8 as they applied to other Indian run-of-river HEPs on the Western Rivers. And here I come, Mr Minear, to your question and, Professor Murphy, to your follow-on.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide rule, or with the maths of the engineers sitting and undertaking that calculation. In the light of Baglihar and subsequently, as Pakistan has come to look at these issues, I think the appreciation that we came to was that there was too great a complexity in the calculation that Pakistan was advancing, and that it also did not arrive at a number certain. And if you want to provide an interpretation of the Treaty, of paragraph 8(c), you have to be able to
	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Annexure D of the Treaty. While the Baglihar Neutral Expert determination of 12 February 2007 drew a line under the parties' differences in respect of the Baglihar HEP, it did not resolve the dispute between the parties over the wider systemic questions of interpretation of paragraph 8 as they applied to other Indian run-of-river HEPs on the Western Rivers. And here I come, Mr Minear, to your question and, Professor Murphy, to your follow-on. While there have been some adjustments to the detail	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide rule, or with the maths of the engineers sitting and undertaking that calculation. In the light of Baglihar and subsequently, as Pakistan has come to look at these issues, I think the appreciation that we came to was that there was too great a complexity in the calculation that Pakistan was advancing, and that it also did not arrive at a number certain. And if you want to provide an interpretation of the Treaty, of paragraph 8(c), you have to be able to arrive at a number certain for any particular plant.
	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Annexure D of the Treaty. While the Baglihar Neutral Expert determination of 12 February 2007 drew a line under the parties' differences in respect of the Baglihar HEP, it did not resolve the dispute between the parties over the wider systemic questions of interpretation of paragraph 8 as they applied to other Indian run-of-river HEPs on the Western Rivers. And here I come, Mr Minear, to your question and, Professor Murphy, to your follow-on. While there have been some adjustments to the detail of the parties' respective positions on the paragraph 8	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide rule, or with the maths of the engineers sitting and undertaking that calculation. In the light of Baglihar and subsequently, as Pakistan has come to look at these issues, I think the appreciation that we came to was that there was too great a complexity in the calculation that Pakistan was advancing, and that it also did not arrive at a number certain. And if you want to provide an interpretation of the Treaty, of paragraph 8(c), you have to be able to arrive at a number certain for any particular plant. You can't say, "It's between this range", because those
	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Annexure D of the Treaty. While the Baglihar Neutral Expert determination of 12 February 2007 drew a line under the parties' differences in respect of the Baglihar HEP, it did not resolve the dispute between the parties over the wider systemic questions of interpretation of paragraph 8 as they applied to other Indian run-of-river HEPs on the Western Rivers. And here I come, Mr Minear, to your question and, Professor Murphy, to your follow-on. While there have been some adjustments to the detail	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide rule, or with the maths of the engineers sitting and undertaking that calculation. In the light of Baglihar and subsequently, as Pakistan has come to look at these issues, I think the appreciation that we came to was that there was too great a complexity in the calculation that Pakistan was advancing, and that it also did not arrive at a number certain. And if you want to provide an interpretation of the Treaty, of paragraph 8(c), you have to be able to arrive at a number certain for any particular plant.
	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Annexure D of the Treaty. While the Baglihar Neutral Expert determination of 12 February 2007 drew a line under the parties' differences in respect of the Baglihar HEP, it did not resolve the dispute between the parties over the wider systemic questions of interpretation of paragraph 8 as they applied to other Indian run-of-river HEPs on the Western Rivers. And here I come, Mr Minear, to your question and, Professor Murphy, to your follow-on. While there have been some adjustments to the detail of the parties' respective positions on the paragraph 8	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide rule, or with the maths of the engineers sitting and undertaking that calculation. In the light of Baglihar and subsequently, as Pakistan has come to look at these issues, I think the appreciation that we came to was that there was too great a complexity in the calculation that Pakistan was advancing, and that it also did not arrive at a number certain. And if you want to provide an interpretation of the Treaty, of paragraph 8(c), you have to be able to arrive at a number certain for any particular plant. You can't say, "It's between this range", because those who are designing and constructing and operating need to
	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Annexure D of the Treaty. While the Baglihar Neutral Expert determination of 12 February 2007 drew a line under the parties' differences in respect of the Baglihar HEP, it did not resolve the dispute between the parties over the wider systemic questions of interpretation of paragraph 8 as they applied to other Indian run-of-river HEPs on the Western Rivers. And here I come, Mr Minear, to your question and, Professor Murphy, to your follow-on. While there have been some adjustments to the detail of the parties' respective positions on the paragraph 8 criteria over the years for example, on the precise	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a pondage [calculation] that was undertaken with a slide rule, or with the maths of the engineers sitting and undertaking that calculation. In the light of Baglihar and subsequently, as Pakistan has come to look at these issues, I think the appreciation that we came to was that there was too great a complexity in the calculation that Pakistan was advancing, and that it also did not arrive at a number certain. And if you want to provide an interpretation of the Treaty, of paragraph 8(c), you have to be able to arrive at a number certain for any particular plant. You can't say, "It's between this range", because those

ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE IX AND ANNEXURE G OF THE INDUS WATERS TREATY 1960 Day 1 -- Hearing on the Merits, First Phase Monday, 8 Monday, 8 July 2024

17:04 1	know how the plant works.	17:08	1	has addressed that aspect of your question. We will be
2	So the position that we have advanced to you in our		2	coming back to this in some considerable detail. You
3	Memorial, and you will hear this from Dr Miles, is		3	will see on the outline of the submissions that there is
4	almost essentially the same position that Pakistan has		4	a segment that is put down for my attention at
5	been advancing previously, subject to some modification	:	5	number 17 this is the closing segment on Thursday
6	which he will address.		6	situating the calculation of pondage within the scheme
7	But where the parties remain very far apart and	,	7	of the Treaty. It was my intention, in fact, to
8	this is evident on the face of India's statement of		8	elaborate on what I've been saying now, and I will do so
9	difference in the Neutral Expert proceedings, which you		9	in rather more detail. And then Dr Miles, when he comes
10	will see because they are annexed to the Supplementary	1	0	to spend two and a half hours with you on pondage on
11	Rules of Procedure in the Neutral Expert proceedings,	1	1	Friday morning, will look into the detail of the
12	I drew those to your attention, and to Pakistan's	1	2	Baglihar arguments, how these arguments evolved,
13	statement of position is that Pakistan says that the	1	3	including by Pakistan and by India.
14	calculation of maximum allowable pondage has to be	1	4	So I hope that, in a sense, I've given you the
15	undertaken by reference to the formula in	1	5	taster menu, but you'll come to the real stuff a little
16	paragraph 8(c). And that formula in paragraph 8(c)	1	6	bit later on. But if there's anything on that that
17	refers to the calculation of firm power and the minimum	1	7	I can help you with at this stage, I'd be happy to try.
18	mean discharge in paragraph 2(i). And the reason why	1	8	Otherwise I will move on to the scheme of my
19	you look at the 2(i) MMD, minimum mean discharge, and	1	9	submissions.
20	firm power, is because 8(c) expressly requires you to do	2	20	THE CHAIRMAN: It's a very good taster menu.
21	so: it has an express renvoi back. So Pakistan's	2	21	Let me just note and you may wish to just leave
22	approach is driven by paragraph 8(c) and the firm power	2	22	it to Dr Miles, as we will hear more about this that
23	MMD formula in 2(i).	2	23	in my understanding, what Pakistan advanced in the
24	India's approach, as we understand it over the	2	24	Baglihar proceeding was that when we try to figure out
25	years, is to if I can put it in terms that are not	2	25	the time period to be thinking about fluctuations in
	Page 209			Page 211
	1 1 1 2 2 2 2			1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
17:06 1	intended to be disparaging, but it's a little bit more	17:09	1	firm power, that actually you would look at a weekly
2	of a mélange. It's looking at paragraph 8(c) and the	2	2	time period; as opposed to now, Pakistan is maintaining
3	calculation, then going back to the definition in	3	3	that it should be a daily time period.
4	paragraph 2(c), which talks about satisfaction of the	4	4	So that just struck me as one kind of change that
5	load, and to read that into the calculation of pondage,	4	5	might have something to do with disagreements within the
6	and also to rely on the operating provisions in	(6	Commission, although it sounds like, from what you've
7	paragraph 15 for purposes of its calculation of pondage.	7	7	said, the parties are so far apart that, no, it doesn't.
8	Forgive me, because there's a lot to be unpacked	8	8	But it does raise a different issue, which could be: is
9	here; we'll come back to that in some detail in due		9	Pakistan in agreement that there is no definitive way of
10	course. But in a sense, that divide between Pakistan's	10		determining maximum pondage under the Treaty if there is
11	approach, resting on 8(c) and 2(i), and India's	1		this possibility of variations in the way it's properly
12	approach, resting on an amalgam of 2(c), 8(c) and 15,	1:		calculated?
13	that divide has not changed and the essence of those	1:		SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, let me give you an immediate
14	calculations have not changed.	14		response, and that will be unpacked and developed by
15	We thought very carefully as to whether the dispute	1:		Dr Miles in due course.
16	that we were bringing to you on pondage was a dispute		6	I think in the first instance you are absolutely
17	between the parties that had been aired between the	1		correct, if I may say so, to put your finger on this
18	parties, and we had no difficulty, I have to say, at	13		question of daily and weekly, because the issue of the
19	all, in concluding that it was. And if you have a look	19		daily and weekly, the time period for purposes of firm
20	at paragraphs 11.1 to 11.3 of our Memorial those are	20		power, is something that we have grappled with in our
21	the opening paragraphs of the pondage chapter you	2		thinking about these issues.
22	will see quite clearly how it sets out both the	2:		The conclusion that we've come to and you've seen
23	consistency in the arguments, but also the divide	2:		this in chapter 11 of our Memorial is that, having
24 25	between the parties. So I hope, Mr Minear, Professor Murphy, that that	2:		been through the Treaty now pretty systematically, the conclusion that we have come to is that there is only
23	50 i nope, wii winicai, rioiessoi wiuipiiy, uiat uiat	۷.	J	conclusion that we have come to is that there is only
	Page 210			Page 212

56 (Pages 209 to 212)

17:11	•	hich jumps out as being the appropriate	17:14 1	a number of accomplished mathematicians, I think, on the
		e calculation, and that's the 24-hour	2	panel. But we will put all of these issues to you and
	-	look across all the various provisions	3	invite you to explore them further.
		d you will recall in the context of	4	MR MINEAR: Sir Daniel, I hate to give more assignments to
		here were some exchanges and if	5	your team, but when we get to the question of pondage,
		e, Professor Murphy, you were in the lead	6	it would be useful for me to know what variations there
		s on the part of the Court about the	7	have been in India's approach to pondage over time, and
		the plant, and that it was operating	8	also to go to the travaux. I think Pakistan initially
	on a 24-hour cycle		9	suggested a pondage determination based on a minimum
		t, as we must, I suppose, two things:	10	load factor, and I would be interested in knowing what
1		ere is no time period that's	11	relevance that might have to the position that was
		reaty specifically on this in	12	ultimately formulated in the Treaty.
1		n paragraph 8(c). It doesn't say,	13	SIR DANIEL: Mr Minear, thank you very much for the homework
		4-hour cycle" or, "You must use	14	to my team. I'm glad that that's not going to be my
1		". We also accept that there are	15	homework this evening, but it is going to be homework
		and 24 hours and weekly written into	16	for the team. But I have to say I think that that's
	7 the Treaty.		17	homework that has already been done, so it will be
		e day, it's going to depend on	18	a question of focusing the answers in response to your
1		ersuaded by our treaty interpretation	19	question.
2	-	hour period is a period that must	20	I do note, as an aside, that there has been a very
2		blied into the Treaty, and indeed that	21	heavy component over the years of hewing India's
2		d that could have been intended by	22	calculation of pondage to the load curve. And we were
2		-	23	struck by the question that you asked Mr Shah, "Does
2		your, as it were, sort of dangling	24	India ever provide this load data?", and his response,
2	conclusion, which	is: would we accept that there is no	25	"No, they don't".
		Page 213		Page 215
17:12		ere is no fixed method, I think but	17:16 1	But we take your question very much to heart and
	2 I'm going to say th	nis in a very sort of conditional and	17:16 1 2	it will be something that is addressed as we go on.
	I'm going to say the tentative way I	nis in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with		it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you.
	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thin	nis in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with hak that we have been now through such	2 3 4	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b.
	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thing a process of exam	nis in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with hk that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that,	2 3 4 5	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away
	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I this a process of exam whatever other me	his in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with his that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have	2 3 4 5 6	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much
	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I this a process of exame whatever other me been able to come	his in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with his that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's,	2 3 4 5 6 7	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my
	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I this a process of exame whatever other makes been able to come looking at Creage	nis in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with his that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little boof a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it
	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thing a process of exame whatever other modern able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has be	his in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with his that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, r & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not
1	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thing a process of exame whatever other me been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been do other method of c	his in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with his that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's
1	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I this a process of exame whatever other measurement been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been done the tental treason or another:	his in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with his that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, r & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well.
1 1 1	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I this a process of exame whatever other me been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been other method of creason or another: undertaken in 196	his in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with his that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little be of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it
1 1 1 1	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thing a process of exame whatever other medical been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been other method of come reason or another: undertaken in 1963 a storage plant, or	his in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with his that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner.
1 1 1 1 1	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thing a process of exame whatever other me been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been other method of comparison or another: undertaken in 196 a storage plant, or Now, we of course.	his in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with his that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, ar & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I suspect that I will
1 1 1 1	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thing a process of exame whatever other measurement of the been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been other method of comparison or another: undertaken in 1963 a storage plant, or Now, we of coutsiling the say of this is why the reads	his in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with his that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, ar & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature. The service of the conditional and don't think that we have up with a something of that nature. The service of the conditional and don't think that we have up with a something of that nature. The service of the conditional and don't think that we have up with a something of that nature. The service of the conditional and don't think that we have up with a something of that nature. The service of the conditional and don't think that we have up with a something of the conditional and that we have up with a something of the conditional and the something of the conditional and the service of the conditional and the service of the service of the conditional and the service of the ser	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I suspect that I will go on tomorrow, and that's fine. You've already got me
1 1 1 1 1	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thing a process of exame whatever other me been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been other method of comparison or another: undertaken in 196 a storage plant, or Now, we of coursubmissions in	nis in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with his that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature. The area are very content and indeed, son why we're here and we're offering in so much detail we are very content	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little be of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I suspect that I will go on tomorrow, and that's fine. You've already got me on the schedule as being the MC for tomorrow's
1 1 1 1 1 1	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I think a process of exame whatever other medical been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been other method of creason or another: undertaken in 196 a storage plant, or Now, we of cour submissions in to have our feet here.	his in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with his that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature. The area are very content and indeed, son why we're here and we're offering in so much detail we are very content teld to the flames, and no doubt our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little be of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I suspect that I will go on tomorrow, and that's fine. You've already got me on the schedule as being the MC for tomorrow's submissions. But I will try and use the next 15 minutes
1 1 1 1 1 1 1	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thing a process of exame whatever other me been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been other method of compart of the process of this is why the reason or another: Now, we of course this is why the reason or submissions in the to have our feet he engineering members.	his in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with his that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature. The are very content and indeed, son why we're here and we're offering in so much detail we are very content eld to the flames, and no doubt our pers will do so. And Dr Miles will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I suspect that I wil go on tomorrow, and that's fine. You've already got me on the schedule as being the MC for tomorrow's submissions. But I will try and use the next 15 minutes just to complete one aspect of what I have to say.
	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thing a process of exame whatever other me been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been other method of compart of the process of this is why the reason or another: Now, we of contains the process of the pro	nis in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with ak that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature. The are very content and indeed, son why we're here and we're offering a so much detail we are very content eld to the flames, and no doubt our pers will do so. And Dr Miles will an any of the questions that are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I suspect that I wil go on tomorrow, and that's fine. You've already got me on the schedule as being the MC for tomorrow's submissions. But I will try and use the next 15 minutes just to complete one aspect of what I have to say. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, reduced to its
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I this a process of exame whatever other me been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been other method of comparison or another: undertaken in 196 a storage plant, or Now, we of cour submissions in to have our feet he engineering members.	his in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with his that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature. The are very content and indeed, son why we're here and we're offering in so much detail we are very content eld to the flames, and no doubt our pers will do so. And Dr Miles will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little be of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I suspect that I will go on tomorrow, and that's fine. You've already got me on the schedule as being the MC for tomorrow's submissions. But I will try and use the next 15 minutes just to complete one aspect of what I have to say. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, reduced to its essentials, the present dispute between the parties is
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I think a process of exame whatever other me been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been also a storage plant, or looking looking looking looking at Creage wisdom that has been as to come looking at the looking	nis in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with a that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature. The area are very content and indeed, son why we're here and we're offering a so much detail we are very content eld to the flames, and no doubt our pers will do so. And Dr Miles will any of the questions that are are we've got Dr Morris and we've got	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little be of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I suspect that I wil go on tomorrow, and that's fine. You've already got me on the schedule as being the MC for tomorrow's submissions. But I will try and use the next 15 minutes just to complete one aspect of what I have to say. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, reduced to its essentials, the present dispute between the parties is about two key issues.
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I think a process of exame whatever other me been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been other method of compart of the process of the process of exame whatever other me been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been another: I make the process of exame whatever other me thod of compart of the process	nis in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with ak that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature. The are very content and indeed, son why we're here and we're offering in so much detail we are very content eld to the flames, and no doubt our pers will do so. And Dr Miles will in any of the questions that are are we've got Dr Morris and we've got the een that there is a mathematical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I suspect that I wil go on tomorrow, and that's fine. You've already got me on the schedule as being the MC for tomorrow's submissions. But I will try and use the next 15 minutes just to complete one aspect of what I have to say. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, reduced to its essentials, the present dispute between the parties is about two key issues. The first is about Treaty-consistent approaches to
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thing a process of exame whatever other me been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been other method of compart of the process of the process of exame whatever other me been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been as the process of th	nis in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with ak that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature. In the arrest very content and indeed, son why we're here and we're offering in so much detail we are very content eld to the flames, and no doubt our pers will do so. And Dr Miles will in any of the questions that are arrse we've got Dr Morris and we've got the een that there is a mathematical at Dr Blackmore is nodding with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I suspect that I wil go on tomorrow, and that's fine. You've already got me on the schedule as being the MC for tomorrow's submissions. But I will try and use the next 15 minutes just to complete one aspect of what I have to say. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, reduced to its essentials, the present dispute between the parties is about two key issues. The first is about Treaty-consistent approaches to the management of sediment. This goes to the
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thing a process of exame whatever other medical been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been able to come another: undertaken in 196 a storage plant, or Now, we of conthis is why the reasour submissions in to have our feet he engineering member attempt to assist in raised; then of could make a spendix. I see the a smile on his face.	nis in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with ak that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature. In the arrevery content and indeed, son why we're here and we're offering a so much detail we are very content eld to the flames, and no doubt our pers will do so. And Dr Miles will an any of the questions that are urse we've got Dr Morris and we've got the een that there is a mathematical at Dr Blackmore is nodding with e. The mathematics caused a great	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I suspect that I wil go on tomorrow, and that's fine. You've already got me on the schedule as being the MC for tomorrow's submissions. But I will try and use the next 15 minutes just to complete one aspect of what I have to say. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, reduced to its essentials, the present dispute between the parties is about two key issues. The first is about Treaty-consistent approaches to the management of sediment. This goes to the interpretation and application of subparagraphs (d), (e)
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thing a process of exame whatever other medical been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been able to come another: undertaken in 196 a storage plant, or Now, we of conthis is why the reasour submissions in to have our feet he engineering member attempt to assist in raised; then of course appendix. I see the asmile on his face.	nis in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with ak that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature. In the arrest very content and indeed, son why we're here and we're offering in so much detail we are very content eld to the flames, and no doubt our pers will do so. And Dr Miles will in any of the questions that are arrse we've got Dr Morris and we've got the een that there is a mathematical at Dr Blackmore is nodding with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I suspect that I wil go on tomorrow, and that's fine. You've already got me on the schedule as being the MC for tomorrow's submissions. But I will try and use the next 15 minutes just to complete one aspect of what I have to say. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, reduced to its essentials, the present dispute between the parties is about two key issues. The first is about Treaty-consistent approaches to the management of sediment. This goes to the interpretation and application of subparagraphs (d), (e)
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thing a process of exame whatever other medical been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been able to come another: undertaken in 196 a storage plant, or Now, we of conthis is why the reasour submissions in to have our feet he engineering member attempt to assist in raised; then of course appendix. I see the asmile on his face.	nis in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with ak that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 10, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature. The are very content and indeed, son why we're here and we're offering a so much detail we are very content eld to the flames, and no doubt our pers will do so. And Dr Miles will an any of the questions that are urse we've got Dr Morris and we've got the een that there is a mathematical at Dr Blackmore is nodding with 2. The mathematics caused a great people like me, but there are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little be of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I suspect that I will go on tomorrow, and that's fine. You've already got me on the schedule as being the MC for tomorrow's submissions. But I will try and use the next 15 minutes just to complete one aspect of what I have to say. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, reduced to its essentials, the present dispute between the parties is about two key issues. The first is about Treaty-consistent approaches to the management of sediment. This goes to the interpretation and application of subparagraphs (d), (e) and (f) of paragraph 8.
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	I'm going to say the tentative way I that, because I thing a process of exame whatever other medical been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been able to come looking at Creage wisdom that has been able to come another: undertaken in 196 a storage plant, or Now, we of conthis is why the reasour submissions in to have our feet he engineering member attempt to assist in raised; then of course appendix. I see the asmile on his face.	nis in a very sort of conditional and don't think that we would agree with ak that we have been now through such ination that we have concluded that, ethods of calculation of pondage we have up with looking also at India's, at & Justin, and looking at all of the een collected in this field that any alculation of pondage fails for one it couldn't have been a method 0, it would have turned the plant into something of that nature. In the arrevery content and indeed, son why we're here and we're offering a so much detail we are very content eld to the flames, and no doubt our pers will do so. And Dr Miles will an any of the questions that are urse we've got Dr Morris and we've got the een that there is a mathematical at Dr Blackmore is nodding with e. The mathematics caused a great	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it will be something that is addressed as we go on. MR MINEAR: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Daniel, just since we've had a little b of a break here, I note that we're about 15 minutes away from our normal breaking time. I don't know how much more you have, but I did want to signal that it's my intention that we stop at half past the hour. If it were to run an extra minute or two, that's not a problem, but I think that if it's more than that, it's best to continue with you tomorrow morning as well. Even though that breaks up your presentation, I think it would probably be best for us to proceed in that manner. SIR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I suspect that I wil go on tomorrow, and that's fine. You've already got me on the schedule as being the MC for tomorrow's submissions. But I will try and use the next 15 minutes just to complete one aspect of what I have to say. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, reduced to its essentials, the present dispute between the parties is about two key issues. The first is about Treaty-consistent approaches to the management of sediment. This goes to the interpretation and application of subparagraphs (d), (e)

57 (Pages 213 to 216)

ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE IX AND ANNEXURE G OF THE INDUS WATERS TREATY 1960 Day 1 -- Hearing on the Merits, First Phase Monday, 8 Monday, 8 July 2024

17:17 1	The second is about the permissible size of a HEP's	17:20 1	be applied to new power plants under the Treaty."
2	operating pool, including, principally, the storage of	2	That's at paragraph 6.1.3.
3	water by way of pondage, but also the height of the	3	So this philosophical approach to the design of
4	freeboard. The higher the freeboard, the more potential	4	run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers was
5	there is to store water. And this goes to the	5	crystallised in that exchange in January 2004 in respect
6	interpretation and application of subparagraphs (c) and	6	of the Baglihar Plant.
7	(a) of paragraph 8.	7	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, this is the nub
8	These disputes of systemic interpretation go to the	8	of the dispute between the parties: India couldn't be
9	heart of the application of the Treaty.	9	bothered. For India, the 200 or so HEPs planned for the
10	So I come back to a point that I've made already but	10	Western Rivers are an afterthought. India approaches
11	I think is worth underlining here, and that is that in	11	HEP design and construction on a colossal scale by
12	my submissions a little bit earlier today, I drew	12	reference to template design standards that are focused
13	attention to the fact that India has somewhere around	13	on the more than 96% of its dam construction programme.
14	5,264 completed large dams on its rivers, less than 4%	14	Recalibrating India's template standards to accommodate
15	of which are located on or planned for the Western	15	the bespoke design criteria of the Treaty is, for India,
16	Rivers. And I noted that there is an evidently strong	16	too much of an irritant. It is easier for India simply
17	national imperative on India's part to design its	17	to ignore, we say to dissemble, to play long, to fail to
18	Western Rivers run-of-river HEPs by reference to its own	18	engage, to contest competence, and all the while to
19	Treaty-unconstrained design criteria that it uses for	19	build, build, build. That is what India is doing.
20	the rest of the country.	20	Now for Pakistan, however, those 200 or so Indian
21	Indeed, India said as much expressly in the course	21	HEPs planned for the Western Rivers pose risks akin to
22	of the 90th meeting of the Commission in January 2004,	22	arteriosclerosis in the arteries of the heart. Pakistan
23	which was convened in an attempt to reach	23	is totally dependent on the waters of these rivers. As
24	an understanding between the two sides on the	24	Mr Fietta will address tomorrow, these rivers are
25	differences between them with respect to the Baglihar	25	Pakistan's lifeblood.
	Page 217		Page 219
17:19 1	HEP. The record of this meeting is at Exhibit P-544:	17:22 1	India's template design standards that are focused
17:19 1 2	HEP. The record of this meeting is at Exhibit P-544; I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to	17:22 1 2	India's template design standards that are focused on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the
2	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to	17:22 1 2 3	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the
2 3	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian	2	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's
2 3 4	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that:	2 3	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown
2 3 4 5	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the	2 3 4	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of
2 3 4	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that	2 3 4 5	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown
2 3 4 5 6 7	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into	2 3 4 5 6	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for	2 3 4 5 6 7	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and operation of the works."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that would be sound, economical, satisfactory. The divide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and operation of the works." That's at paragraph 6.2.3 of the minutes of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that would be sound, economical, satisfactory. The divide between the parties on this issue is absolutely
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and operation of the works." That's at paragraph 6.2.3 of the minutes of the record of the 90th meeting.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that would be sound, economical, satisfactory. The divide between the parties on this issue is absolutely fundamental. India is driven by the 5,000; Pakistan is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and operation of the works." That's at paragraph 6.2.3 of the minutes of the record of the 90th meeting. Pakistan's Commissioner is recorded as having	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that would be sound, economical, satisfactory. The divide between the parties on this issue is absolutely fundamental. India is driven by the 5,000; Pakistan is driven by the Treaty and the 200. That is the issue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and operation of the works." That's at paragraph 6.2.3 of the minutes of the record of the 90th meeting. Pakistan's Commissioner is recorded as having responded to India's statement of position as follows:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that would be sound, economical, satisfactory. The divide between the parties on this issue is absolutely fundamental. India is driven by the 5,000; Pakistan is driven by the Treaty and the 200. That is the issue that needs to be addressed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and operation of the works." That's at paragraph 6.2.3 of the minutes of the record of the 90th meeting. Pakistan's Commissioner is recorded as having responded to India's statement of position as follows: "To the Indian Commissioner's statement that all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that would be sound, economical, satisfactory. The divide between the parties on this issue is absolutely fundamental. India is driven by the 5,000; Pakistan is driven by the Treaty and the 200. That is the issue that needs to be addressed. India's approach to the calculation of pondage is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and operation of the works." That's at paragraph 6.2.3 of the minutes of the record of the 90th meeting. Pakistan's Commissioner is recorded as having responded to India's statement of position as follows: "To the Indian Commissioner's statement that all hydroelectric plants on the Himalayan rivers have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that would be sound, economical, satisfactory. The divide between the parties on this issue is absolutely fundamental. India is driven by the 5,000; Pakistan is driven by the Treaty and the 200. That is the issue that needs to be addressed. India's approach to the calculation of pondage is designed to maximise the storage of water, both for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and operation of the works." That's at paragraph 6.2.3 of the minutes of the record of the 90th meeting. Pakistan's Commissioner is recorded as having responded to India's statement of position as follows: "To the Indian Commissioner's statement that all hydroelectric plants on the Himalayan rivers have the same design and Baglihar Plant is not an exception,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that would be sound, economical, satisfactory. The divide between the parties on this issue is absolutely fundamental. India is driven by the 5,000; Pakistan is driven by the Treaty and the 200. That is the issue that needs to be addressed. India's approach to the calculation of pondage is designed to maximise the storage of water, both for power generation and for passive sediment management
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and operation of the works." That's at paragraph 6.2.3 of the minutes of the record of the 90th meeting. Pakistan's Commissioner is recorded as having responded to India's statement of position as follows: "To the Indian Commissioner's statement that all hydroelectric plants on the Himalayan rivers have the same design and Baglihar Plant is not an exception, Pakistan Commissioner states that the Treaty has placed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that would be sound, economical, satisfactory. The divide between the parties on this issue is absolutely fundamental. India is driven by the 5,000; Pakistan is driven by the Treaty and the 200. That is the issue that needs to be addressed. India's approach to the calculation of pondage is designed to maximise the storage of water, both for power generation and for passive sediment management purposes. And I think this goes to a question that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and operation of the works." That's at paragraph 6.2.3 of the minutes of the record of the 90th meeting. Pakistan's Commissioner is recorded as having responded to India's statement of position as follows: "To the Indian Commissioner's statement that all hydroelectric plants on the Himalayan rivers have the same design and Baglihar Plant is not an exception, Pakistan Commissioner states that the Treaty has placed certain restrictions on the design and operation of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that would be sound, economical, satisfactory. The divide between the parties on this issue is absolutely fundamental. India is driven by the 5,000; Pakistan is driven by the Treaty and the 200. That is the issue that needs to be addressed. India's approach to the calculation of pondage is designed to maximise the storage of water, both for power generation and for passive sediment management purposes. And I think this goes to a question that Dr Blackmore put, and which Dr Morris will address.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and operation of the works." That's at paragraph 6.2.3 of the minutes of the record of the 90th meeting. Pakistan's Commissioner is recorded as having responded to India's statement of position as follows: "To the Indian Commissioner's statement that all hydroelectric plants on the Himalayan rivers have the same design and Baglihar Plant is not an exception, Pakistan Commissioner states that the Treaty has placed certain restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers. Therefore,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that would be sound, economical, satisfactory. The divide between the parties on this issue is absolutely fundamental. India is driven by the 5,000; Pakistan is driven by the Treaty and the 200. That is the issue that needs to be addressed. India's approach to the calculation of pondage is designed to maximise the storage of water, both for power generation and for passive sediment management purposes. And I think this goes to a question that Dr Blackmore put, and which Dr Morris will address. In this, India is, we say, intentionally blurring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and operation of the works." That's at paragraph 6.2.3 of the minutes of the record of the 90th meeting. Pakistan's Commissioner is recorded as having responded to India's statement of position as follows: "To the Indian Commissioner's statement that all hydroelectric plants on the Himalayan rivers have the same design and Baglihar Plant is not an exception, Pakistan Commissioner states that the Treaty has placed certain restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers. Therefore, a standard design of other plants on the Himalayan	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that would be sound, economical, satisfactory. The divide between the parties on this issue is absolutely fundamental. India is driven by the 5,000; Pakistan is driven by the Treaty and the 200. That is the issue that needs to be addressed. India's approach to the calculation of pondage is designed to maximise the storage of water, both for power generation and for passive sediment management purposes. And I think this goes to a question that Dr Blackmore put, and which Dr Morris will address. In this, India is, we say, intentionally blurring the lines between Annexure D, Part 3, run-of-river
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and operation of the works." That's at paragraph 6.2.3 of the minutes of the record of the 90th meeting. Pakistan's Commissioner is recorded as having responded to India's statement of position as follows: "To the Indian Commissioner's statement that all hydroelectric plants on the Himalayan rivers have the same design and Baglihar Plant is not an exception, Pakistan Commissioner states that the Treaty has placed certain restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers. Therefore, a standard design of other plants on the Himalayan River[s] without consideration to the design criteria given in paragraph 8 of Annexure D to the Treaty cannot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that would be sound, economical, satisfactory. The divide between the parties on this issue is absolutely fundamental. India is driven by the 5,000; Pakistan is driven by the Treaty and the 200. That is the issue that needs to be addressed. India's approach to the calculation of pondage is designed to maximise the storage of water, both for power generation and for passive sediment management purposes. And I think this goes to a question that Dr Blackmore put, and which Dr Morris will address. In this, India is, we say, intentionally blurring the lines between Annexure D, Part 3, run-of-river peaking plants and Annexure E, storage works. In seeking to maximise pondage, India is impermissibly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I don't invite you to call it up. But in response to questions from Pakistan's Commissioner, the Indian Commissioner is recorded as having said that: " most of the hydro-electric plants in the Himalayan Rivers have design provisions similar to that of the Baglihar Plant. The design has taken into account national and international practices for run-of-river developments and is in [accordance] with the obligations of the Treaty to follow sound and economical design and satisfactory construction and operation of the works." That's at paragraph 6.2.3 of the minutes of the record of the 90th meeting. Pakistan's Commissioner is recorded as having responded to India's statement of position as follows: "To the Indian Commissioner's statement that all hydroelectric plants on the Himalayan rivers have the same design and Baglihar Plant is not an exception, Pakistan Commissioner states that the Treaty has placed certain restrictions on the design and operation of run-of-river plants on the Western Rivers. Therefore, a standard design of other plants on the Himalayan River[s] without consideration to the design criteria	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	on its 5,000 non-Western River dams do not reflect the design criteria of paragraph 8 of the Treaty. India's default approach to sediment management through drawdown flushing, which drives its approach to the placement of outlets and intakes and the design of spillways, is inconsistent with both the Treaty and with the dispositive findings of the Kishenganga Court. As you will hear from Dr Morris, whose experience in this field is unmatched, there are a range of Treaty-compliant approaches to sediment management that would be sound, economical, satisfactory. The divide between the parties on this issue is absolutely fundamental. India is driven by the 5,000; Pakistan is driven by the Treaty and the 200. That is the issue that needs to be addressed. India's approach to the calculation of pondage is designed to maximise the storage of water, both for power generation and for passive sediment management purposes. And I think this goes to a question that Dr Blackmore put, and which Dr Morris will address. In this, India is, we say, intentionally blurring the lines between Annexure D, Part 3, run-of-river peaking plants and Annexure E, storage works. In

58 (Pages 217 to 220)

ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE IX AND ANNEXURE G OF THE INDUS WATERS TREATY 1960 Day 1 -- Hearing on the Merits, First Phase Monday, 8 Monday, 8 July 2024

17:24	1 basing its pondage calculations on elements that are	
	2 extraneous to the pondage design criterion of	
	paragraph 8(c). Again, the divide between the parties	
	4 is fundamental.	
	5 Mr Chairman, members of the Court, Professor Webb	
	and Dr Miles will develop these contentions fully in	
	7 their submissions on paragraph 8 on Thursday.	
	8 Mr Chairman, that's perhaps a good point to stop, if	
	9 you are content to do so, because I have a very brief	
1	0 little while to go, but it is to address a topic that's	
1	1 a little bit discrete: it's on the relevance of the	
1	2 Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for	
1	3 these proceedings. But that's something I can	
1	4 conveniently do tomorrow morning.	
1	5 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Let's plan on you starting out	
	6 tomorrow morning with that, and then setting the table,	
	7 I suppose, for the presentations to follow tomorrow.	
	8 So why don't we adjourn for the day, and see you all	
	9 tomorrow morning at 9.30 am. Thank you very much.	
	O SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much.	
	21 (5.25 pm)	
	(2) (The hearing adjourned until 9.30 am the following day)	
	(The hearing adjourned until 9.30 am the following day)	
	4	
2	55	
	Page 221	

	169:2 170:21 173:8	63:22 64:16,22	afforded 12:18 145:6	160:10,13,19,20	along 23:12 41:11
A	173:9 183:7 218:8	66:22 73:2 74:21	affording 15:4	163:19 179:24	61:7 65:17 73:12
Abdullah 2:13 2:6	accumulate 85:1	81:8,19 91:23 94:20	affords 84:22 197:13	185:20,22 186:2,7	74:2 76:3 81:11
ability 13:21 146:4 162:25 163:3 188:8	accuracy 72:6 166:14	97:12,24 105:5	Afghanistan 125:2	187:4 188:23,24,25	85:18 120:4 155:19
199:21	achieve 16:16 69:19	108:21 117:6 129:1	after 2:24 5:6 6:1,22	189:8,12 191:22,23	159:19 174:11
able 30:14 33:6,8,8	70:24 127:14	131:10,12 196:5,13	7:12 49:10,11 59:14	191:23,25 192:1,1,6	alongside 46:24
	achieved 36:10 44:8	204:9 211:1 216:2	60:8 65:5 81:12	192:8,10,12,13,22	already 28:25 29:3
38:16,25 39:19	46:17	220:16	86:1 89:4,15 90:14	192:24 193:24	37:15 38:21 41:5
40:14 43:21 114:18	acknowledge 37:20	addresses 74:13 75:20	115:2 119:9 120:20	194:9,9,15 195:6	54:15 55:9 56:19
117:9 142:4 145:2	acknowledging	102:2,13 110:1,12	135:2 138:5 139:24	202:21 203:1,2,6,12	60:17 97:24 98:22
192:15 208:22 214:7	207:24	130:10	172:17 174:10,23	203:13 212:9	103:4 104:1 123:14
above 102:12 198:18	acquiesced 182:21	addressing 18:5 22:24	181:24 185:5	agreements 158:5	144:4,21 146:7
abrasion 44:10	acquiescence 195:6	23:1 24:21 25:17	191:18 192:16	161:5 185:23,24	149:4 171:15
absence 2:17 4:3 10:9	acquire 195:2	26:12 32:1,12 49:24	193:4 202:14	186:10 187:1	174:24 182:24,25
10:11,16 15:1 18:4	acquisition 174:1	50:19 51:11 59:3,24	204:10	188:22 191:13,21	192:3 201:11
18:10 20:16 23:22	across 25:10 31:18	60:1 63:10 69:11,12	aftermath 184:17	192:14 193:7,12,14	202:10 215:17
160:17 200:16	65:2 67:21 69:8	70:6,7,7 90:7	afternoon 28:7,8,14	193:19	216:15 217:10
absent 10:15 17:12	70:10,17,23 85:8	123:19 124:9	28:16 31:11 113:6	agricultural 85:2	Alright 153:5 190:16
86:19	93:18 97:23 192:16	adept 43:7	113:16,17 116:18	129:13	alteration 157:8
absolutely 91:14	193:8 213:3	adequate 134:14	119:15,19,20 203:1	agriculture 157:3	alterations 128:16
110:1 183:12	act 64:24,25 67:19	157:17 171:4,10,21	afterthought 219:10	ahead 145:8 174:22	134:25 135:5,6
195:13,21 198:1	100:8 131:25	adjourn 221:18	again 3:4 17:7 32:2,4	189:23	alternative 87:16
212:16 220:13	acted 35:14 184:22	adjourned 117:23	33:24 43:16 57:2	Ahmad 8:11	although 24:9 32:8
absolutist 83:7	acting 3:17 77:12	221:22	62:10 63:14 75:8	aim 17:13	51:15 61:4 71:23
abstract 83:20 88:6	action 127:8	adjournment 27:20	77:19 78:6 80:19	aimed 13:15	80:5 81:7 88:7
abundantly 196:2	actions 15:24 80:25	adjust 25:22 73:20	96:9 99:13 101:3	aired 210:17	104:7 161:17 212:6
abuse 86:15,16	active 175:13	adjusted 74:7	102:25 104:16	airing 17:21	altogether 82:12
abused 12:13	activities 161:6	adjustment 30:20	105:2,4 107:16	Akbar 2:4 3:4 1:10,12	always 34:11 43:2
abusing 12:17	activity 132:5 acts 176:24	38:7 72:11 207:5 adjustments 206:23	109:7 121:3 122:17 130:12 132:25	1:16 7:15,19,24 8:1	142:4 173:5 177:11 177:11
accept 52:12,16 82:10	actually 54:14 61:3	administer 121:24	137:18,21,25 138:7	15:5,14 16:1,20,23 17:2 23:23 33:11	AL-KHASAWNEH
145:19 174:21	101:5 118:12	administration 5:18	142:2,7 146:4	64:14 78:18 80:2	1:10
213:10,15,25	178:15 179:9 192:4	administrative 34:12	148:25 153:6 160:6	84:8	amalgam 210:12
acceptance 181:15	199:21 212:1	40:23	168:10 170:19	akin 67:16 70:20	amassed 123:2
accepted 69:1 181:25 accepting 39:10	acutely 12:22 50:23	admission 3:10	171:7 173:15,25	76:24,25 77:13	ambassador 2:7 1:19
access 3:6 62:25	78:21 80:3 88:10	admit 115:3,22	176:7 177:17,18	219:21	1:20
142:12 144:6 164:6	acuteness 79:4	admitted 114:22	182:15 183:25	Alam 114:8	ambulatory 93:6,23
164:6,15,19	add 4:13 18:23 51:3	admonition 152:18,25	184:1 192:6 200:12	albeit 135:7	amenable 29:6 93:19
accessible 115:17	186:12	adopt 51:8 61:9	201:1 206:8 221:3	alert 50:23	amend 5:8
116:2	addition 10:5 130:2	adopted 71:21	against 3:22 10:11	algorithm 214:1	Amended 5:9,11 51:7
accommodate 25:22	185:24	advance 18:20 26:14	12:21 13:8 86:20	Ali 2:5 3:13 1:17	178:8 195:25 205:1
27:3 44:1 87:25	additional 7:9 19:7	129:22 134:9	88:1,16 106:5	118:19 119:24	among 3:14 125:10
219:14	114:11 144:23	147:16 149:14	157:17	alia 51:1 169:24	amongst 96:10
accommodation 31:3	address 4:22,25 10:21	173:17 179:3 197:6 197:21	agenda 137:15 200:24 Agent 2:4 3:4 1:11	alive 193:23	amount 84:23 111:7 195:17
38:10	11:12 14:24 18:3,22 21:24 22:15 23:6	advanced 6:25 9:14	7:19 8:3,10 18:13	allocate 71:15 allocated 23:24 31:20	amounts 195:18
accompanied 6:10	26:16,18 27:25 32:6	144:4 148:8 174:24	22:18 64:21 151:25	81:1	analysed 3:21
accompanying 64:17	33:2,10,15,25 34:15	207:18 209:2	ago 8:5 62:9 75:19	allocates 91:20 155:15	analysis 37:25 38:3
accompli 144:10,11 accomplished 215:1	36:13 46:19 47:1	211:23	agree 138:10 182:6	allocation 72:8 97:22	angry 175:6
Accord 154:25 155:16	48:21 49:15 52:4	advances 87:6	214:3	202:13	annexed 209:10
accordance 1:5 13:16	54:20 55:15 65:15	advancing 208:20	agreeable 118:4,7,8	allow 36:21 44:7,9	annexes 96:17
49:18 50:16 95:2	71:3 75:9,17 78:14	209:5	118:13	73:22 76:9 86:15	annexure 1:1 5:2 10:5
121:22 136:1	80:6 86:8 87:24	advised 164:2	agreed 10:10 12:5	88:12 93:8 119:1	19:25 20:23 21:6
142:12 162:11	90:9 94:6 96:23,25	advisor 2:6,14,15 2:3	13:2 17:13 74:10	140:4 150:14	22:1 26:24 30:6,9
171:25 194:25	98:19 103:10 105:1	147:9	79:23 94:18 139:13	183:14	33:18 42:7,10 43:19
218:9	110:10,17 123:11	advisors 24:8	144:21 159:8,16	allowable 105:15	47:5,15 48:4,7,14
accorded 66:1,3	123:13 127:20	advocacy 23:9,25	168:13 203:6	106:24 110:3 207:1	48:18,19,21 49:5
according 89:6,8,11	128:3 196:14	advocates 26:12 27:14	agreeing 27:4	209:14	50:5,8,9 51:2 52:15
89:14,18 132:23	200:20 201:20 202:17 209:6	advocating 182:20 affairs 2:6 2:4 140:14	agreement 13:18 38:23 50:16 65:8,12	allowed 27:19 32:20 138:17	52:16,18 57:18 58:6 75:21 87:8 94:15
139:1 148:20	202:17 209:6 219:24 220:21	affect 13:22 75:3	89:5,7 93:11,20	allowing 90:2 185:1	98:21 99:22 102:2,2
149:16 153:21	221:10	129:20 132:13,20	95:24 98:4 127:2,14	allows 84:19 87:10	102:2,3,4,19,23
160:13 167:1	addressed 3:18 7:5,14	167:17 199:13	138:22 145:2 148:2	alluded 84:8 123:14	103:2,5,12 111:24
182:13	9:5,13 10:3 20:15	affirmation 10:22	148:3,5,12,21	almost 13:9 16:5	112:13 125:12
accordingly 25:22	27:11 30:1,7 36:20	102:25	150:11,16 151:5	32:20 58:6 68:10	129:10,14 130:8,9
51:15 accords 83:4 94:15	40:9,10,17 47:8,21	affirmed 9:20 51:5	153:19 154:1 158:3	84:17 91:16 137:4	130:12 131:1,6,7,10
account 71:9 75:5	48:18 51:3 52:10,14	afflux 100:14	158:12,14,19,22	148:6 160:9 168:18	133:7,8,18,20 134:2
109:23 156:5,7	52:15 55:13,20 62:6	afford 24:22 185:8	159:2,9,10 160:7,8	180:9 209:4	134:5,20 135:11,15
1	ĺ				

Page 1

Trevor McGowan

Amended

	1	1	1	1	
145:25 146:3	61:10,21	arc 8:15	133:5 197:25	202:8	96:2,8 97:8,10,12
167:20 196:24	applied 206:20 219:1	architecture 135:10	assessed 36:21	aware 62:19 115:8	97:17,19,20 111:17
197:1,10 199:23	applies 11:8 47:10	area 67:11 71:16 74:3	assessment 37:6	123:8 161:6	112:6,10
206:14 218:25	54:12 69:13 70:9	156:14,15	assignments 215:4	away 202:2 216:5	barrage 80:9 143:8
220:23,24	73:23 74:8 127:6	argument 71:10 77:10	assist 28:21 214:19	AWN 1:10	based 21:16 44:21
annexures 101:22	135:25	90:12,14	Assistant 2:21	axiomatic 59:7	56:16 107:7,14
125:7,7,11	apply 53:9 54:23	arguments 17:19	associated 17:11		136:11 215:9
annual 129:12 137:12	57:16 102:19	106:14 151:24	association 73:15	В	baseline 25:10
138:11,13,14,16,22	114:12	210:23 211:12,12	assume 4:16 53:4	b 100:9 105:9 109:12	bases 183:7
139:14 160:10	appointment 8:23	arise 36:19 43:24	assuming 120:9	109:22 120:6	basic 5:14 7:6
168:23	apportioned 75:2	50:14,20 53:19	assure 15:7	129:10,14 198:18	basically 75:4 153:19
annually 137:1	apportionment 75:1	54:17,18,18 91:3	attempt 37:20 138:15	baby 66:8	153:23 154:22
another 10:25 27:10	154:25 155:16	92:9 126:23 130:7	140:3 214:19	back 2:5,7 15:3 18:24	155:8,14,18 158:8
43:3 49:3 56:14	apportionments 75:4	134:16 179:7	217:23	28:9 32:3 36:4 37:4	158:12 160:18
58:20 65:11 84:18	apportions 155:15	arisen 24:23 134:19	attempts 143:12	38:4,16,19,24 39:24	162:6,21 164:18
112:19 145:22	appreciate 16:24	144:1 174:9 181:7	attend 2:20	54:4 55:7 58:13,15	165:7,13,14 166:5,8
161:10 175:9 190:6	17:23 20:10 39:24	184:6 202:5	attention 26:6 30:22	59:13 72:2,25 78:2	169:2 172:9 173:19
196:12 214:11	42:22 66:5 83:19	arises 52:22	45:1 51:1,23 108:5	78:16 81:7 91:24	173:20 174:3
answer 15:15 22:23	90:8 114:23 162:20	arising 114:25 119:12	122:15 152:5	99:19,24 100:4,17	179:15,19 184:11
142:14 161:24	180:15 186:17	128:4 135:22 201:4	157:10,10 192:20	101:3,13 103:4,23	184:12,15
167:5 188:11	appreciated 180:22	201:21	194:18 209:12	104:17 105:7	basin 20:9 45:8 65:21
answered 77:3	appreciates 8:21	armed 151:13	211:4 217:13	106:17 107:17	65:23 66:21 74:3,14
answering 77:4	appreciation 14:18	Army 114:19	attentive 86:3	108:17 110:5	80:16 106:2 124:1
answers 23:13,14,19	17:15 21:14 22:2	arose 26:9 32:10	Attila 2:12 1:24	111:16 112:22,25	124:13,17 139:24
191:6 215:18	53:1 75:15 82:14,25	41:21 70:15 202:17	Attorney 2:7 1:21	113:17,18 116:17	140:13 141:9 154:7
anticipate 23:1 29:25	83:4 96:9 112:9	205:11	attractive 175:16	117:25 120:22	basing 221:1
31:16 42:21 64:19	162:4 199:5 201:12	around 31:24 42:18	August 9:2 63:2	153:6 167:10	basis 17:14 20:16
anticipated 19:2 27:18	208:18	43:22 45:8 55:11	114:20 137:15	190:10,16 195:12	23:17 41:7 43:11
155:10	appreciations 103:22	57:4 75:25 101:13	195:23 202:12	196:14 198:2 199:6	46:11 51:4 63:22
anticipating 72:15	apprised 3:5	137:5 154:5,15	206:2,11	201:2,5 202:11	69:21 89:24 90:1
anxiety 80:1	approach 12:14 21:8	205:10 217:13	auspices 153:20 154:2	205:25 209:21	92:20 93:13 97:3
anyone 164:14 187:18	29:11 46:11 72:23	arranged 27:12	Australia 154:21	210:3,9 211:2	107:2 111:5 116:7
anything 90:21 97:25	83:8 85:8 87:6 88:1	arrangement 148:15	authorities 24:12	217:10	120:10 128:12
183:18 184:5	88:24 94:17 103:8	arrangements 79:23	115:16,22,23 116:9	backdrop 77:5 88:17	129:12 137:12
211:16	117:15 143:20	126:6 148:7,12	116:15 118:11	background 88:2	146:9 149:13 155:3
apart 50:4 86:16	147:23 170:15,16	157:25 158:20	authority 10:6 11:10	178:16	155:9 156:18
106:23 139:18	171:19 182:20	161:7 180:2 185:11	150:13	backstop 58:10,18	160:10 161:14,19
207:2 209:7 212:7	207:4,6,23 208:1,6	193:18 198:4	automatic 166:8	back-and-forth	170:1 179:10
apologies 15:1 25:14	209:22,24 210:11	arrive 208:20,23	AV 48:12	204:10	202:18 205:24
apparent 95:14 115:5	210:12 215:7 219:3	arteries 219:22	avail 83:14,16	back-to-back 27:13	batching 174:5
194:6,11	220:4,5,17	arteriosclerosis	availability 155:3,4,9	Baglihar 7:1 24:15	Beas 65:24 124:20
appear 8:8 17:7 96:3	approached 207:18	219:22	155:12,22 156:21	26:20 34:3 35:11,15	148:15 164:17
122:17	approaches 85:6 86:2	articles 98:12 125:6	available 19:5,13 35:8	37:10,12 141:16	became 63:5 81:18
appearance 3:3	216:22 219:10	articulated 88:18	47:24 61:4 69:22	143:10 169:6,7,12	89:16 162:2
APPEARANCES 2:1	220:11	artificially 109:16	107:5,8,16 114:20	170:6,14,17,18	become 115:5 140:19
appearing 17:11	approaching 32:6	Asad 2:6 2:4	115:23 118:10	181:12 182:8,10,12	168:25 200:13
appears 131:18	77:5	ascertain 128:15	132:16 133:4 147:8	182:18 200:24	becomes 95:14 156:18
169:16 173:8	appropriate 27:24	aside 9:11 207:5	154:6 155:11	201:11,21 202:7	becoming 122:20
appendices 6:17 21:1	31:25 53:13 123:13	215:20	156:19 162:11	205:21,22,23 206:2	151:15
appendix 64:17	169:23 213:1	asked 8:11 22:18 28:4	163:16 164:13,13	206:15,17 207:7,10	bed 198:18
104:10,12 120:6	appropriately 8:17	141:6 195:15	172:22,23 180:9	207:11,16,19,24,25	before 1:9 3:15 4:9,19
134:4 145:25	approvals 172:23	215:23	199:15	208:16 211:12,24	6:25 7:1,2 8:8 9:17
167:20 197:9 198:6	April 6:5,5 138:12	asking 152:13 168:11	average 107:2	217:25 218:7,19	9:18 12:4 14:8 15:5
198:11 214:23	139:14 202:22	168:17 177:22	averted 66:23	219:6 221:12	17:7,10 18:24 19:16
applicable 21:18 43:5	Arabian 124:25	178:7 183:13 185:7	avoid 27:13 28:1	balance 12:8 14:13	19:19,20 20:24 22:6
43:15 44:2 75:20	arbitral 205:14	186:24 199:1	142:7 163:23	66:10,18 76:6 98:5	23:11 28:19 33:7
87:22 94:14 130:15	arbitration 1:1,4 2:19	asks 4:14	avoiding 113:25	112:16	34:11,13 36:14
133:18 135:13	1:4 3:21 4:2,21 5:8	Aslam 8:11	143:13	bank 3:19 9:3 65:16	37:12 41:1 42:1
application 3:10 5:1	5:9,11 7:2,24 9:1,6	aspect 24:6 68:3 80:18	award 3:13,14,18 5:6	173:16	46:20,21 49:14
10:4 14:5,10 19:18	9:11,13 51:7,18	167:7 211:1 216:18	9:19 11:3 46:25	Bank's 9:12	52:19 56:9,12,15,19
20:6 60:3 63:19	56:10,19 57:24 58:5	aspects 2:19 16:1 31:7	73:1 75:18 77:9	bargain 12:4,6 66:18	59:24 60:5,6 63:12
94:17 102:13	58:8 75:22 76:1	41:9 72:7 127:12	81:7,19,23,25,25	74:9 82:25 97:17,21	63:17,20 77:11
113:12,14,20 114:2	116:20 122:15	130:22 145:9 157:2	82:2,3 94:5 173:13	98:1,2,11,14,17,18	78:17 82:20 94:10
114:13 115:21	123:7 151:17 178:9	176:9	173:14 185:5	98:19 111:18,19	113:1 118:2,5
116:12,13,13,14	184:18 195:22	asserted 93:21	192:17,21 193:2,5	112:7,7,8	121:19,24,25
118:14 182:1	196:1,12 204:3,22	assertive 83:2	201:14 204:4	bargains 21:10 33:15	122:17 123:10
216:24 217:6,9	205:2,4	asserts 80:25	221:12	42:18 74:12 83:17	124:24 125:16
applications 31:4 61:2	Arbitration's 184:23	assess 86:8 132:17	awards 184:25 201:22	94:9 95:10,20,21	135:2,8,11 137:8
				· · ·	
	1	1		1	1

	I			I	1
145:14,17 162:1	74:19 75:1,22 76:6	18:3 22:20 28:23	building 166:19 176:2	captured 98:11	187:15 190:5
165:23 167:2	76:12 79:9 81:21	34:21 36:1 47:10	Buildings 2:11,12	care 18:4	certified 6:13
168:12,17 170:20	82:2 83:1 84:7 89:5	51:17 54:12 66:17	builds 177:21	careful 66:15	cetera 103:19 144:7
172:5,11 174:7	89:8 91:7 95:20,23	67:17 82:16 87:17	built 9:7 86:14 194:4	carefully 6:1 18:22	157:3
178:5,16 179:7	96:2 98:4,5 105:17	94:20 101:17	bundle 44:25 47:25	20:24 52:6 210:15	Chair 8:23 113:24
180:20 183:5	112:17 123:19	114:23 125:24	49:3 60:18 62:14,16	carried 149:23	challenge 17:10,22
185:13 187:22	126:8,23 127:10	127:6,24 128:15	79:12,16 80:8,14	carry 135:4 140:5	50:6 164:7
189:21 190:21	134:19 142:11	129:18 140:12	129:8	193:11	chance 19:21 24:9
200:4 205:20 206:7	146:5,16 148:8	152:5 157:22	bundles 19:1,3 33:23	cascade 84:22 85:4,8	145:1 167:9 174:18
beforehand 198:8	150:12 151:12	169:20 179:25	burden 60:5	85:18 92:21	change 30:25 68:13,15
began 36:19 38:18	158:5 160:10 161:4	180:15 182:5	burdensome 37:4	cascades 84:16	68:19 69:3 70:10
203:23	183:24 187:14	184:10 192:4	buried 202:2	cascading 45:9	72:10 75:16 78:5
begin 55:1 118:2	193:13 201:15	195:14 203:3	Burki 2:6 2:4	case 1:3 2:22 3:6,9,15	93:22 100:10,13,23
124:12 153:10	202:19,21 203:16	207:12 210:22	button 91:16	4:4,23 7:18 8:19	132:2 135:1 147:23
191:9	203:22 204:20	220:7.18		10:14 11:5 14:16,25	
		, -	buy 143:12		147:24 154:15
beginning 49:15	206:18 208:24	bothered 219:9	Buytaert 1:12 32:16	16:23 17:16 18:12	155:23 156:1,5,7,24
134:10 137:19	210:10,17,17,24	bottom 21:25 182:2	157:21,22 160:21	18:15,17 22:15 23:6	156:25 157:4,17
145:17 197:7	216:20 217:24,25	bound 46:6	161:3,24 162:10,23	24:2 28:21 29:10	162:15,16 175:12
beginnings 203:20	219:8 220:13,23	boundaries 50:24 68:9	164:10,22 166:16	31:8 37:5 38:14	212:4
begun 35:25 151:18	221:3	boundary 13:16,18	166:25 167:8	51:17 52:2 53:4	changed 74:4 200:23
behalf 3:2,18 7:22	beyond 27:7 30:6	66:25 67:15 68:22	by-pass 100:15	68:22 69:9 70:6	210:13,14
37:8 190:19	40:15 41:4 53:9,11	69:5,6 70:7,10,21		73:22 89:1 94:2	changes 71:9 74:23
behind 1:25 109:20	58:2,11 143:21	71:14,16 73:11,14	C	107:9,11 110:22	76:11 134:22
being 10:14 13:5 29:6	159:17 160:4	73:16,17,20,22	c 21:5 47:5 105:10	117:13 135:25	144:22 184:8
55:20 57:16 70:3	169:13 178:21	76:25 93:16 97:24	109:10,25 127:16	160:1 173:5 176:25	changing 72:19 73:21
77:2 79:24 118:12	182:4 186:12	165:11,12 169:25	198:20 217:6	188:12 191:17	93:23 183:19 184:5
129:13 131:2	Bhakra 148:14 164:17	boxed 36:4	cadence 17:8 25:22	196:5 201:18	184:14 195:7
134:13 135:8	bid 173:4	break 19:17,20 22:12	85:16	cases 36:5,16 71:17	chapeau 99:12,20
138:17 174:10	bidder 173:9	27:2 59:12,14,15,19	calculate 172:17,20	133:4 134:24 143:3	107:25 108:13
175:19 196:13	bids 173:6,6,7	59:24 60:5,6 61:1	calculated 106:13	144:5	chapter 25:3 97:14
208:8 213:1 216:16	big 20:10 22:16 34:9	95:16 113:1,2	181:18 212:12	case-related 34:23	201:17 210:21
belabour 74:20	60:8 112:19 164:7	117:18 118:1,5	calculating 170:16	cast 34:7 82:18,19	212:23
believe 2:11 18:25	173:14	152:12 153:3	calculation 105:15,18	catastrophic 45:11	chapters 21:2 97:15
29:2 117:10,19	bigger 19:1	187:22 189:23,24	106:8,24 107:1,14	166:18,23	character 33:11 64:9
121:25 140:18	bilateral 13:11 180:17	190:10,14 216:5	110:2 182:12	catchment 66:10	73:9 76:11 78:5,15
145:19 151:11,11	binding 10:6 19:24	breaking 216:6	183:21 205:5,24	176:6	93:23 94:11
152:10,11,23 157:6	57:21 58:8	breaks 216:12	207:1,4,6 208:7,8	catchments 156:14	characterised 72:18
163:7 168:8,16	bit 22:7 23:19 27:21	bridge 100:15	208:10,13,15,19	165:19,19,22 166:3	75:14 90:19
170:10,24 171:13	34:18 40:13 52:11	brief 8:14 19:17 59:10	209:14,17 210:3,5,7	catch-all 40:8,21	charged 43:4
171:17 179:20	75:9 77:1 80:18	60:11 62:1 117:11	211:6 213:2 214:6	categories 130:10,13	charts 165:9
181:1 184:10,10	88:6 105:22 158:9	118:22 123:25	214:10 215:22	131:3 134:3 198:10	chasing 35:16
187:3 189:23	179:1 183:16	124:12 160:19	220:17	category 40:8 68:11	cheaper 44:3
below 110:8 185:14	185:19,21 190:8,25	202:6 221:9	calculations 210:14	caught 40:21 145:14	check 15:6 130:14
bench 25:4 31:19	191:11 193:11	briefly 11:16 31:8	221:1	cause 85:17,24 86:1	135:12 164:2
beneficial 183:10	195:9 210:1 211:16	34:15 57:1 110:18	call 14:23 19:11 26:25	132:5,12,19 199:11	chemical 25:7
benefit 17:20 162:14	216:4 217:12	159:1,14	37:24 57:18 98:23	200:7 205:22	Chenab 66:2 85:19
167:4 175:25 180:7	221:11	brighter 174:18	141:25 155:6,7	caused 67:10 79:1	124:22 140:24
183:3	black 93:10	bring 50:25 54:14	161:25 163:24	100:15 207:22	141:9,12 149:25
benefits 156:2 172:18	Blackmore 1:11 32:15	180:6	194:21 218:2	214:24	176:25 202:23
benign 85:17	106:15,19 153:10	bringing 174:4 210:16	called 3:13 14:17	causes 100:10,23	choice 177:11
beset 67:11	153:12,17 154:5,14	brings 12:23 17:8 39:7	69:22 78:14 118:19	132:2	chose 160:12
bespoke 87:23 104:18	154:17 155:25	81:7 95:10 193:22	148:3 156:23	caveat 9:23 29:6 49:25	circumference 17:13
104:23 105:5	175:2,3 176:7	British 64:24 67:18	calling 19:7 151:21	cell 163:20,23 164:1	circumstance 68:14
219:15	185:20 191:2	broad 22:14,17 23:6,7	calls 39:23 90:16	central 45:4 83:24	68:15 69:3
best 43:14 94:25 95:2	214:23 220:21	34:8 84:2 127:19	Cambodia 69:10	89:10,15 112:8	circumstances 17:19
95:7 129:14 176:12	black-letter 14:16	broadcasts 159:5	came 28:9 139:9	125:23	21:19,22 58:18
216:11,13	blind 86:4	broader 8:15 96:6	194:14 208:18	Centre 122:24 156:24	60:20 68:16,19,20
Bethlehem 2:10 3:6,20	BLINK 2:22	98:2 163:2	Cameron 2:11 2:2	certain 6:20 16:14	70:5 72:19 73:6,21
1:19 8:18	blocks 31:21	broadly 97:7	camp 174:4	29:9 43:9 56:17	74:13 93:22 96:21
better 16:21 74:21	blurring 220:22	broke 158:3 162:7	camps 144:7	68:20 76:19 89:19	127:7 148:25
170:25 179:2	blush 39:4	168:21	canal 128:24 147:5	128:12 129:10	circumvent 43:13
between 1:15 1:6	Board 164:17	brought 58:13	canals 89:12 161:13	132:19 141:12	circumventing 44:11
11:22 12:5 13:14	boiling 202:5	brush 22:17 23:7 84:2	canter 107:20 109:8	145:9 148:12	circumvention 43:24
20:12 35:22 38:23	bolts 172:20	BRYCE 2:21	capable 43:21 52:17	158:19,19 160:24	cite 181:20
41:15 44:16 46:9,18	border 165:1	bubble 38:18	95:6 109:15 208:8	163:10 208:21,23	cited 69:10 137:9
65:21 66:19,25 67:2	both 3:5 5:16 10:12,20	bucket 45:12	capacity 175:19 203:9	218:21	188:5
67:4,6 68:4 69:9,19	11:8,16 12:7,13,19	build 30:15 78:7	captive 31:23	certainly 18:9 25:2	claim 50:12 89:12
70:14 71:1 73:8	12:25 13:18 17:8,12	219:19,19,19	capture 38:16 193:17	29:6 71:16 177:23	claimed 69:23 140:25

Page 3

Trevor McGowan

Amended

	I				I
142:16	196:14 200:14,19	common 25:12 64:22	115:8	confidentiality 60:19	constrain 86:15
claims 4:9,10,11 70:8	200:21,25 201:1,1	125:17 181:12,21	comprise 124:20	61:20 64:1	constrained 12:17
93:21	205:16 206:21	communicate 135:19	compromises 146:4	configuration 43:9	constraint 43:8
clarification 19:18	208:6,17 210:9	147:20 197:8,16	compétence 3:24,24	45:18	158:17
23:20 29:14 60:4	211:15 212:22,25	communicated 79:7	52:13,14	configure 159:22	constraints 42:10,22
73:4 153:13 192:24	214:7 217:10	129:21 135:7,8	concentrations 147:11	163:14 164:9	42:24 43:2,2,3,5,13
clarified 195:18	comes 25:17 45:3 52:2	141:3	concept 71:14 106:25	configuring 149:13	43:15,18 44:2,5,7,9
clarify 154:17 195:12	74:23 75:10 83:9	communication	conception 24:17	confined 21:2 96:4	44:12,14,18 46:5
clarity 24:2 63:13	88:1 103:8,22 135:3	129:17 159:4,7,8,10	conceptions 26:21	119:11	64:2 86:11 133:3
187:6	145:2 159:25 161:9	communications	concepts 103:20	confirm 3:3 119:21,25	197:3
clause 69:24 94:14	173:13,18 194:12	35:24 187:14	concern 11:23 15:21	120:14 189:14	construct 84:9 87:11
160:7	211:9	compared 172:11	15:21 16:14 33:12	confirmed 11:4	101:23 131:22
clauses 76:4	comfortable 16:18	compelled 179:5	58:19 64:10 79:2,10	120:23	174:14 176:14
clear 10:22 19:23	coming 8:20 15:2 16:6	compensate 165:1	83:12 84:1 85:12	confirming 118:24	177:2,11 199:10
30:18 74:16 75:22	23:10 32:3 96:11	compensation 50:13	87:3 88:7,19 140:21	conflict 67:11 151:12	constructed 44:5
76:12 77:21 78:3	100:17 155:13,17	competence 3:13,17	151:16 174:25	conflicts 146:5	85:14 182:10
82:8 95:17 108:13	166:10 211:2	3:21 5:6 9:19,24	177:13 214:25	conform 46:13 108:10	194:17 202:23
142:24 152:19	213:24	11:4,4,10,11,13	concerned 12:22	108:11,12,14	constructing 16:9
157:23 158:1	comity 11:7 47:10	46:25 47:15,18,21	15:24 88:10,20	conformity 108:21	157:18 208:25
169:19 173:21	49:19 51:3 54:12	48:23 49:13,16,22	104:8 107:10,13,24	146:2 197:12	construction 9:9,14
191:22 195:13	59:7	49:24 50:2,6,14,21	108:3 124:15 164:3	conforms 134:1 197:5	12:15 20:13 21:25
196:2	commence 112:20	50:24 51:4,5,11,25	166:24 170:9 185:4	confronted 176:22	33:17 45:15 63:6
clearer 82:4	145:15	52:10,23,24 53:3,11	185:15 186:7,17	conjecture 162:12	86:12,14 87:1,20,21
clearing-away 34:12	commenced 63:7	53:14,19 54:1,20,25	concerning 14:6 26:17	conjunction 4:20	92:7 93:14 96:19
clearly 16:2 18:2	comments 7:11 41:23	56:12,17,18 57:4,21	61:16 120:17 121:2	connected 128:25	104:3 108:7 131:2
91:14 194:12	138:22	58:4,12,18,19,22	130:18 131:4,8	134:11 145:18	132:6 133:9 134:10
195:21 210:22	comminglings 52:8	59:3 61:13 62:24	141:2 143:3 149:14	147:5 155:23 166:4	135:17 137:8 144:3
climate 75:16 154:15	Commission 7:1 35:21	63:23 86:20 113:23	149:19 150:20	174:8 197:8	144:5,6,7,20,23
155:23 156:1,5,7,25	45:4 54:5 120:19,23	114:25 115:21,25	151:6,10 159:15	conscience 122:4	145:15,18 157:11
157:4,17	120:25 126:3,5,15	116:8 191:18	169:4,11 170:14	conscious 23:15 25:4	171:23 172:5,12,14
close 17:17 66:15	126:21,24 127:1	192:17,21 193:2	181:23 184:25	25:4	172:24,25 174:4,6,8
106:11 164:25	134:14 136:8,14,16	201:13,13 219:18	204:7	consciousness 97:19	174:12,24 177:9
closely 4:8 97:13	136:18,24,25	competent 3:25 4:21	concerns 11:21 12:1	100:25	179:4 197:7 218:11
closer 165:11	137:12,13 138:11	48:21 51:19 54:10	15:10 16:19 22:20	consented 56:15	219:11,13
closest 18:12	138:15 139:5,12,19	58:14 82:5	22:22 26:15 63:17	consequence 53:12	constructions 95:11
closing 211:5	139:22 140:11	competing 90:25	66:22 75:16,17,24	158:12 162:8	construed 21:12 73:7
coating 44:11	142:16,25 144:14	competitive 173:6	75:25 78:20 79:4	166:13 207:7	96:15
coffee 19:17,20 60:5	145:2 151:23	compiling 37:10	83:11 84:3 87:25	consequences 65:5	construing 20:22
61:1 189:24 190:10	153:23 158:15	complemented 66:24	101:13 110:23	83:3 85:2,5,7 88:16	92:13 97:4
cog 112:15,15	168:23,25 169:4	complete 6:22 29:10	144:17,18 161:1	89:19 149:21	consult 164:14
cognisant 156:6	178:1 179:17 180:9	65:11 80:22 113:10	162:17 166:18	166:19,21,23	consultancy 169:9,11
collaboration 154:20	180:16,17,18	113:17 116:21,22	172:2	consequently 154:1	consumed 143:4
collate 128:12	183:18 184:3	118:6 183:6 189:25	conclude 14:14 27:16	consider 3:25 13:10	contact 152:22
collation 36:10	192:25 193:3	216:18	202:6	20:19,24 121:9	contained 51:6
colleague 48:10 198:5	194:13 203:25	completed 44:23	concluded 21:8 47:10	132:11,13 144:18	contains 67:23 99:3
colleagues 23:14 34:6	204:10 212:6	66:24 67:17 122:8	53:7 67:25 185:25	145:6 152:15	103:13
40:6 105:7 115:15	217:22	144:8 189:22	186:2,10 187:1	considerable 92:22	contemplated 85:18
167:9	commissioner 2:5	217:14	189:3 194:15 214:5	197:17 211:2	contemplates 86:13
collect 35:25	1:17 26:25 122:19	completely 13:9 70:4	concludes 7:13 54:24	considerably 165:20	contemporaneous
collected 214:9	138:19 139:10	80:11 83:7	concluding 151:6	consideration 101:2	146:9 161:19
collective 33:20	141:25 142:15	completeness 51:4	178:18 210:19	169:22 203:2,14	contended 207:17
colossal 219:11	147:10 148:11	63:14 104:5	conclusion 3:23 7:12	218:24	content 53:25 116:7
combination 162:9	149:6 152:2 162:2	completing 174:23	21:22 68:17 96:21	considerations 66:11	214:14,16 221:9
come 22:25 23:3 34:6	162:25 163:6,20	completion 29:7	151:8 180:11	66:14 94:4 96:7	contention 71:1
37:4 38:4 39:8,24	168:11 171:12	174:11	202:15 207:15	considered 52:5 61:8	145:12
43:22 55:1 58:15	180:10 181:19	complex 175:5	212:22,25 213:25	140:16	contentions 221:6
59:12 60:12 72:2,25	190:22 218:3,4,15	complexity 197:18	conclusions 4:19 94:1	considering 6:1	contest 207:14,14
73:11 74:2,11 78:1	218:20	207:24 208:19	concrete 92:21 150:19	considers 132:14,20	219:18
78:15,17 79:17	Commissioners 35:23	complied 44:15	condition 36:8	144:16 148:23	contested 93:18
83:18 91:24 94:10	126:13 137:3	comply 136:7 146:10	conditional 47:17	149:9	205:25
99:19 103:4 104:17	142:11 148:1	152:3 178:3 196:9	49:21,23 51:10 59:3	consistency 210:23	context 20:11 21:12
105:7,13 106:16,17	158:17 160:11	complying 38:6	59:25 82:3 214:2	consistent 4:7 75:6	21:20 22:2 40:3,4
107:17 108:17	187:14	151:19	conduct 59:8 118:22	80:24 183:22	41:22 47:8 55:20
109:20 111:16	Commissioner's	component 215:21	136:13 137:11	consistently 80:4	62:24 63:2 65:12
112:24 113:17	138:22 218:17	components 125:6	143:19 144:25	184:22	73:18 74:23 75:20
158:18 165:2 167:9	commitment 125:24	composite 204:17,17	186:24 195:6	constantly 92:23	80:7 82:21 83:20
183:3,25 190:10	committed 10:12,19	204:20,21,23	conducted 140:1	constituted 1:5 25:5	89:17 92:7 93:25
193:7 195:12	10:23	comprehensively	confident 38:15 190:3	constitution 52:4	94:21 96:16 105:22
1					
				•	

		-	-	-	
110:13 131:16	60:18 62:14,16	102:10 106:18	curious 51:21	dam-specific 191:25	deals 101:6 102:3
142:16 169:18,23	79:12,16 80:8,13	110:19 111:12	current 28:16 51:24	192:12	108:17 110:14,24
170:3 185:23	106:9 129:8 201:13	114:23 115:8	78:10 82:22 85:18	dangling 213:24	194:2 198:3
191:12 192:7,13	corners 44:3	117:16 124:24	167:6 168:24	Daniel 2:10 3:6,20	dealt 57:16 113:23
194:18 196:17,18	cornerstone 11:21	146:20 164:5 167:6	195:19	1:18,22 7:15,16	decade 143:17
194.18 190.17,18	12:23 13:20 14:20	170:8,10,12,24	currently 56:7 139:6	8:18 11:12 13:17	decades 148:6 157:13
207:20 213:4	33:11 64:9 67:6	181:15 183:15	196:11	16:25 17:4,5 29:2	160:9 180:5
contingency 29:19	68:2 74:18	190:24 193:7,16,23	curve 215:22	29:13 31:2 37:7	December 9:4
continua[tion 195:3	Corps 114:19 116:23	195:24 202:1	curves 167:21,24,25	38:9 51:20 52:5	decide 48:16 58:3,4
continue 56:24 69:25	118:7	210:10 212:15	168:1	54:23 55:3 56:3	decided 4:22 6:2 16:3
175:13 190:17,21	correct 89:13 114:6,13	214:14,20 217:21	cusecs 159:18 160:1	57:1 58:23 59:1,17	54:11 55:17 65:14
201:7 216:11	120:7 121:7 161:1	Court's 5:23 8:6,10	customary 69:2 76:9	59:22,23 71:2 72:1	89:9 118:15,21
continued 3:19 160:9	171:25 182:1 186:1		76:20 77:19 78:3	75:8 77:7 88:21	172:21
	212:17	11:2,2 27:6 33:14	cut 13:9 16:15 65:6	90:4 106:20 113:3	
160:21,22 190:20 continuing 134:21	corrected 189:5	41:13 47:9 56:8 64:11 75:18 82:1	78:24 81:16 89:13		decides 51:25
continuing 154:21 continuous 160:23	correction 60:9	114:24 116:18	91:21	113:13 116:16,25	deciding 4:20 decision 47:9 49:12
				117:5,17,20,21	
161:21	120:17 121:2	119:12	cutting 44:3 66:8	118:5,16 152:17	50:12,15,20 51:4
continuously 69:22	corrections 118:25	cover 39:13,18 121:18	cut-off 89:9,11	166:17 178:22	52:23 53:1,6,12,18
164:2	120:15,16	155:10	cycle 111:6 213:9,14	189:24 190:2,17,18	53:20,23,25 56:25
contours 8:19 22:14	correctly 56:14 57:7	covered 180:13	213:15	190:21 193:10,21	57:20,22 58:7
23:6 76:21	168:16 192:8	192:10,11		201:8 212:13 215:4	116:18 149:8
contract 173:13,14,22	correspondence 35:22	covering 62:12	D	215:13 216:4,14	174:14 184:23
contractor 144:7	39:9 40:19 62:23	covers 40:11	d 1:10 5:2 10:5 19:25	221:20	187:12
173:11,12,13,16,18	114:1 137:9 139:10	Covid 168:4 188:5	20:23 21:5,6 22:1	data 107:5,7,15,16	decisions 4:6 10:6
173:23 174:3	141:18,20 147:22	Covid-19 168:12,17	33:18 42:7,10 43:19	128:10,12,14,23	14:17,18,19 18:11
contractors 173:2	180:8 188:9 204:15	169:3	47:5,5 87:8 98:21	129:2,3,6 132:21,22	34:3 58:11 201:11
contrary 94:25 149:15	206:1,5	co-operate 127:14	99:22 101:22 102:2	133:3,4,11 134:6,6	declaration 120:2
contributes 145:22	corresponding 21:6	co-operation 126:8	102:3,4,15,16,22	143:16 146:8,17,18	121:17,24
contributing 134:18	costs 44:2,3,9 144:23	199:8	103:2,5,12 109:10	146:24 147:4,7,13	declare 67:8 122:4
contributions 182:24	172:18	co-operative 126:6	110:7,11 111:23,24	156:18,21 159:3	declaring 67:9
control 7:17 15:22,22	Council 79:6,9	Crawford 77:12	112:13 125:12	160:21,22 161:11	declined 2:21
35:10 67:5 84:19,23	counsel 2:21,21 1:18	Creager 214:8	130:8,9,12 131:1,6	161:12,19,22,23	decrease 16:15 166:15
87:4 98:25 165:13	8:18 11:12,19 12:25	create 159:21 177:9	131:7,10 133:7,8,18	162:1,7,24 163:2,9	dedicated 156:23
controlled 85:21	14:15,24 16:21	created 89:18	133:20 134:2,5,20	163:12,14,24,25	deemed 100:16
controlling 16:10,12	17:11,18,19,20	creates 149:11	135:11,15 145:25	164:7,12,16,20,25	deep 8:11 11:23 80:2
84:22 85:13 94:19	34:22 36:11 152:1	creating 89:8	146:3 167:20	165:2,2 167:21	93:17
110:12	152:23 170:11	crest 203:9	196:24 197:1	168:1 198:13,15	deeply 9:4 20:11 56:1
convened 217:23	178:6,22 179:11	criteria 14:11 26:22	198:21 199:23	199:14 215:24	deep-held 11:20
convenient 1:15 19:14	183:14 185:15	45:25 87:7 92:13	206:14 216:24	data-sharing 158:1,2	default 4:6 18:11
48:7 59:12	186:15,19 190:24	93:4,14 94:24 96:5	218:25 220:23	158:5 161:4,7,8	220:4
conveniently 221:14	counsels 182:25	97:5 108:10,11,15	daily 100:11,14,24	185:21	defer 23:13,20 190:23
Convention 68:25	counsel's 11:17	108:19 109:9	101:1 128:12 132:2	date 71:20 131:2	191:7 200:21
96:13 193:25	counterpart 137:15	110:22 112:15	161:12 212:3,18,19	138:6 141:3 189:8	deferred 22:22 39:15
converge 174:18	137:22 146:16	134:1 146:3 171:25	213:16	dated 146:22	define 103:16 135:15
conversation 175:4	168:12 180:11	197:5 199:22	dam 24:16 25:8 43:6	dates 137:15,22	defined 46:23 103:21
convey 8:11 168:19,20	counterparts 140:3	205:19 206:25	45:4 141:15,16	138:10,21 139:7,13	104:6,7,19,21
conveyed 3:19 160:13	counter-memorial 3:1	217:19 218:24	150:20 167:22	168:19	127:18 134:4
160:25	6:18 88:25 182:8	219:15 220:3	177:9,12 181:23	day 1:6 27:17,20 28:9	155:16 159:11,13
conveying 162:17	countries 10:20 13:14	criterion 221:2	194:11,16 198:16	28:19 29:5 72:19	160:25
cooperate 127:4,5,24	69:18 79:10 139:6	critical 67:7,17 78:24	198:18 200:4	76:5 116:4 141:17	defines 100:6 105:11
145:20 172:8	158:10 161:5	87:25 91:3 103:14	219:13	183:2,13 213:18	131:24
cooperation 88:4	181:13 193:13	110:1 126:3 130:13	damage 149:1	221:18,22	defining 67:7
125:19,22 126:11	country 45:16 46:1	155:25	damages 147:19	days 8:20 15:2 23:10	definitely 172:1
126:20 127:10,12	152:6 157:19	critically 100:19	149:11	29:9 32:21 102:10	178:21
127:16 147:23	163:13 217:20	crop 155:5,6,17	damaging 9:4 84:21	137:7 139:3 141:11	definition 100:19
149:16 151:18,20	couple 88:21 106:22	cropping 78:25 91:17	85:23 93:8	165:23 202:11,20	103:17,18,19 104:2
158:16 180:2,14	151:7 157:24	155:3,5,8,13	damming 83:6 87:14	de 3:24 52:14	104:4 105:8,9,10,20
202:19	196:15	cross-examination	dams 16:9 44:23 45:6	dead 104:19,20,20	105:24 106:5,7,12
cooperative 10:12	course 15:8 16:25	17:18	45:10,14,15,19	105:8 110:8 150:17	107:18 110:5 200:9
126:2 202:17	19:13,16 23:15,15	Cross-section 198:20	84:10,11,12,16,21	203:8,9	210:3
coordinated 85:8,24	25:24,25 27:6 31:15	crystallisation 205:13	85:5,8,12,13,22	deadline 197:24 200:3	definitional 100:5
85:25	34:23 36:24 38:5	crystallised 72:16	87:22 88:15 102:3,3	deal 21:3 59:14	105:14,17
coordination 151:21	41:24 42:21 50:1	204:11 205:20	103:17 148:14	105:13 110:21	definitions 103:13,15
copies 33:23	51:8,21 56:25 60:23	219:5	150:19 163:1	155:22 187:3	104:15,18
copy 19:12 28:23	60:25 63:24 70:5	crystallises 195:7		198:22 200:25	definitive 212:9
102:6	71:3 72:25 82:23	CSIRO 154:21	175:15,25 177:15 194:8 197:19	214:25	deflect 15:15 175:19
core 19:1 21:10 44:24	89:3 91:17 97:18	cubic 159:17	217:14 220:2	dealing 109:1 177:25	178:6,14 182:16
46:18 47:25 49:2	98:13 100:18	cumecs 185:7	dam-related 55:16	187:3	degree 37:23 74:16
			uam-relateu 33:10		
	l		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Page 5
Trevor McGowan
Amended

Day 1 Hearing on	me Mems, First Phas	е			Monday, 8 July 202
122:23	198:7,12 204:4	38:6 116:3 210:18	58:15 65:9,19 67:2	36:23 37:2 38:16	220:4
delay 134:12 148:25	206:23 208:4 210:9	digitisation 36:1	67:3 70:14 73:25		drawing 45:1
		0		39:3,4,12 40:2,9,11	0
delayed 144:12	211:2,9,11 214:16	dimension 109:5	78:9,22 83:21 84:2	40:17,20 48:13 60:4	drawings 172:25
delays 144:8	detailed 23:14,19	181:22	84:7 88:8,10 90:18	61:3,21 79:12,17	173:2 198:1
delegation 1:8,14,15	32:21,25 34:5	Dimensioned 198:16	90:24 91:4,7 92:2	113:12 115:6,8	drawn 54:4 73:18
2:18 122:18 139:4	125:12 141:13,18	dimensions 171:13	93:17 96:2,4,6	118:9 187:13 202:3	192:19
deleterious 86:5	142:8 146:1 148:7	180:19 183:9	97:22 131:16 136:2	doing 5:16 14:25	draws 61:18
Delhi 91:13	167:4 170:21	diminish 92:9	143:7,8 171:5,11	37:25 38:3 102:9	drew 51:23 75:21
deliberate 19:21	172:19 174:11	direct 3:14 25:21	178:5,9,13 195:17	125:16 157:5	206:16 209:12
113:25	details 26:24 29:16	27:23 65:19 116:11	195:19,23 196:10	169:11 187:22	217:12
deliberations 24:5	62:6 63:20 66:12	118:22 119:18	196:11 198:3 201:9	191:7 219:19	driven 66:14 208:10
25:13	158:24 167:7	121:14,19 123:14	201:25 202:10	domain 62:3,11,18	209:22 220:14,15
delimit 65:1,3	detect 77:13	131:15 162:8	203:21 204:2,11,14	115:17 116:2,10	drives 220:5
delimitation 13:17	deteriorated 120:25	205:17	204:20 205:9,18,18	118:11 163:16	driving 74:14
66:24 70:22 93:15	deterioration 162:1,5	directed 10:3 26:7	205:22 206:7,12,18	164:12	drop 45:12
93:17 169:25	determination 53:14	47:1 60:18,22	210:15,16 216:20	dominated 175:10	DSL 185:14
delimited 65:20 66:15	82:4 169:15 201:22	direction 35:7,12	219:8	DON 1:11	due 19:13,16 23:15
67:13	202:8 206:15 207:8	115:24 116:8	disputes 4:1 55:10,16	done 6:21 43:12 86:8	27:24 28:15 38:4
delimiting 68:9	207:10,11,19 215:9	directions 34:17 35:3	108:20 126:22	111:3 117:4 143:15	42:20 56:25 60:23
delivered 101:9,16	221:12	113:24 114:24	134:18 143:1,4,9,25	155:14 172:18,21	63:24 71:3 72:25
demonstrate 172:8	determinations 53:8	156:3	178:8 179:7 180:16	173:18 174:3,10	97:17 100:14
demonstrated 78:22	determine 4:1,9	directly 13:12 14:3	194:8 195:19	181:24 189:12	106:18 110:19
180:3	147:17	54:14 98:15 199:20	199:19 205:5,8,11	215:17	111:11 117:16
demonstrating 180:14	determined 54:9	directness 202:4	205:14,15 217:8	door 3:9	124:23 145:15
denial 62:25	56:11,17 115:25	directs 60:21		Doppler 165:10 166:1	
			dispute/disagreement		167:6 170:12,24
density 74:3,4	determining 52:17 212:10	disagree 82:14	196:7 disregard 151:4	166:3 doubt 54:19 72:2	183:15 210:9 212:15
deny 91:15 92:25		disagreed 207:12	C		
depart 152:20	detriment 145:3	disagreement 201:14	disregarded 44:15	214:17	Dul 143:10 194:11,16
Department 165:5	develop 12:25 14:15	disagreements 135:16	disregarding 44:6	down 28:3 44:17	duly 67:24
departments 164:3,16	84:8 156:4 163:19	212:5	disrupted 120:25	46:24 94:3 133:8	during 5:12 25:24
depend 28:17 213:18	176:17 194:24	disappointment 141:5	140:7	158:3 162:7 192:17	26:9 32:10 119:6
dependent 27:5	195:9 221:6	disapproved 89:14	disruption 89:18	198:5,6 202:5 211:4	138:14 141:15
219:23	developed 64:3 77:15	disaster 85:17	140:17	downstream 13:25	142:15 155:7,13,17
depending 28:19	77:15 154:19,20	disavow 72:3 78:7	dissemble 219:17	80:3 81:15 83:3	157:13 167:5
depends 127:8	212:14	disavowed 91:13	disseminate 165:8	84:21,24 85:1,5,7	168:10 203:17
depleted 150:17	development 126:8	194:4	distance 84:14,17	85:10,15,17,23,24	duties 10:23 66:16
157:12	127:15 172:14	discarded 44:15	distinct 96:1	86:1,4,6 87:14,25	duty 11:7,7 47:9 49:18
deprives 149:10	developments 3:6	discharge 107:1,2	distinction 81:21	88:16 91:19,22	51:2 54:11 55:22
depute 163:22	76:8,9 82:22 119:5	160:16,17 209:18	distributed 155:12	92:18 93:9 128:21	59:7 152:5 179:15
Deputy 2:4,20 3:4	123:11,13 136:11	209:19	distribution 155:19	129:23 149:21	dynamic 162:5
1:10 7:19 8:3 18:13	218:9	discharges 129:19	156:20	167:15 176:20	D.II 104:10,12
22:18 64:21 151:25	devoted 152:6	149:9	diversion 81:12,17	177:19	
describe 203:18	de]crease 159:24	disciplines 96:11	204:1,7	Dr 1:11 2:11,14 2:2,7	E
described 39:13 52:12	dialogue 199:21	disclose 61:21	divide 70:17 210:10	23:1 24:8,11,20	e 21:5 47:5 101:22
59:6 97:20 98:16	Diamer-Basha 176:2	disclosed 193:8	210:13,23 220:12	26:16,18 28:18 30:9	102:2,2 105:23
104:22	difference 48:16 57:16	disclosure 34:16 35:4	221:3	30:14 31:22,23	109:10 110:13,14
describing 123:17	209:9	discontinued 120:20	divided 64:25 67:4,14	32:15 42:20 43:16	·
designed 4:14 32:5	differences 47:14	137:5	67:20 70:23 93:16	86:7 94:21 95:8	216:24 220:24 each 26:12 29:20
42:9 71:24 85:13	134:18 171:18,20	discord 145:21	123:21,23 167:3	105:13,23 106:10	
220:18	202:14,17 203:16	discovered 65:14	divides 73:8 76:13	106:15,17,19	36:15 73:21 91:1
designing 43:4 44:1	203:22 206:17	69:25 70:2	124:18	107:16 114:17	95:24 96:7 97:9
208:25	217:25	discrete 221:11	division 65:21 66:13	153:10,12,17 154:5	112:9 124:22
designs 87:16,16	different 9:15 27:14	discuss 144:15	70:12 165:6.7	154:14 155:25	128:11 130:12
92:20 130:17	44:6 52:11 70:6	discussed 11:6 29:4	divisions 13:15 91:20	157:21 167:5 175:3	139:24 145:7 147:3
133:11 135:14	71:7 72:13 75:16	185:21	docket 19:6	176:7,7 185:20	161:19 182:6
171:19 174:19	77:20 88:24 90:22	discussion 81:21	document 19:9 34:16	191:2,2 208:4 209:3	204:18
desire 172:8 179:8	90:25 91:1 104:13	109:4 112:5 115:20	35:4 36:15 38:21	211:9,22 212:15	earlier 13:13 145:16
despite 92:5 140:9	104:24 108:18	171:24 194:13	39:21 48:11 49:4	214:18,20,23 220:9	172:10 179:10
142:19 162:16	139:18 143:3 159:4	dismay 112:24	60:9 61:17 79:25	220:21,21 221:6	217:12
163:18	161:5 170:18	disparaging 210:1	114:21,22 115:2	draft 138:23	earliest 202:11 207:22
destabilising 84:20	172:13 204:18	display 122:10	118:8 191:19	drafters 213:23	early 9:16 27:16 29:5
detached 98:15		2 0		dramers 213:23 dramatic 91:18	29:8 31:11 145:6,10
	212:8	dispositive 220:8	192:16		145:13 162:2 163:3
detail 20:18 22:25	differentiate 41:15	dispute 8:15 12:4	documentation	136:19	163:12 164:9 166:4
31:6 39:21 63:10	differently 81:6	13:13 14:8 17:14	197:18	dramatically 74:4	189:3 202:20
66:15 75:9 80:18	difficult 10:16	20:11 21:21 34:1	documented 62:25	draw 4:15 30:22 67:12	203:17,18 205:20
97:12 102:8 111:10	difficulties 183:17	36:19 38:18 44:16	documents 3:10 7:9	75:23 83:23 108:5	205:25
161:20 176:8 190:2	184:3	46:9,18 47:12 48:22	19:4,7,18 22:10	152:4 194:18	earth 150:19
190:25 195:10	difficulty 29:11 30:24	51:6 54:6,10,16	35:5,10,16,19 36:13	drawdown 185:1,14	easier 117:1 219:16

Page 6

Trevor McGowan

Amended

Day 1 Hearing on	the Merits, First Phas	е			Monday, 8 July 202
easily 36:21 115:17	emphasising 42:2	entire 11:5 15:8 19:6	194:24	except 99:17 101:22	60:20,22 61:10,23
116:2	137:19	41:7 113:7	events 13:14	105:25 108:2	62:1,4,8 63:23 64:3
East 65:6 78:23 89:5	employer 173:3	entirely 30:18 78:24	events 13.14 eventually 125:3	150:17 159:12	115:6,7 118:9
East 03.0 78.23 89.3 Eastern 12:1,3,8,10	emptying 124:24	entirety 89:13	168:21 176:19	162:21	123:17 124:6
	1 0	entitled 52:25 53:7,14			
12:13,20 13:8 16:3	enable 44:3,5,12 85:20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	181:15,25 182:2	exception 65:25 92:12	169:24 170:2
22:21 65:23 80:10	87:12 92:16 132:16	53:24 88:14,15 93:1	ever 137:8 167:15	98:8,10,20 99:23	206:15 207:12
81:1 82:10 83:2,6	133:5,25 146:1	93:3 147:3	168:4 215:24	102:1,17 103:7,9	209:9,11
98:6,8 101:6,8,13	147:17 197:4	entitlement 67:13	every 68:2 120:21	112:1 218:19	expertise 25:5 170:7
101:15,17 124:19	199:16	entitlements 65:3	121:5 137:4 139:23	exceptions 12:17	experts 6:12 170:24
124:20 129:12	enabled 202:16	66:16	142:25 148:5	99:18 111:7,23	183:1,5
131:20	enables 128:15,23	entrails 36:18	159:11 163:22	exchange 17:14	Expert's 47:13,22
economical 104:1,2	130:16 135:11	entrusted 157:1 165:7	180:10,11	108:20 128:9 146:8	48:25 49:22 50:12
218:11 220:12	encroached 149:4	179:15	everybody 156:2	161:11 162:1,7,24	50:24 53:18 56:12
effect 21:2 36:15	end 1:25 6:13 11:3	entry 166:9	everyone 1:3 2:11	163:9 185:19 219:5	59:7 60:15,24 61:6
78:13 80:11 132:17	26:8 39:16,25 76:5	enumerated 108:15	117:25	exchanges 60:2 213:5	61:12,15 63:9
132:23 133:6	78:18 107:6 137:14	enumeration 48:19	everything 16:4 36:11	213:7	115:10 169:15
163:21 199:17	141:10 151:17	envelope 43:15	36:25 174:9 197:21	excluded 9:21 68:22	expired 89:5
effective 131:2	213:18	environment 81:15	198:1 202:2	excluding 148:13	explain 13:17 39:17
effectively 13:18	endangering 150:18	environmental 14:1	evidence 3:7 6:20 27:1	exclusively 81:2	39:20 143:14 158:9
effectiveness 136:8	151:1	75:16 76:1 77:24	27:23 28:3 95:18	excuse 90:20	159:1 185:16
effects 45:10 84:21	endeavour 25:9 34:7	78:1 81:10,22 94:1	118:12,24 121:18	excuses 136:21 142:6	explained 3:14 134:11
85:10,24 86:4,6	127:1 180:23	185:2,4	121:23 151:19	exercise 20:20 41:8	146:7 148:16 149:6
87:14 91:19 92:18	endeavoured 18:17	envisaged 128:14	152:1 194:7 196:18	66:8 87:4 97:4	158:25 170:5
93:9	25:8 26:4,8	129:3	198:9	103:24 112:8	171:15 177:16
efficient 87:17	ending 29:5 138:12	envisaging 203:25	evidence-in-chief	exercised 169:21	180:20 182:24
effort 143:1	endorsed 81:9	204:7	119:3	exhaustion 17:9	184:3
efforts 13:13 143:5	enforcement 86:18	epidemic 168:5	evident 20:18 24:6	exhibit 44:24 47:25	explains 61:24 133:23
eight 8:25 65:5 125:7	engage 2:21 5:13	equally 3:5 4:4 56:9	47:21 61:22 92:4	49:2 60:17 79:25	explanation 168:3,5
143:3 168:19 181:6	24:10,22 26:11	equitable 75:1	202:19 209:8	114:7,14,15 116:20	explanatory 62:22,25
181:16 199:2	28:18 87:15 199:20	erected 80:10	evidently 45:22	116:22 118:6,7	141:19 142:8
either 7:14 23:18	219:18	eroded 136:8	103:21 217:16	129:8 137:17,21,25	explore 215:3
25:19,25 67:15 78:6	engaged 25:11 83:25	error 114:5	evolution 75:11 82:1	138:1,2,8,20 139:8	express 124:5 209:21
86:15 102:1 135:25	97:8 98:15 137:7	errors 70:2	93:12 205:12	140:6,10,25 141:8	expressed 5:24 49:25
140:12 141:24	153:23	especially 37:22	evolutionary 94:16	141:13 147:12	69:7 141:5
142:5 174:21	engagement 11:3	essence 70:21 210:13	evolve 72:18,22 74:18	148:4,18 149:7	expressing 193:15
183:19 184:5	35:13	essential 84:24 107:25	evolved 211:12	150:3,6 192:2	expressly 41:12,15,17
194:24 199:10	engages 96:7 199:19	137:20	evolves 73:3	202:24 206:5 218:1	51:12,15 59:4 68:12
elaborate 64:20 119:3	engaging 145:7	essentially 55:8 98:12	exactly 22:21 54:20	exhibits 6:17 62:15	68:22 69:3 86:24
123:9 125:16	engineer 24:16 43:4	118:4 144:8 187:13	200:24	79:13,15 80:13	94:2 129:1 209:20
166:22 180:1 211:8	45:4 122:21,22	209:4	examination 3:14,17	114:4,5 146:14,15	217:21
elections 140:25	169:10 171:17	essentials 216:20	17:17 27:6,7 28:11	161:17 162:22	extend 71:13
electrically 28:23	engineering 23:2 24:4	Essex 2:10,11	113:15 117:12	exist 153:18 158:7	extends 127:16
electricity 44:4	24:6,7 25:7,8 32:6	establish 69:18 86:17	118:22 119:10,12	existed 68:17 181:21	extensive 126:11
· ·			,		
electronic 19:3,5	42:21 43:25 46:17	126:6	119:18 121:14,19	existence 204:14	130:5 133:13 159:9
33:23 99:3 102:5	83:22 86:9 94:24	established 14:13	123:11,14 188:20	expect 190:6	extent 4:13 56:10 76:6
element 67:7,18 72:5	95:2,7 104:24	69:21 148:7 202:12	214:5	expecting 54:17	82:4 83:6 90:4
91:2 187:2	122:23,24,25 123:3	establishes 69:5	examine 119:9 134:15	174:21	116:1 127:4 147:7
elements 25:11 72:21	127:17 131:22	111:21 173:19	examined 126:25	expeditiously 8:22	148:12,22 185:16
73:2 88:11 108:18	132:11 167:16	establishing 70:21	example 36:22 38:21	35:18	193:14,19
221:1	172:19 174:11	estimate 29:21	43:9 52:15 53:3	experience 24:13,17	external 34:21 38:12
elevated 106:17	197:18 199:10	et 91:5 103:19 144:7	55:21 72:6,7,23	74:25 123:3,5	extra 216:9
eleven 168:18	200:7 214:18	157:3	73:25 74:1 75:13,14	124:10 136:5	extractions 128:18
eloquently 78:8	engineers 42:24 43:6	ethnic 73:15	75:24 79:6 81:6	169:14 173:24	extracts 114:10,11
elsewhere 47:8 73:18	43:20 114:19	evaluate 162:25	85:3,19 100:14	220:9	extraneous 221:2
104:7	116:23 118:8	even 3:5 17:18 27:21	103:15,25 104:9	experiencing 183:18	extraordinary 129:19
email 138:16	208:11,14	29:8 36:25 56:6	106:20 128:19	expert 7:1 9:19,23,24	148:23 149:10
emanating 10:21	enlarge 92:11 93:7	73:17 83:6 86:23	129:2,5 132:5	11:9,11,13 33:7	150:7 160:16,17
Embassy 2:8,9 2:9	enough 190:23	87:4 91:10 93:21	137:10 140:5 147:9	34:25 40:12 41:2	extremely 193:16
embed 97:18 100:25	enquiries 31:24	135:6 139:21 142:3	158:14 163:3	46:21 47:19,20 48:1	
embodied 95:21 96:8	enquiry 17:25 18:3	143:9 144:16 145:7	164:25 171:22	48:3,15,20,23 49:7	
embrace 207:9	32:5 109:11	149:1 152:24	172:13 176:23	49:11,12,15,24 50:1	
emerge 203:23	ensure 81:11 130:13	176:17 177:16	191:1 202:21	50:7,14,21 51:11,17	f 21:5 47:5,15 48:4,7
emergency 108:22	145:13 146:8	193:17 216:12	206:25	51:18,24 52:13,16	48:14,18,19,21 49:5
e .					50:5,8,9 51:2 52:15
135:5 150:18,23	entail 44:2	evening 215:15	examples 128:2	52:23,24 53:5,7,19	52:18 57:18 58:6
151:1	enter 52:1 138:25	event 48:2 52:22 72:4	146:14 179:24	53:23 54:13,24 55:6	105:23 109:10
emergent 65:1	172:19	73:11 79:15 130:23	exceed 110:4 160:1	55:16,24 56:9,16,16	110:13,15 216:25
emerging 75:24	entered 137:2 148:1	132:8 134:22 135:5	exceeded 160:24	57:17,20 58:3,4,7	face 86:20 93:21
emphasised 140:14	174:24	150:21 165:24	Excellence 122:24	58:11 59:4 60:1,13	137:24 138:6 209:8
		~	7		
		Pa	ge 7		

214:24	February 49:5 79:7	finishing 95:15	99:8,11,15 100:1,9	151:2 206:12	203:7
faced 17:23 43:3	80:9 122:20 138:2	finite 175:10	100:11,14,21,24	formality 29:24	fullest 127:4
faces 1:13	204:12,13,15	firm 61:19 104:22	101:1 111:22,25	formally 52:24 53:13	fully 6:24 11:13 15:9
facie 177:3	206:16	106:5,7,10,12,20,23	128:10 132:1,2	113:21 115:18,22	18:20 21:24 23:4
facilitate 24:4 126:16	Federal 8:1 91:12			116:4 139:10	
		107:14 110:4,6	148:24 149:5 185:2		24:1,22 64:4,23
136:21	feel 15:15 38:15	169:11 174:14	185:4,7	formed 173:3	94:6 103:11 123:5
facilitates 128:16	157:15 158:17	209:17,20,22 212:1	flowed 65:2 67:13,20	forms 41:6	180:15 183:1 221:6
facilitating 61:12	160:15,24 164:18	212:19	70:17	formula 107:1,3	function 23:7 126:10
facilities 168:7 175:7,9	167:3 172:9,13	firmly 106:19 145:5	flowing 156:9 176:20	209:15,16,23	136:16 155:2
175:20,22,24	174:16 178:14	firms 169:10	flows 89:13 124:22,23	formulated 215:12	functionality 151:22
fact 18:16 22:23 23:17	180:12	first 1:7 2:8,9 4:24	128:16,17,18	formulation 36:12	functioning 43:22
24:3 39:7 53:1 55:9	feels 10:8 171:16	6:16 8:9 9:25 10:2	129:20 147:16	forth 4:1 5:4 37:19	136:13 143:19
71:14 73:13,14	172:3 181:2	11:1,21 17:25 29:7	148:8 149:3 156:2	119:7	145:23 178:1
75:19 77:10 79:5	feet 32:8 116:13 183:5	29:10 31:10 33:4	157:2,8 159:16,25	fortuitous 202:25	functions 126:5
90:7,16 95:14	214:17	34:14,23 36:14,18	160:4,24	forum 126:25	142:25 155:1
106:23 107:15	felt 64:4 179:25	37:8 39:4 46:22	fluctuations 100:14	forward 9:18 25:23	fundamental 68:3,13
116:25 120:2	few 102:10 111:15	47:20 55:12 57:13	211:25	29:23 31:9 111:24	68:15,19 69:3 93:22
123:19 124:9	139:3 152:14 153:1	63:3,5 80:21 90:15	flurry 114:1	144:21 180:1	95:22 206:12
			· ·		
155:21 163:18	161:15 167:13	96:3 97:20 120:17	flush 88:14,15	184:20 202:14	220:14 221:4
200:22 205:10,20	171:13 177:20	122:16 123:9,25	flushing 85:5 93:8	found 75:2 98:20	furnish 134:21
211:7 217:13	184:21	124:2 125:21	149:20,23 150:24	133:17 149:25	furniture 153:6
factor 145:22 215:10	fewer 27:18	126:25 130:23	151:2,3 185:1 220:5	foundation 11:17	further 3:24 7:8 22:7
factors 134:18 155:24	field 123:3 214:9	134:24 136:12	focus 5:3 26:4 109:3	31:12,16 34:5	25:9 35:3 46:15
162:9 168:5	220:10	138:4 144:13	111:12 131:12	founded 4:10,12	64:18 66:19 76:3
facts 76:10 158:25	fielding 25:23	146:21 153:23	focused 20:21 45:19	four 33:2 99:4 116:17	86:9 89:25 96:23
fail 129:16 150:6	Fietta 2:12,12,13,13	155:2 159:4 165:17	57:25 108:5,6,24	118:4 130:10,12,22	121:13 125:1
219:17	2:14 2:1 66:6,12	166:12 167:14	110:25 219:12	131:3 136:15 140:8	128:23 179:1
failed 64:25 70:16	74:12 80:17 90:6	172:24 173:19	220:1	141:11,14 155:17	183:16 189:18
86:25 178:3	201:20 219:24	178:11 183:2,13	focuses 193:2	155:19 198:9	191:12 193:11
failing 136:21 143:15	figure 44:24 45:1,2,5	188:4,16 194:6	focusing 215:18	204:23	195:11 200:19
144:25	211:24	196:16 203:24	follow 8:18 15:16 23:9	fourth 33:25 131:6	215:3
fails 214:10	figures 44:22	205:11,21 212:16	23:13,15 29:17,22	frame 25:13	future 10:22 154:15
failure 18:15 65:3	file 6:18	213:11 216:22	31:13 34:10 76:15	framed 94:15	156:1 199:8
					130.1 199.8
136:7 137:11 138:9	filed 5:10 6:16 49:4,6	first-round 25:24	152:25 180:19	framers 163:7	
143:23 152:3 168:3	filigree 23:8	five 118:23 121:5,6,12	194:5 218:10	framework 23:8 123:4	G
168:6 171:4,9	fill 62:2	121:12 134:3	221:17	191:14,15 195:19	g 1:1 21:7 52:16 75:21
195:16 196:8	filled 176:19 177:4	139:23 157:13	followed 6:14 30:10	202:13,16	94:15 106:1 109:9
fairly 162:13 205:12	final 57:21 73:1 75:18	fix 71:20 138:6	following 13:14 27:1	free 15:15 42:11	110:15
fait 144:10,11	81:19,22,25 82:3	fixed 145:10 214:1	35:3 39:9 80:17	178:14	gain 177:13
faith 90:17	94:5 124:4 136:3	flames 214:17	97:15 108:10	freeboard 30:10,14	gap 123:19
fall 47:14,17 49:22	149:19 188:18	flexibility 111:6	119:10 125:8 148:6	103:17 105:22	GARTH 2:20
fallen 139:18	200:3	flexibly 92:14	172:16 200:23	109:19 184:7 217:4	gated 110:14
fallible 113:14	finalise 138:16 139:7	flip 175:23	202:15 204:5,11	217:4	gates 182:3 203:10
fallow 27:21 28:6,9,14	finalised 138:11,14	floated 173:1	205:21 221:22	frequency 120:18,24	gathering 114:7
falls 48:17 52:17	139:15 157:6	floats 173:4	follows 33:3 52:3	121:4,11 136:18,19	
189:20	finalising 146:20	flood 129:20 147:16	69:14,17 218:16	159:23	gauging 156:12,13
false 93:21	finality 50:11 53:17	147:18,19,20 148:2	follow-on 206:22	frequently 69:10	159:11 161:13,20
falter 151:18	69:20 70:1,9,25		Follow-up 187:18	137:20 139:21	166:7,8
		148:3,20,22 149:11			gave 115:24 196:18
familiar 1:13 2:11	72:13 74:8,15 91:25	158:3,13,20 159:12	fons 91:5	fresh 55:4	general 2:7,20 1:21
37:23 57:13 68:6,8	finally 32:19 141:9	159:16,21,25 160:4	footnote 81:22 137:9	Friday 26:19 29:7,10	11:7 21:16 31:12
98:22 104:1 124:3	financial 43:1 44:1	161:8 163:3,12,19	force 137:3	201:1 211:11	32:1 40:8 41:9
familiarising 41:9	50:13 173:9	164:1,9 165:6,6,15	forcefully 95:1	friends 90:10 200:17	45:19 47:9 49:18
familiarity 17:9	financing 172:22	166:4,22 179:23	forecast 155:2 156:21	friendship 126:2	55:21 69:18 89:17
far 70:3 71:24 77:2	find 4:11 44:23 48:6,9	180:11 186:2	165:18,23	front 18:25 48:13	90:1 96:12 101:25
84:1,5 95:15 129:22	49:2 80:12,15 81:18	188:23	forecasted 155:22	50:10 76:18 117:1	111:21,24 112:10
143:5 144:4 147:16	99:2 102:5 199:7	flooding 85:25	forecasting 154:23	119:25 120:2,10	121:4,9,11 126:17
161:6 170:9 185:3	206:4	floodplain 149:5	165:6,6	frontier 69:18 70:3	130:2 132:15 134:7
185:14 186:7,16	finding 43:7	floods 149:14 159:24	forecasts 155:9 165:8	frustrate 10:10	136:19 139:16,20
207:2 209:7 212:7	findings 220:8	160:15 163:4	165:16	frustrated 86:21	139:25 140:12,22
fare 42:24	fine 117:3 118:10	floor 17:4	Foreign 2:6 2:4	143:19	
fashion 56:18	170:13 178:24	flow 12:3 13:8,22,22	foreseen 68:18 121:17	frustrating 136:22	141:9,11 142:20
faster 27:17	183:12 184:1	16:10,15,16 43:11	forget 186:21	177:24	154:5 181:8 184:2
Fatima 2:8 2:8	187:17 188:2,15	65:6 75:3 77:25	forgive 41:5 210:8	frustration 124:5,7	188:7
			O		generalised 15:21
faulty 57:3	189:15 216:15	78:1 80:12,23 81:3	forgot 60:3	136:4	generally 22:15 73:7
favour 4:6,11 74:5	finger 212:17	81:10,10,11,14,21	form 23:17 39:1 87:10	fulfil 140:4	110:12 144:16
93:12	finish 29:8 187:8	81:22 82:11 84:4,14	118:7 205:16	full 19:23 32:21	155:4 171:17 183:4
feasibility 172:16,17	190:4,5	85:15,16,20 88:2	formal 30:19 116:11	105:20 119:21,23	192:11
features 103:16 203:7	finished 95:13 189:16	90:2 92:10 94:1	116:13,14 118:14	157:10 175:11	generate 145:11
	ī	1	1	I	, ~

Page 8

Trevor McGowan

Amended

	<u> </u>				
generating 44:7	184:19 190:7 191:7	handles 11:8	height 198:18 205:6	holistically 97:6	204:16 206:1
generation 44:4 99:21	194:2,19 195:4,8	handout 30:17	217:3	homework 215:13,15	ICSID 35:14
99:22 102:13,21	200:21 202:2,14	hand-up 28:22	heightened 79:9	215:15,17	idea 71:24 75:7 76:23
125:13 130:7	210:3 213:18 214:2	happen 139:20	heightens 87:2	honour 8:5,8 17:6	identification 22:19
133:15 220:19	215:14,15	happening 82:23	heights 182:3	122:4,17	112:6
genesis 33:25 201:9	gone 120:22	162:6 165:24 166:2	held 93:25 136:25	hoof 31:5	identified 5:3 35:19
205:10 206:6	good 1:3 2:10 7:18,25	happens 75:15	137:13,16 201:8	hope 17:21 22:12	36:23 55:22 178:8
genuinely 172:3,9	36:8 59:21 90:17	happy 18:9 23:11	202:25 214:17	23:25 51:7 54:18	191:16 204:16,19
geographic 66:10	119:15,19,20	112:21 113:1,16,21	help 76:20 187:7	57:5,5 58:16 61:18	identifies 124:16
geological 43:1	121:16 122:7 129:2	116:12 147:1	211:17	61:24 83:22 88:5	133:20
Georgina 1:23	158:16 173:11	187:16 190:23	helpful 37:17 48:9	98:25 117:25	identify 32:25 39:4
gets 56:6 58:13	179:6 185:18	211:17	115:11 187:12	152:25 195:12	105:6 108:16
getting 173:25 177:4,4	201:12 211:20	hard 19:12 28:23	189:21 193:10,16	210:25 211:14	135:19 192:15
Gilgit-Baltistan	221:8,15	33:22 102:6	Hence 10:11	hopefully 190:10	identifying 96:1
156:16	goodwill 126:1 149:15	hardcopy 48:13	HEP 20:13 32:13	hopes 3:8	118:24 198:9
give 22:7 27:1 28:4,22	172:9 180:3,14	harder 193:17	42:12 43:4,9,14,18	hoping 95:13	ignore 219:17
34:8 42:11 60:7	governing 68:3	hardly 176:12	44:1,5,12 46:12,13	horizon 22:16 34:9	ignored 142:6
75:13 121:16	government 13:3 37:9	hardship 114:21	81:13 83:22 84:15	host 139:4	ignoring 44:9 136:20
134:14 150:21	79:20 89:11,15,15	harm 76:1 77:24	86:11 87:4 93:14	hour 28:12,15 32:3	II 83:8 98:12 131:19
152:1,17 158:1	91:12,13 118:3	81:15	94:2 137:7 150:8	216:8	134:4 145:25
167:9 187:25 191:6	150:22 153:25	Hasti 143:10 194:11	151:1 203:7 205:21	hours 28:19 31:24	167:20 197:9 198:6
200:17 212:13	154:19,21 156:6,11	194:16	206:17 218:1	111:4 211:10	198:11 203:12
215:4	156:17,22 157:9	hate 215:4	219:11	213:16	III 5:1 10:4 20:1 21:10
given 7:10 12:9,11	169:8 172:22	having 9:21 15:17	HEPs 24:18 26:20	housekeeping 18:24	33:17 42:10 47:4
25:8 27:17 29:5	179:14	17:24 23:12 25:14	41:15,18 42:4,6,7,8	19:15	83:10 92:8,10 95:12
44:14 56:4 63:25	Governments 126:19	30:2 54:4 56:16	42:17 44:20 45:7,21	huge 144:22	98:12,20 99:2 101:3
64:13 67:2 103:15	203:4	60:14 114:22	45:24 84:9,22 85:18	hundreds 13:24	101:4,5 102:15,16
107:3 115:1 121:18	government-to-gove	118:15 187:6	87:2,9,11,20 92:17	hurdles 17:24	102:22 103:5
151:3 155:25	138:25	201:18 212:23	95:5 96:6 141:14	hurts 22:13	111:20,23 131:19
171:25 211:14	granted 5:9 7:10 94:3	218:4,15	143:9 145:25	hydraulic 134:6	192:8
218:25	114:3 117:7	head 44:7 177:8,9,13	200:10 206:20	167:21 168:1	III(1) 111:25
gives 54:1 85:14	grappled 212:20	192:2	217:18 219:9,21	198:14	III(2) 99:25 111:25
169:19	grateful 17:2 27:2	heading 36:22 107:23	HEP's 217:1	hydro 97:17 98:17,18	III(2)(d) 99:22 112:2
giving 121:23 174:20	31:2 37:9,14 38:10	179:7 199:8	her 28:4 30:11 50:21	102:17 111:18,19	III(4) 111:25
glad 215:14	39:10 122:2	headline 45:5 110:11	53:11,25 58:12	112:7	illuminate 64:5
Global 156:23	grave 151:16	203:5 207:3	64:19 71:4 94:7	hydroelectric 5:15,20	illuminating 62:10
go 16:23 18:24 23:11	great 1:12 69:8 158:13	heads 22:13 107:22	96:23,25 110:10	5:22 8:7 9:5,9,12	illustrate 27:22 38:20
27:7,17 28:12,20	187:7 198:22	headwork 103:16	187:19 191:7	12:16 14:7,11 20:5	53:5 91:14
29:23 31:6 36:4	208:19 214:24	headworks 160:2	hermetically 112:13	24:18 41:10 42:23	illustrated 79:4
54:4,5 55:7 56:1	greater 44:7 74:5 87:8	health 173:9	hesitation 142:17	92:12 93:2 99:21,23	imagine 64:12 184:18
58:11 66:12 71:24	186:11 207:16	hear 8:20 18:9 42:20	hewed 196:1	125:13 130:7 131:1	immaterial 135:6
95:15 97:13 102:7	greatest 90:10	43:16 90:13 105:22	hewing 215:21	131:3 132:7 133:16	immediate 65:4 66:22
112:20 143:14 145:8 152:24	Greg 23:1	106:6 110:18	he'll 175:6	133:19 141:21	90:8 150:21 212:13 immediately 1:25 27:1
	Gregory 2:14 2:7 24:8	111:11 208:2,4 209:3 211:22 220:9	high 82:14	142:22 149:24 153:16 177:2,3,7,14	41:4 68:6 185:5
174:22 177:11 183:25 185:10	ground 67:12,14 68:21 69:4 76:10	heard 139:9 202:18	higher 217:4 highest 71:1	182:9 218:18	41:4 68:6 185:5 192:18
183:25 185:10 189:23 191:4			highlight 46:7 101:20	hydrograph 165:22	immensely 31:15
196:11 198:1 201:5	grounds 68:13 groundwater 75:3	hearing 1:7 2:21 3:3 4:14,25 6:22,23 7:6	103:3	hydrograph 165:22 hydrologic 134:6	immensely 31:15 imminently 139:11
215:8 216:2,15	groups 124:18	7:6,12 8:9 15:2,9	highlighted 130:4	198:13	immovable 203:9
217:8 221:10	guarantee 173:16	18:20 26:15 27:20	highlighting 146:17	hydrological 128:7	impact 13:24 14:1
goes 27:9 38:24 46:9	guidance 14:9 19:24	34:19,24 37:17 42:1	him 52:19 53:2,15,25	161:4	136:12 147:18
53:11 82:25 83:16	20:3,17 60:7 114:19	50:2 52:10 54:19	120:11 138:23	hydrology 25:7	156:24 157:18
101:12 169:13	guidelines 45:18	57:4 113:23 114:25	189:25	128:24 147:4,13	162:24,25 163:2
195:14 196:20,22	guiding 208:5	115:2,21,25 116:8	Himalayan 24:14	154:15 156:1	impacts 156:5,8
200:20 202:11	Gulland 1:23	119:6 167:6 170:12	155:25 218:6,18,23	hydropower 99:19	impairment 145:22
205:25 206:9	1.20	191:18 221:22	Himalayas 156:3	112:2 143:24 163:1	impeded 136:16
216:23 217:5	Н	hearings 34:13	175:8	166:19	imperative 45:23
220:20	h 106:2 125:7	heart 33:16 41:25	himself 47:20 173:19	hydro-electric 102:14	88:17 217:17
going 10:3 22:13,24	Hague 1:5 2:9	44:16 46:9 83:17	hinterland 40:20	102:21 218:5	imperilled 79:24
31:9 33:13 38:16	half 28:19 31:24 32:3	84:6 85:12 94:9	history 27:25 67:2	hyperbolic 82:18	impermissibly 220:25
62:19 63:18 75:10	66:8 125:15 211:10	95:11 106:13,24	170:21 183:7	hyperlinked 19:3	implement 179:16
76:6 77:17 80:17	216:8	111:17 127:23	201:14	hypothetical 53:3 58:2	implementation 126:7
95:15 100:17 103:7	Hall 69:8	130:11 162:16	hold 93:4 137:11	73:10	127:7 140:17,19
106:25 109:3,25	Hamdia 2:8 2:8	216:1 217:9 219:22	139:11 168:13,14	H.E 2:7	154:24 161:2
111:11 113:11	hamstrung 63:25	heavily 34:22 83:14	169:3 188:6,7		162:19 185:3
120:3 152:20 157:6	hand 37:22 177:6	207:14	holding 137:23 140:15	I	191:24 200:14
168:14 170:20	handed 46:24 123:10	heavy 215:21	143:13	ice 156:13	implemented 126:1
174:14 180:1	192:17	hefty 19:1	holistic 200:17	ICIW 147:22 204:13	136:6 185:17 186:9
	122	*			
L	I .				

Page 9
Trevor McGowan
Amended

implied 213:21	213:21 214:14	26:25 33:10 35:21	inherently 43:17	interdisciplinary	introducing 2:14
importance 15:18	217:21	35:23 41:11 45:8	initial 22:19 41:3	25:11	116:3 118:23
96:1 125:19 127:20	indefinitely 69:25	46:5 54:5 64:9,15	202:15	interest 5:16 31:17	introduction 124:12
128:6	independence 13:4	65:10,17,18,21,22	initially 9:1 146:17	106:17 193:12	Introductory 3:1 2:16
important 8:16,24	65:6 202:12	66:2,21 67:5,16	148:10 215:8	196:2	intuitive 96:11
10:13,25 31:15	independent 6:9 Indian 20:7 35:22	69:12 70:11,19	initiative 89:7	interested 89:2 90:13	invariably 180:9
57:11 66:5 72:5 77:16 81:20 91:11	41:15 42:4,6,17	71:12 73:5,23 74:3 74:9,14,16 79:24	innovation 94:24 95:1 input 170:7	175:3 193:20 215:10	182:5 invented 208:12
100:19 101:2,4,21	45:3,7,13 62:12	80:16 114:9 120:19	insecurity 13:6	interesting 64:12	invitation 2:20
102:17 103:7 105:6	64:23 65:6 78:25	120:23,24 122:19	insights 182:22	101:12,20	invite 1:14 7:18 18:12
105:12,16 109:4	79:20 82:16 84:3	123:4 124:1,1,13,15	insignificant 100:13	interests 93:12	33:22 44:25 62:12
110:25 125:11	86:11 89:10,15 96:5	124:16,17,21 125:1	132:3	interference 99:17	79:13 102:4 104:10
126:21 127:12	137:14 138:19,21	125:3 126:3 128:5	insists 46:12	100:3,7,16,19	122:15 150:4 205:2
128:20 129:23	139:10 140:3	136:13,24 139:5,24	insofar 26:11 33:6	130:24 131:14,17	215:3 218:2
134:17 160:7	142:10,15 146:16	140:13 151:10,22	40:11,14 113:15	131:24 132:6,9,12	invited 2:23 3:3 5:16
162:18 163:8	148:11 149:6	153:21,22 154:3,4,9	192:9 201:16	132:13,19,20	invoked 68:20 69:4
170:10 178:17	160:12 163:24	154:10 156:14	inspect 63:4,6 139:22	199:11 200:7,9,11	invoking 56:13
186:18 196:16	164:3,16,24 175:15	157:8 158:2,15,18	142:4	interferences 133:2	involve 89:10 144:22
199:6 importantly 46:3	181:25 182:8 203:25 206:20	159:12 163:4,6,9,20 168:11 169:4	inspection 86:22,23 121:5,9,11 126:17	intergovernmental 35:24	involved 89:12,16 151:10 169:6,7
104:22 132:18	218:3,17 219:20	171:12 176:13	136:20,22 139:17	interim 9:8 77:9	199:20
impose 134:21	Indian-administered	179:16,17 181:19	139:20 140:1,5,7,12	interiocking 96:8 97:8	involves 100:12
imposed 9:3 169:22	124:23	188:22 190:23	140:15,23 141:3,9	112:6	Irfan 8:11
imposes 86:10 94:16	Indian-controlled	192:7,11 203:3,15	141:14,15,25 142:1	international 3:16	irrelevant 9:11
129:17 141:23	176:5	203:25	142:2,21 143:14	14:19 21:15 25:6	irrigation 85:2
impossible 69:20	Indian-Occupied	inevitable 34:12	185:9	68:7,10,11 69:2,7	irritant 219:16
impression 88:23	176:13	inflows 148:13	inspections 142:5,7,20	71:17 73:19 75:6	Islamabad 34:21
inaccuracy 69:23	India's 3:11,22 4:3,5	inform 97:10 199:16	installed 165:11 166:9	76:9,20 77:19 78:4	35:24 39:3 192:16
Inaudible 106:19 incident 88:22,24 89:4	6:1,3 10:9,11,16 18:4,10,21,22 20:13	information 25:10 40:7 62:15,18 74:23	instance 153:23 181:20,21 212:16	96:10 165:12 193:19 218:8	Islamic 1:16 2:2 3:3 3:11,19 1:6 7:23 8:2
89:23	33:12 44:21 45:23	75:5 87:1 108:20	instances 34:4 182:14	internet 164:6,8,11,19	11:20 13:5 190:20
incidental 100:13	62:25 64:10 74:5	110:21 127:25	instead 71:15 121:10	interpolate 81:24	issuance 5:6 163:13
132:4	78:19 80:22 82:15	128:20 129:11,15	138:20	interpret 76:22	issue 4:18 14:4 22:24
inclination 83:13	83:2,4 84:15 87:3	129:19,21 130:16	instructed 164:2	interpretation 5:1 7:3	29:4,25 32:12 33:21
include 115:13 126:16	88:25 89:21 90:1	132:8,16 133:2,21	instrument 14:20 42:5	14:4,10 19:24 21:4	35:2,3,4 36:14 37:3
196:3	93:7 95:5 124:4,7	134:3,7,9,13,16,22	67:6 68:2 72:20	21:15,17,18 31:14	39:25 41:6 42:3
included 6:17 9:10	133:10,21 134:12	134:23 135:1,20,23	73:6 74:18	32:22 53:8 55:13	49:9,12 51:13 52:10
62:13 150:3 195:25	135:12,16 136:3,7	143:23 144:2,9,13	instruments 68:11	63:18 71:5,19 73:4	52:11,20 54:17 56:2
205:4 includes 49:17 96:17	136:12 137:10	144:15 145:1,6,13	72:18 insulate 76:7	74:22 76:17 77:17	56:12,23 57:4 59:5
96:17	138:9,24 140:4 142:17 143:19,22	145:16,23 146:12 147:11,14,16,20	intake 198:16	77:23 82:7,15 87:7 94:17,22 96:4,12,24	59:14 60:1 63:13 67:10 69:11 70:25
including 2:19 3:6 7:6	144:25 146:25	148:2,8,13,20,22,24	intakes 30:12 87:12	103:9 109:13	71:5 80:5 82:1,24
24:13,23 32:14	147:23 149:8 168:3	149:9,11,14 150:7	103:19 110:15	110:13 112:11,12	83:17 84:5 94:1
50:12 71:3 99:18	171:4,9 182:17	150:22 154:6,14	203:11 205:6 220:6	169:17 170:22	101:13 105:5 106:1
118:8 119:4 128:17	187:9 195:16 196:8	158:20 159:19,23	integral 95:24 106:7	181:12 187:2,5	109:18 115:20
150:2 154:7 203:7	205:21,22 206:2	160:3 165:17	integrate 26:10,12	191:5 193:15 195:7	163:3 176:22
207:3,20 211:13	209:8,24 210:11	166:11 167:22	integrated 32:13	205:8,19 206:13,19	178:25 181:8
217:2	214:7 215:7,21	168:4,6 171:4,10	166:4	208:21 213:19	182:12 191:1
incomplete 146:13	217:17 218:16	172:3,10 174:17	intended 2:25 29:20	216:24 217:6,8	193:23 194:11,19
184:20 incompleteness 114:5	219:14 220:1,3,17 indicate 2:25 118:2	178:2,17 179:4 184:21 195:16	31:11 34:5 65:18 103:21 123:19	interpretations 71:8 interpretative 20:3,16	196:7,20,22 199:5 212:8,18 220:13,15
incompleteness 114:5	137:22 189:12	197:9,15,23 198:7	210:1 213:22	20:20 26:17 72:22	issued 3:13 6:6 7:4
20:14	indicated 5:15 34:17	198:22 200:6	intending 60:4	75:23 83:25 94:13	issues 4:19 10:21
incomprehensibly	116:21 179:2 187:8	information-sharing	intensified 143:17	96:14 97:10 103:8	11:18 12:2,24 15:18
76:11	197:22	125:20 126:11	intensive 17:9	112:8 201:21	18:5 20:12,15 21:24
inconsequential 30:8	indicates 49:3 203:13	127:21,22 128:2,8	intent 42:14 74:14	interpreted 181:9	22:16 23:7 24:3,3,4
inconsistent 220:7	indicating 138:21	130:3,5,11,19,23,25	85:17	interpreting 88:11	24:23 25:20 26:5,17
incorporate 73:17	indication 169:19	131:5,7,9,11,13	intention 34:6 127:5	interpretive 103:24	32:2,10 33:14 34:2
incorporation 32:12	indicative 29:23	133:7,13,24 135:10	127:13 211:7 216:8	interval 155:13	34:9,13,16,23 36:17
increase 92:15 159:16 160:4 166:14	indicators 140:16 indirectly 16:12	178:10,13,25 195:24 196:9	intentional 10:10 intentionally 86:4	intervals 159:20 160:4 160:6	36:19 40:23 43:24 49:13,21 51:21 52:9
increased 205:23	individual 27:14	199:25	220:22	interventions 128:19	54:21 55:20 56:8,10
indeed 3:12 21:9	32:22 116:15	informed 2:19 45:18	intentions 127:4	Inter-Dominion 65:8	63:17,22,23 64:6,11
29:13 31:16 37:15	indulgence 27:15,19	56:22 108:12 185:4	inter 51:1 169:24	65:12	64:13 65:15 82:20
52:6 59:1 65:11	28:2 83:23	informing 185:11	interaction 97:9	intricate 58:16	83:22,24 84:6 88:18
79:5 122:17 163:5	Indus 1:2 2:5 1:5,18	informing-sharing	105:17	introduce 1:14,22	94:6 95:9 112:5
178:2 183:12	6:25 7:3 10:5 11:22	143:21 196:15	interactions 6:11	114:16	119:3,11 123:9
201:14 202:21	13:2,12 19:25 20:9	inherent 77:23	interactive 24:1	introduced 27:22	124:2 137:21

Page 10

Trevor McGowan

Amended

, ,	,
144:24 151:10	KC 2:10,12 2:1
181:13 183:20	keep 113:18
184:6 187:6 192:9	keeping 180:24
193:9 194:2 196:14	184:18
201:10,12,17,21	
201:10,12,17,21	kept 2:18 3:5 key 18:2 19:24 34:2
	•
207:3 208:17	38:16 46:25 86:25
212:21 215:2	88:3 126:15 184:6 201:10 202:1
216:21	
itching 106:15	206:13 216:21
items 48:20	Khan 2:6 2:4
IV 21:3 149:17 161:9	Kharif 155:7
194:20	KHEP 63:1,4,4,19,21
IV(8) 129:17 147:15	142:12 143:7
147:21 148:21	184:24 185:5
150:8	204:14
IX 1:1 10:7 53:21 54:7	kind 43:3 59:9 82:14
55:5,8 57:14 58:13	154:22 212:4
86:16 126:24 136:2	kinds 71:18 104:13
153:22 171:5,11	193:13
174:23 189:1	KING 2:21
192:25	Kingdom 2:8,9,10
IX(1) 193:4	Kishenganga 7:2 9:6
IX(3) 50:17	9:9 24:11 34:2 35:6
I(ix) 150:15	36:19 37:11 38:17
I(15) 100:17 200:10	55:19 62:5 72:24
I[ix 151:4	73:1 75:18 76:2,16
	77:8,14,18 81:7,9
J	81:12,13,17,19 86:22 88:14 89:1
j 2:15 107:18	90:15 93:25 94:2,5
Jamal 2:9 2:8	141:20 142:22
January 5:23 141:10	151:17 162:8
217:22 219:5	184:17,19,23
jargon 72:17	201:11,22 202:8
JEFFREY 1:11	203:21 204:1,3,8,9
Jhelum 66:2 124:22	204:22 205:11,15
176:23	220:8 221:12
JKUpdate 150:2	know 26:23 28:24
job 43:7	38:13,19 48:6 95:19
joins 125:3	125:10 152:21
JUDGE 1:10	153:13,21 163:5
judgment 36:17 37:24	170:1 173:5,7 176:2
39:23 69:9,11	176:16 177:6,10
July 1:6 1:1 3:14 4:20	179:14 194:21
5:10 7:8,10 30:7 46:24 49:15 64:25	209:1 215:6 216:6
140:10 148:9,17	knowing 215:10
149:7 158:25	knowledge 129:14
	176:12 182:16
159:19 163:21	known 9:17 75:5
jump 107:21 jumps 213:1	1110 (11) 11 / 70 10
jumps 213:1 juncture 78:24 149:18	
June 7:4 26:23 27:12	L 2:14
35:4 40:11,19 49:1	la 3:24 52:14
49:6 139:3 140:6	lack 163:1 165:1
146:25 187:11	lag 165:20 166:14
jurisdiction 54:21	Lahore 122:25
jurisurcuon 54.21	lake 176:24.25

Landic 122.23
lake 176:24,25
land 64:25 65:3 67:19
70:16,16,18,23 91:9
174:1
language 49:21,23
51:10 59:3,25 67:9
68:1 199:1
laptops 208:11
large 6:24 44:23 45:5
45:13,15,19 84:11
84:12,23 85:22

jurisprudence 116:1 **Justice** 2:4 1:12 8:2 69:7,8 71:17

justification 80:25 **Justin** 214:8

Kabul 125:2 154:8

Kashmir 67:4 124:23

Kalnai 141:16

176:13

CTICLE IX AND A	ΝN
87:22 152:7 175:18 177:9 204:24	lei lei
217:14 largely 102:8 207:7,10 last 12:2 19:15 59:2	les
82:23 111:15 115:14 137:6,13 140:8 141:11 171:3	
192:14 193:5 200:2 201:8 lasted 141:11 143:7,9	let
late 9:16 172:1 later 75:2 90:3 129:24 137:14 139:3	
167:10 177:17 211:16 latest 107:8,11,15	
latitude 111:8 203:18 latter 35:2 Laura 2:13 2:1 27:24	
law 2:4 1:11 8:2 13:1 14:16,19 24:3 25:6 25:7 68:10,25 69:2	let
73:19 75:6,21 76:9 76:20 77:19 78:4 94:14 96:13 193:25	
lawyer 186:22 lawyers 21:15 68:7 96:10	let
lays 133:8 lead 1:18 8:18 11:12 11:17 12:25 14:24 16:21 140:18 213:6	let
leaders 84:3 leading 13:25 24:12	let
149:1 learn 5:14 least 23:13 28:14	lev
38:11,17 57:13 80:22 89:22 134:9 137:1,12 139:22 155:12 165:23 172:4,11 182:18	
191:9,17 197:6,11 197:21 198:8 203:23 206:10,11	lev lev
leave 5:7 6:21 7:8 15:5 38:4 58:24 63:12 75:8 103:10 105:1 106:25 194:2 195:8	lie lie lif
200:1 211:21 leaves 27:21 144:13 leaving 59:5 84:8	lif lif lif
led 27:23 65:15,17 137:11 left 9:11 20:15 30:21	lig lik
67:18 91:8 113:8 149:12 legal 2:6,21,21 1:21	
2:3 36:2 39:2 65:13 79:23 82:14 86:10 115:16,22,23 116:9	
116:15 118:10 150:13 151:24 170:22,23 183:9	

NEXURE G OF TH	IE INI
	170
engthen 175:23 engthy 22:5 27:13	170 176
44:8 205:12	179
ens 13:1	201
ess 45:9,13 71:12	214
85:17 96:11 120:20 145:20 159:17	likely 1 147
217:14	limit 1
et 15:6,7 16:23 18:23	limitat
22:7 25:14 32:25	limitat
34:14 37:8 40:23	limited
46:19 57:1 72:4 73:10 78:17 92:10	65:2 112
94:10 99:8,11,15	144
100:1 103:3 111:15	176
111:21,25 113:20	limits
169:17 171:7 178:25 183:16	169 line 21
187:19 189:24	69:2
194:15 211:21	76:1
212:13	165
etter 5:23 26:23 27:12	lines 1
30:7 35:4 40:11 93:10 114:20 129:7	lingeri linguis
138:15 140:6,10,24	linked
141:7 146:24	Lisa 1
148:17,18 149:7	list 13
150:5 158:24 etters 79:7 140:2	listed lists 20
142:10 146:15,22	literal
168:18 187:10	literall
188:10	little 1
et's 53:3,5 59:15 71:12 74:2 221:15	27:2 40:1
et-flow 12:9,11	75:9
evel 43:25 71:7 79:5	80:1
82:14 89:10 104:19	105
104:20 105:21 109:16 136:23	159 179
138:17 153:25	179
160:16 171:10	193
172:20 180:16,17	210
180:18 203:8,8,10 203:10	217
evels 44:1 148:14	live 10 lived 1
everage 13:7	lives 1
ie 127:23	living
ies 130:11 156:15 ife 149:1 152:7 169:8	73:6 LLP 2
175:10,23	load 1
ifeblood 219:25	168
ifecycle 180:20,21	215
ifted 89:16 ight 26:21 28:11 80:7	local 1
197:17 208:16	localis locate
ike 8:14 19:12 25:21	located
28:1,17 30:12 36:18	111
41:3 58:1,18 74:17 90:20 91:5 98:23	217
102:11 107:4,20	location 183
114:6,18 115:3,12	logger
116:21 118:6,20	Londo
122:15 135:6 138:3 143:10 147:25	2:12
151:7 152:17	long 9 107
154:17 155:3 157:3	165
157:25 158:9,23	179
163:17 164:17	194

170:11,19 171:14
176:9 178:18,21
179:13 188:13
201:23 212:6
214:25
likely 26:5 28:6,7,13
147:18
limit 160:24,25
limitation 66:3 67:22 limitations 33:7 94:16
limited 9:24 11:12
65:25 68:20 107:8
112:2 118:23 137:6
144:14 170:6
176:22
limits 75:10 159:13
169:22
line 21:25 67:5,12
69:20 73:17 75:22
76:12 116:4,5
165:12 206:16
lines 123:21 220:23
lingering 143:5 linguistic 73:15
linked 102:16
Lisa 1:23
list 133:13 181:6
listed 125:7 128:3
lists 203:12
literal 172:6,6
literally 45:12
little 16:6 22:7 23:19
27:21 34:18 35:1
40:13 52:11 60:13
75:9 76:2 77:1
80:18 84:14 88:6
105:22 158:9 159:17 177:17
179:1 183:16 190:8
190:25 191:11
193:11 195:9 208:2
210:1 211:15 216:4
217:12 221:10,11
live 105:9,25 191:10
lived 13:6
lives 13:24
living 13:25 72:18,20
73:6 92:23 LLP 2:12,13,13,14
LLP 2:12,13,13,14 load 167:21,24,25
168:1 210:5 215:10
215:22,24
local 140:25
localised 89:23
locate 38:25
located 36:6 87:12
111:20 181:17
217:15
location 44:6 134:5
183:20 198:12
loggerheads 182:5
London 2:10,11,11,12
2:12,13,13,14 long 9:7 22:12 70:1
107:7 161:21
165:20 177:12
179:21 180:7,15
194:9 219:17

longer 143:9 189:22
190:8
longest 107:5,15
long-standing 79:23
long-term 154:23
155:22 157:1
look 25:23 48:7 58:5
74:2 79:17 82:16
98:24 104:9,12
105:3 106:11 109:7
111:24 154:7 157:1
175:7 178:7,10
198:11,14 205:1
208:17 209:19 210:19 211:11
212:1 213:3
looked 39:5 71:18
88:25 141:15
194:10
looking 2:5,7 37:16
40:5 48:2 97:6 99:3
104:15 182:17
210:2 214:7,8,8
looks 36:25
loss 149:1
lot 37:21 100:18
102:10 106:6
111:11 183:2
190:24 194:13
198:12 210:8
lots 31:17,17 64:12
104:13 190:23
lower 13:6 91:15
141:16
lower-case 104:6
low-height 177:12
lunch 22:11 27:2 60:6
95:16 113:2 117:18
118:1,5
lunchtime 95:15
M
machinery 174:5
made 4:15,17 5:10
8:17 9:1 13:13 18:7
19:10 34:16 36:17
39:23 41:24 56:22

Iuncii 22.11 27.2 00.0
95:16 113:2 117:18
118:1,5
lunchtime 95:15
M
machinery 174:5
made 4:15,17 5:10
8:17 9:1 13:13 18:7
19:10 34:16 36:17
39:23 41:24 56:22
57:23 61:20 64:20
72:11 73:22 77:10
77:14 78:12 79:1
82:4 88:9 89:1 90:6
90:15 103:22 114:2
115:21 125:5 135:8
174:13 180:24
185:6 192:6,12
217:10
Madhopur 160:2
magic 104:14
magnitude 132:17,23
133:6 199:17
main 11:16 130:22
136:15 140:16
143:25 144:12
145:8 155:1 162:6

145:8 155:1 162:6 166:18,24 176:13 181:13

mainstay 156:9 maintain 50:18 60:19

186:14

198:18,21

length 20:18 64:16

Trevor McGowan Amended

163:17 164:17

126:6 164:18	mark 19:13 106:4	168:23 169:3 188:6	207:13,14	154:20,22,22,23,23	24:8,11,20 28:18
maintaining 212:2	massive 176:3	217:22 218:1,14	methods 214:6	155:8,14,21 156:4	31:22,23 42:20
maintains 49:25	master's 122:23	meetings 120:19,24	metres 159:17	166:5	43:16 86:7 167:5
major 65:22 125:1	material 35:25 38:13	136:18,25 137:5,12	microphone 112:23	modelling 86:8	176:7 191:2 214:20
make 7:19 8:16 10:19	62:17 135:1 144:6	138:14 139:19	mid-November	modernising 156:17	220:9,21
10:25 14:18 19:19	203:22	140:15 142:15,17	137:25	modes 159:4,7	Morris's 114:17
21:2 30:1,16,19	materially 92:15	143:13 168:7	might 4:13,15 15:24	modification 67:23	most 24:6 26:5 28:6
33:4,16 35:17 37:6	132:14,21 167:17	meets 130:15 135:13	16:15 17:18 21:1	93:20 209:5	34:4 67:17 78:21
37:24 41:6 53:7,14	199:13	Megan 2:14 2:5	28:12 116:12 117:5	modified 148:11,15	98:4,14 125:11
53:24 59:11 60:3	materials 3:7 37:11,12	Mehar 2:5 3:13 1:17	135:20 145:8 167:9	modify 139:1 207:23	126:16 127:6
61:21 62:18 64:17	37:16,18,21 38:2,5	118:19 119:24	167:16 169:13	moment 28:13 36:9	131:15,18 133:16
68:5 73:10 74:16	40:15,16 96:20	member 122:17	178:7 187:9,21	37:5 38:11 55:11	137:10 159:9
79:14 80:20 90:6	114:2,3 119:6	members 2:11,12 7:24	190:3 191:9,15	62:9 69:21 74:11	194:12 218:5
101:10,17,18	120:10	7:25 8:13,22 10:8	192:20 193:14,15	75:19 78:16 81:24	mostly 26:15 28:14
113:12,21 115:12	mathematical 214:22	11:15 14:2,14 17:6	212:5 215:11	83:18 99:19 104:11	60:9 109:3
116:10,11 117:8,9	mathematicians 215:1	19:22 22:6 25:5	migration 157:3	109:21 111:13	move 55:14 73:16
118:25 119:1,6	mathematics 214:24	26:2 31:18 32:17,24	Miles 2:11 2:2 26:16	175:21 191:20	99:12 130:20
120:4,15 124:16	maths 208:14	37:15 40:5,22 41:24	26:18 30:9,14 94:21	196:24 200:2 205:3	150:14 172:23
130:1 142:25	matrix 105:18	42:21 44:21 46:7	95:8 105:13,23	momentarily 60:12	211:18
147:18 149:18	matter 1:1 29:24	50:22 60:11 61:25	106:10,17 107:16	moments 86:2 111:15	moved 144:21 207:8
151:24 152:16	30:21 34:20 49:16	62:21 63:12 64:7	208:4 209:3 211:9	Monday 1:6 1:1	moving 9:18 49:4
158:23 163:8 175:4	50:25 51:25 52:2,4	68:5,8 70:19 78:9	211:22 212:15	monitoring 28:21	95:23 96:19 112:15
193:8 194:3	52:17 54:14,25	79:20 82:13 83:19	214:18 221:6	128:16 month 91:18 139:5,8	166:12 184:20
makes 30:13 52:23	56:19,25 57:22 58:12 64:22 76:17	85:11 86:7 88:5	millions 13:24 mind 4:17 52:8 119:13	month 91:18 139:5,8 monthly 128:13	much 1:16 2:10 12:21
53:23 88:5 108:13		92:6 94:8 97:3		•	15:3 16:18,20,24
142:24 193:17 making 22:5 30:9,11	77:6 117:6 127:8 140:20 141:18	111:9 112:4 113:4 116:6 119:16,23	144:19 194:12 minds 191:10	161:14 months 8:5 65:5 82:23	17:1 23:19,23 25:20 28:17 29:13 31:2
30:25 31:3 33:1	144:23 155:21	122:14 123:7	Minear 1:11 54:23	134:9 135:19,22	38:1,9 57:25 59:23
41:5 61:3 71:10	157:9 159:14	124:14 128:22	55:25 74:20 75:8	137:14 145:17	62:3,10 74:5 76:23
72:12 90:11,14	176:17 177:17	131:23 132:18	76:14 167:11,12,19	161:15 168:19	78:7 82:4,18 95:13
115:15 123:8	178:16,23 180:14	138:9 143:22 151:9	167:24 168:1,3,8	172:5,11 174:7,20	102:8,8 113:13,19
198:24	194:16	152:8 153:9 170:25	169:5,13 170:5,13	179:3 197:6,11,14	117:17,20 118:16
managed 39:3	matters 7:14 36:13	191:11 201:4 206:8	171:2,7,9 175:1	197:21,22,25 198:8	145:16,20 152:9
management 24:13	57:20 58:22 59:9	214:18 216:19	177:21 178:4	199:2,3 200:2	157:22 166:16
31:4 85:7 86:3	128:4	219:7 221:5	179:19 188:15	more 8:24 9:7 11:13	167:8 172:6,10
128:4 150:25 163:2	maximise 220:18,25	Memorial 2:24 6:16	195:14 200:20	21:24 22:7,15 23:19	181:4 187:6,20
164:17 216:23	maximum 105:15	20:19,25 21:1,3	206:21 210:25	28:12 32:25 34:5	189:19,25 190:18
220:4,11,19	106:24 110:3	25:3,9 63:20 64:4	215:4,13 216:3	35:1 40:8,13,24	204:10 205:20
Manager 2:22	170:16 207:1	64:16,23 80:16	Minear's 188:4	46:3 59:10,13 60:13	214:16 215:13
manages 11:9	209:14 212:10	88:22 95:19 97:13	minimise 146:5	63:10 66:6 71:22	216:1,6 217:21
mandate 18:18 21:19	maybe 59:11,11 71:22	105:3 109:12 110:9	minimum 77:25 81:10	73:9 74:6,13 75:9	219:16 221:19,20
76:22 82:7 96:20	71:23 72:3 76:19	120:6 161:16	81:11,14,21 107:1	78:7 80:18 82:18,25	MUHAMMAD 2:5
165:7	160:12 185:22	170:15 196:4	185:2,3 209:17,19	83:9 84:5 88:6,13	3:13 118:19
mandated 48:3 86:24	MC 216:16	201:18 209:3	215:9	90:5 91:10 94:6	Muhammed 119:24
mandatory 93:4	McGowan 1:23	210:20 212:23	Ministry 2:4,5,6 1:11	97:7,16,25 103:10	mull 56:24
108:11,19 109:8	mean 55:10 107:1	memories 33:20	2:3 8:2 156:25	109:19 110:18	multiple 139:21 140:2
112:14	131:25 164:11	111:13	mini-case 31:4	111:11 112:25	multiplies 85:9
mangle 72:14	198:18 209:18,19	memory 38:24 52:6,7	minute 28:3 59:13	118:6,14,23 119:2	Murphy 1:10 189:9
manifold 85:10	meaningful 86:12	52:9 72:24 113:14	187:25 216:9	123:5 130:2 137:6,7	195:18 206:22
manipulate 85:15	means 21:17 84:21	168:16 170:8 189:5	minutes 19:19 118:23	145:20 157:7,15	210:25 213:6
87:13	85:12 100:7 112:11	213:6	119:2 152:14 153:1	164:25 167:4,10	Murphy's 188:18,21
manipulation 84:20	152:22 164:5	mention 11:16 62:2	190:7 216:5,17	176:8,9 180:1 183:9	must 10:17 11:16 13:4
manner 12:20 13:10	179:23	mentioned 15:19 16:4	218:13	186:3 190:25	18:13 36:5 42:8,8
23:25 36:20 85:16	meant 138:10 186:3	88:21 115:4 134:1	miss 163:24	192:11 195:9 210:1	44:15 46:13 52:17
85:20 87:12 92:14	measurement 100:11	158:3 164:11	missed 183:24 185:22	211:9,22 215:4	55:24 95:5 96:15
92:17 143:16	164:25	166:17 197:5 198:9	missing 35:16 146:18	216:7,10 217:4	126:25 128:11
160:23,23 183:6	measures 9:8 164:23	202:24	146:24	219:13	129:11 132:16
216:13	mechanism 112:16	menu 211:15,20	mission 151:12	Moreover 3:7 151:1	133:3 134:3 135:7
manpower 174:5	mechanisms 10:7	merely 152:1	misstep 91:12	morning 7:25 22:8	136:25 180:23
many 1:13 36:3 37:1	86:17,18 90:18	merits 1:7 4:23 6:16	mistake 91:11	28:5 31:11 32:11	195:21 208:7
65:14 72:17 103:13	media 62:12,14 82:16	8:10 10:1 11:1 18:1	mitigate 81:15 147:19	33:2 64:18,21 95:17	213:10,14,14,20
151:10 163:11	Mediating 114:9	36:15 46:23 55:12	163:4	97:2 112:20,23	MUSTANSAR 2:7
man-made 100:9,21	meet 126:17 137:20	55:15 178:11	mitigation 75:25	115:5 117:4 166:17	mutual 11:7 47:9
132:1	138:17 169:1	met 8:5 24:9 142:6	77:24 90:20	190:1,12 201:9	49:19 51:2 59:7
maps 80:15,19	meeting 49:7 137:3,13	Meteorological 165:4	MMD 209:19,23	211:11 216:11	127:14
March 2:25 6:15	137:16,23 138:7,10	method 182:11 214:1	mobilisation 173:17	221:14,16,19	mutually 10:10 13:2
138:13 139:15	138:21 139:5,12,14	214:10,11 methodology 207:1 12	mode 159:9	morning's 111:16	mélange 210:2
146:22 187:11	168:13,13,14,15,21	methodology 207:1,13	model 154:10,12,19	Morris 2:14 2:7 23:1	

Page 12
Trevor McGowan
Amended

	I				
N	NESPAK 169:10	37:3 50:22 58:21	162:20 167:15	97:21	16:21 17:2 24:1,22
Naeem 2:4 1:10 8:1	net 34:8	62:22,25 63:14 81:6	199:25 200:5	ones 71:19 185:25	25:1,2 32:18 60:7
	Netherlands 1:5 2:8,9	82:21 103:14,20	obligations 12:7,9	one-hour 160:3,6	63:4,5 90:9 113:10
name 7:25 13:19	2:10	104:5,16,17 105:2	65:1 66:17 81:5	one-off 89:23	113:25 115:1
67:15 119:21,23	network 156:12,16,18	105:11 106:16,22	88:4 93:15 94:18	one-size-fits-all 46:11	117:11 121:16
165:5	156:19	107:4 111:6 115:4	98:6 127:21 128:2	ongoing 137:24	134:15 145:6
namely 35:20 42:3				0 0	
50:3	neutral 7:1 9:19,23,24	141:19 142:9,9	130:3,5 132:8	only 4:10 16:6 19:8	170:25 185:8
narratives 90:25 91:1	11:9,11,13 33:7	187:12 207:5	133:10 143:21	21:11 29:6 55:19	197:24
narrow 14:4 20:21	34:25 40:12 41:2	211:21 215:20	152:4 169:20	60:13 65:5 70:11	opposed 18:2 134:13
nascent 108:7	46:21 47:12,18,20	216:5	173:22 186:11,12	86:12 87:2 89:11	178:16 207:3 212:2
Nasir 2:9 2:8	47:22,25 48:3,15,20	noted 6:15 25:3 80:2	196:9 200:15,15	91:2 100:12 101:25	opposite 90:11 200:17
	48:23,25 49:7,10,12	112:4 196:6 217:16	218:10	121:8 133:3 138:24	opposition 5:24 34:1
national 25:6 45:16,23	49:15,22,24 50:1,7	notes 79:19 89:4	observation 41:3 68:6	139:25 141:12	201:10,25
217:17 218:8	50:11,14,20,24	nothing 17:12 43:17	71:22 80:21 82:24	142:14 145:3	optimum 127:14
nationally 45:20		C			•
Nations 48:11 79:6	51:11,16,18,24	62:17 73:8 122:6	128:7 194:6 202:7	148:21 149:9 150:6	option 149:12
natural 128:15,17	52:13,16,23,24 53:5	139:9 172:9 175:11	observations 8:16	158:6,8 160:8,15	oral 23:24 25:9 26:2,4
176:25	53:6,17,19,23 54:13	notice 154:10	33:4,17 34:4 40:25	168:22 180:17	49:8 120:22 124:6
naturally 89:19	54:24 55:6,16,24	notices 138:24	47:4 80:20 88:6	181:20,21 185:25	order 4:22 5:5,7 6:3,7
nature 17:25 18:3	56:9,11,16,16 57:17	notification 151:2	194:4	186:1,4,17 197:24	7:5 10:10 11:2,6
	57:20 58:3,3,7,11	notified 163:21 204:13	observed 6:10 140:7	212:25 213:22	16:16 21:7 26:7
113:5 127:10	59:4,6 60:1,13,15	notify 132:15 167:16	140:11 142:10	onset 168:12,17	30:3,4 34:17 37:20
132:17,23 133:5	60:20,22,24 61:6,10	199:13	152:2.3	onto 80:7	38:7 41:13 46:14,23
136:17 150:22		noting 186:23 187:8	observer 6:9	onward 186:25	47:1,2 50:3 64:5
179:21 186:8,15	61:12,14,23 62:1,4		obstruction 100:9,12		-
199:16 213:8	62:8 63:9,23 64:3	novelty 21:14		onwards 162:7	93:7 118:21 119:8
214:13	115:6,7,10 118:9	November 142:11	100:21 132:1	open 3:9 33:22 59:5	121:17,22 147:17
navigating 43:21	169:15,24 170:2	now-independent	obvious 71:13 132:5	75:17 93:12,19,19	154:25 163:14,23
NE 169:23	206:15 207:12	67:1	obviously 27:5 72:5	144:19	164:9 173:1 178:11
near 144:10	209:9,11	NR 161:21	76:5 112:21 162:3	opening 3:2,18 7:13	186:10 201:19
nearly 123:2	never 57:7,8 70:1	nth 74:15	162:24 195:4	7:20,22 8:9 18:7	ordered 6:19
near-catastrophic	147:14 168:2	nuanced 84:6	occasion 167:15	22:14 23:5 34:7	ordering 6:23
65:4	182:13	nub 219:7	168:23	46:8 47:3 64:14	ordinance 61:9,14,20
neatly 36:20	new 3:10 14:6,11 52:4	nuclear 151:13	occasions 88:23	119:1 190:19	organisation 7:5
	55:1 74:22 75:24	number 19:4 31:7	occupy 22:16	210:21	47:11,13 49:17 59:8
necessarily 49:17 52:2	107:23,24 108:9,14	32:9,15 45:7 80:8	occurred 6:5 68:16	openly 145:20	organise 55:24
56:6,13,20 213:21	108:15 114:2,3,15	84:10,11,12 91:18	89:4 184:9 207:6	operate 42:12 43:10	organising 55:23
necessary 20:10 24:4	115:22 118:7 131:6	99:18 103:13	October 8:23 137:22	44:12 64:2 92:16	orient 31:8
27:5 31:25 37:25	131:15 132:7 133:9	108:18,23 114:10	140:24 141:4 148:9	111:5 175:13	orientate 102:11
61:9 64:5 130:17	133:18,22 135:17	115:15,16 116:20	159:20	operated 42:9 85:20	orientation 80:15
135:4,14	T	-		_	
necessitated 141:1	143:24 144:3	128:1 131:18 159:2	odds 46:4,4	123:20	111:13
need 7:14 10:22 15:8	145:25 167:22	175:7 176:15 191:3	off 13:9 44:4 65:6	operates 58:2	orienting 34:9
30:19 44:8 48:1	186:12 219:1	192:2 201:24	78:24 81:16 89:13	operating 87:9 92:21	origin 70:14 204:2
51:8 56:1 63:14	next 26:1 29:20 94:9	204:18 208:20,23	91:21 156:2 179:7	105:24 109:16	original 196:2 205:3
69:15 80:19 90:22	102:10 143:14	211:5 215:1	offer 16:15 25:14	156:12 203:8	originally 28:8
92:1 101:18 110:16	150:15 152:14	numbers 29:19	offered 168:4	205:24 208:25	originating 101:8
114:12 118:14	193:22 216:17	numerous 62:11	offering 138:20	210:6 213:8 217:2	origins 22:2 33:10
	nice 118:1	nuts 172:20	214:15	operation 5:14 12:15	64:8,15 94:12 97:1
152:24 157:7,15	nine 168:19 181:24	nutshell 54:22	office 2:7 1:21 36:6	24:19 32:2 41:10,16	201:24 205:17
163:14 179:25	nodding 214:23	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	163:20	41:19 42:4,15,16,23	origo 91:5
180:18,18,22	noises 78:13	0	official 13:3 118:9	44:19 45:15 86:12	other 3:14 6:20 10:7
187:21 189:13,25	none 187:18		officially 163:21	87:20 92:18 95:6	19:10 20:2 22:10
190:6 195:12	nonetheless 10:18	object 21:19 46:5	officials 78:25 163:22	104:3 108:7,24	31:12 32:16 37:18
208:25		96:18 130:17		,	
needed 65:15 208:12	non-availability 149:5	135:14	164:1	110:24 111:1 131:1	37:22 40:20 42:11
needs 90:5 117:13	non-compliance 88:3	objected 206:2	off-mark 57:3	133:9 135:3 147:5	43:1 53:21 57:10,12
145:16 181:3	non-conformity	objection 5:10 110:22	off-the-shelf 87:21	149:20,24 150:1,9	60:10 63:13 65:14
198:12,22 220:16	110:23	135:24 197:16	often 104:18	151:3 156:16	67:24 68:8 73:6,12
Neelum 81:18	non-interference	198:2	okay 117:4 120:9	196:19 218:12,21	73:13 74:17 75:14
Neelum-Jhelum 5:19	92:11 111:22 112:1	objections 6:1,3	167:19 169:13	operational 9:7 45:21	85:6 87:22 93:20
5:22 8:7 24:24 26:9	non-participation 3:9	135:19,22 153:25	175:23 185:18	63:5 109:5 111:8	96:11,16 98:13,16
26:20 32:10 41:4,8	3:11,15 4:5	174:19 180:23	189:19 190:9	154:22 155:21	101:8,15 103:20
	non-responsive 173:8	objective 6:23 16:17	omitted 114:10	operations 128:25	105:23 107:11,13
41:19	non-Treaty 82:5 94:4	76:21	once 36:9,23 56:17	161:14	112:14 124:4
Neelum-Kishenganga	non-Western 220:2	objects 69:19 144:20	96:9 102:25 113:24	operative 192:5	128:13,19 129:21
81:8	normal 104:24 164:4	· ·	132:25 137:6,21	operator 85:14	132:3 143:9 144:24
negative 13:25	164:5 216:6	obligation 99:8,14,15	155:14 169:2	opinion 123:17 124:6	145:7 146:10 147:6
negotiating 31:13	notably 97:14 126:16	100:1 126:16	172:18,21 173:2,12	145:16 171:1	157:2 158:5 160:5,7
65:16	131:19	127:24,25 129:17		199:12	
negotiation 65:10		132:15 133:1,21	173:18 174:2 186:8		161:4,6,7,19 163:15
negotiations 138:25	note 1:8,9 2:17,23	134:21 140:4	200:12	opportunities 176:5	164:8 165:1 168:5
neighbour 25:17	31:7 34:20 36:12	141:23 147:20	once-and-for-all	opportunity 7:11 15:4	170:14 175:20,25

Page 13

Trevor McGowan

Amended

177:6 181:14 185:1	205:18 206:18,25	pan 166:23	129:22 149:2 156:8	pending 142:22	persuade 140:3
185:23 188:22,23	207:19 209:24	pandemic 168:12,21	156:14,22 157:2	people 73:14 92:18	persuaded 213:19
188:25 193:7,13	215:7,21	188:5	200:16	156:10 174:2	pertaining 12:6
199:13,14,16	overall 14:12 84:11	panel 68:7 215:2	particulars 134:7	214:25	pervasive 93:17
203:16 206:20	126:20 149:15	papers 6:20	198:15	per 9:20 18:18 82:11	Peter 2:15 2:6 24:8
214:6,10 218:23	overarching 20:16	paragraphs 35:20	parties 3:5 5:16 10:12	99:22 121:6,12	petitum 196:4
others 23:9 38:22 71:2	overlooked 114:22	40:18 54:7 57:15	10:23 21:11 26:21	139:21 155:16	phase 1:7 3:1 4:24 5:3
89:3 106:11,25	overnight 27:9 112:24	60:2 68:1 77:10	34:1 46:18 49:8	159:17	6:16 8:9 9:25 10:2
181:16 191:20	overriding 46:16	81:20 97:14 108:21	57:23 60:18 65:3,13	perceive 11:24 83:21	11:1 18:1 20:3
	C				
otherwise 60:21,23	oversight 114:16	108:23,25 109:1	66:17 67:25 68:4,18	196:8	36:14 46:22 47:7
68:8 81:16 98:24	overview 123:25	110:13,20 111:20	70:15,22 74:19 84:7	perceived 94:12	55:12,14 62:24
175:6 195:3 211:18	own 11:8 17:24 28:4	111:23 123:5	93:20 94:19 95:20	Perfect 117:20	63:16 78:10 178:11
other's 182:6	30:22 44:22 49:16	129:10 130:25	95:23 96:2 97:22	perfectly 43:21	201:13,16,18
ourselves 185:10	112:23 144:25	131:5,9,10,12	98:4,5 112:17	perform 10:16 155:1	phases 4:23
out 4:15 8:19,24 10:14	160:25 162:12	133:17 134:20	125:25 126:8,12,24	179:22	Philippa 2:11 2:2
11:1 18:20 37:10	165:10 184:12	135:15,21 141:19	127:4,6,11,13,23,24	performed 10:17	philosophical 219:3
38:20 40:23 44:18	207:13 217:18	192:5 206:3 210:20	128:15 134:19	perhaps 1:22 18:23	philosophy 109:20
47:1 50:14,18 53:20	owner 173:3 174:13	210:21	137:11 143:7 145:5	19:16 27:17 29:5	phrase 200:9
62:2 91:4 101:1	o'clock 117:19 190:5,6	parallel 9:18,20 11:14	146:5,8 148:7	41:5 56:23,24 58:24	phrases 103:25
109:9 122:1 123:5		33:6 34:25 40:12	183:19,22 184:10	68:7 71:10 72:13,14	PIC 137:16 138:7,10
125:12 126:14	P	41:1 46:21 47:13	184:14,15 186:4,24	74:20 77:11,19	138:18,21
127:11,22 128:1	P 1:11	55:6	186:25 187:5	82:25 91:10 106:11	pick 18:7 26:8 64:20
129:6,10 132:9		paraphrase 126:23	199:21 200:23	117:5 150:10	picking 32:9
133:10 134:16	page 48:9,10 69:15	parcel 180:3	201:10,15,25	152:12 168:22	picture 62:2 97:9
135:4 136:10 140:5	72:16 80:17 99:2	parcel 180:3 parent 69:24	201:10,13,23	177:17 179:11,18	piers 100:15
	100:6 102:5 116:4,5	-		T	_
141:14 146:3	148:18 149:8	Parliament 64:24	203:4,6,14,17,22	181:25 183:24	pivot 42:17
149:23 150:1	194:22 196:25	Parliamentary 67:19	204:20 205:18	186:22,23 193:11	place 66:25 87:24
166:23 170:15	199:8	part 5:1 6:21,24 10:4	206:16,18,24 207:2	193:17 196:22,23	140:23 141:10,17
186:2 199:24	pages 20:25 22:4	21:3 33:18 34:25	207:6,12 209:7	206:9 221:8	142:3,7 148:9,16
201:21 210:22	114:10	42:7 45:23 47:15	210:17,18,24 212:7	period 17:10 37:13	149:20 168:22,24
211:24 213:1	painstaking 65:10	48:17,19,24 52:18	216:20 219:8	63:1 91:17 107:5,8	170:20 181:3
221:15	painted 84:1 97:9	56:4,21 64:8 73:25	220:13 221:3	107:16 111:4	185:12,12 186:6,9
outcome 97:11 207:25	Pakistani 8:17 15:17	81:13 98:20 107:21	partition 67:19 70:15	168:18 181:24	placed 218:20
outfit 156:23 165:5	38:12 41:17 65:7	107:22,23 108:16	70:16 89:18 91:9	194:9 202:15	placement 181:22
outfits 156:24	78:24 82:17 168:10	108:24 112:19	97:24	203:17,18,19	205:6 220:5
outflow 65:19	175:16,20 176:10	114:17 115:9 119:2	partitioned 64:24	204:12 207:19	places 126:10 131:18
outflows 148:13	180:10	123:16,18 124:8	66:20	208:9 211:25 212:2	plain 151:4 199:18
outlet 175:12 198:17	Pakistanis 13:24	126:10 133:8 136:4	parts 95:24 96:19	212:3,19 213:1,2,3	plainly 150:25
203:11		142:17 143:15	112:14 123:18	213:11,20,20,22	plan 29:9 30:25 156:4
outlets 30:11 87:11	Pakistan's 2:24 3:22	144:1 151:14 152:7	204:18	periodically 78:12	172:15,15,16
103:18 110:8,12	4:1,10,11 6:2 7:20	158:2 161:5 162:18	party 3:15 49:4 95:24	79:1	198:16 221:15
181:17 182:2,3	8:10,17,19 9:8,21	163:8 167:21 168:8	128:11,13,20,23	periods 44:13	planned 28:5 31:10
	11:5 13:20 14:15,15			-	
183:20 184:7 205:7	14:24 15:20 18:13	174:25 176:5 179:8	129:4,21 135:25	Permanent 1:4 2:19	45:7,21 130:19,22
220:6	20:19 22:15,20 23:6	179:16 180:3,4	146:10 147:3,7	6:25 35:21 54:5	130:23 131:14
outline 7:6 211:3	23:9 24:2,7 26:25	182:7 183:21 184:8	194:24 195:1	116:19 120:19,23	132:9,11 133:2
outlined 30:6 124:2	35:10 36:10 40:10	184:13 193:9 196:3	199:10,13,14,16	120:24 126:2	217:15 219:9,21
outset 15:17 185:20	40:15 45:10 46:8,14	196:4,16 204:24	pass 194:16	136:13,24 139:5	planning 84:9 133:1
outside 51:25 53:2	51:7 61:16 62:22	213:7 217:17	passage 69:10,16	151:22 153:22	plans 5:21 131:22
54:1,24 56:11,18	64:16,20 78:20 82:8	220:23	passive 220:19	158:14 179:17	132:15 199:10,14
154:4 182:15	83:10,11 86:21 87:3	partial 81:25 82:2	past 10:24 48:19	203:24	plant 5:20,22 8:7 9:6
outstanding 137:20	94:23,25 97:13	168:3 204:4	89:20 90:25 143:17	permeate 125:18	9:10,12,14 12:16
194:10	120:6 122:18,19	participate 6:7 9:22	157:13 216:8	permissible 43:14	20:5 38:24 41:19
over 8:20 12:7,10,12	140:9 141:19	participation 90:18	patches 25:15	217:1	42:23 44:13 52:19
12:13 15:2,22 23:9	144:18 147:10	particular 1:9 2:23	pattern 128:15 162:16	permissibly 92:14	53:9 105:25,25
25:20 28:20 51:5	151:25 152:2	4:18 5:2 20:4 22:9	pause 9:3,12 17:5 18:6	permission 1:23 30:19	108:6,9,14 130:13
56:24 66:20 67:2,4		23:16 25:20 30:3	48:11 111:2 122:11	114:16 117:7,8	130:15 132:7
71:9 74:18 82:23	153:25 158:24	31:23 32:15 33:20	152:16 188:2	195:8	133:22 134:1,5,11
83:5 84:9,23 87:5	161:16 162:16	45:20 48:8 52:19	paying 157:10	permissive 83:9 87:6	134:25 135:3,13,17
88:7 93:18,23 97:13	163:6 170:11,23	53:9 55:15 56:4	PCA 1:3 47:24 49:1	92:20 93:14	142:22 143:25
100:18 102:10	178:8,22 182:25				144:3 145:10,19
	183:1 185:15	57:22 72:8,9 73:4	61:1,7 62:8 PCIW 26:7 122:20	permit 99:16 100:2	,
120:22 123:10	186:15,19 188:6	75:11 76:4,18,24	PCIW 36:7 122:20	103:22	149:24 153:16
138:16 139:23	196:7 201:18 205:1	88:25 100:20	204:13,16 206:1	permitted 28:10 81:3	174:9 177:2 184:19
143:7,8,9,10,17	205:3 209:12,21	109:10 127:12	PCIW's 142:20	82:11 87:15 92:16	197:5,8,12 202:22
146:5 147:24,25	210:10 218:3,15	170:9 181:16	peace 1:4 13:19 67:8,9	95:3 116:10	208:23 209:1 213:8
151:13 157:12	219:25	184:25 208:23	67:16 76:24 77:13	personal 8:12	214:12,13 218:7,19
181:9 183:23 184:3	Pakistan-India 14:21	particularly 17:24	97:21 112:7	perspective 23:2 32:7	219:6
194:8 196:8 201:8	Pal 138:24	36:17 56:22 85:4	peaking 44:13 111:5	56:8 86:9,10 89:21	plants 5:15,17 9:5
202:11,25 205:11	Palace 1:4	109:18 128:20	213:8 220:24	166:21 175:17	14:7,11 20:8 24:18

Page 14

Trevor McGowan

Amended

44-11.42-8-53-10 62-5-932-109-912 107-13-23-25-109-11 115-13-101-115 13-101-12-19 13-13-10-12-19 13-13-13-12-19 13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-13-19 13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-1						
16.513 16.09 12.09 1881 1898-24 201-24 2	41.11 42.8 53.10	118:4 145:11 160:5	30-10-20-25 40-3	186:15 10 187:22	177·7 Q	63.17 64.3 78.11
1071-123-23-23-109-1 115-719-123-13-12-2-23-23-23-23-23-23-23-23-23-23-23-23-					· '	
1113-13-10-10-13-11 1313-10-10-13-11 1313-10-10-13-11 1313-10-13-11 1313-10-13-13-11 1313-10-13-13-15 1313-10-13-13-15 1313-10-13-13-15 1313-10-13-13-15 1313-10-13-13-15 1313-10-13-13-15 1313-10-13-13-15 1313-10-13-13-15 1313-10-13-13-15 1313-10-13-13-15 1313-10-13-13-15 1313-10-13-13-15 1313-13-13-13-15 1313-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13				_		
1331-01.21.9	1 1		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		1 1	
133101,219 politey 43:25 143:21 fel. 143 fel. 17 43:25 stil. 143:12 fel. 143 fel. 17 43:25 stil. 143:12 fel. 143:12 fel. 143:13 fel. 143:14				2 0		
14412 16619 16413 16417 16413 16413 16413 16417 16413 1641				1 2		
4328 8817 5124 2907 2818 2919 29			85:19 88:13 134:16	34:20 40:25 46:19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	205:14 207:24
1825.9.19.97.3	141:21 166:19	political 14:18 16:17	164:13	62:24 144:5		209:9,11 221:13
1825.9.19.97.3	174:5 177:3,7,14	43:25 88:17 151:24	power 5:20,22 8:7	preoccupied 34:22	principles 31:13 75:24	process 9:23 36:9 54:5
2014.1.4.200.24 106.10.1.1.5.20 106.21.2.0.23 107.2.1.8.1.7 106.2.2.0.23 106.2.2.0.2.2.2.2.2 109.2.2.2.2.2 109.2.2.2.2.2 109.2.2.2.2.2 109.2.2.2.2.2 109.2.2.2.2.2 109.2.2.2.2.2 109.2.2.2.2.2 109.2.2.2.2.2 109.2.2.2.2.2 109.2.2.2.2.2 109.2.2.2.2.2 109.2.2.2.2.2 109.2.2.2.2.2 109.2.2.2.2.2 106.2.2.2.3 106.2.2.2.3.2.2.2 106.2.2.2.3.2.2 106.2.2.2.3.2.2.2 106.2.2.2.3.2.2.2.2.2 106.2.2.2.3.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.	182:9,19 197:3	Pomper 6:9,13	13:7 30:12 32:13	preparation 34:24		54:23 55:1,4,6,7
2014.1.4.200.24 106.10.1.1.5.20 106.21.2.0.23 107.2.1.8.1.1 106.21.2.0.23 106.21.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2	218:5.18.22.23	pondage 87:10 104:21	87:11 92:4.12 99:21	37:16 38:14 165:15	125:23 208:5	61:13 65:16 69:22
plant-by-plant 20:15 play 219:17 play 229:17 play 229:18 play 229:		. 0	-		prior 6:22 17:20	
platform 10:20 110:411:22 170:16 106:12:20:23 107:14:19 109:24 110:46.15 125:13 127:13:16 127:13	· ·		-			
Pixe			1 1			
Pla-8-002 169-16 18212 18321 18212 18321 130-71 31315 13	_				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
PLA-0002 169:16 PLA-005 130:13 PLA-101 69:14 PLA-513 130:13 PLA-101 69:14 PLA-52 30:224 PLA-101 69:14 PLA-52 30:224 PLA-101 69:14 PLA-53 20:224 PLA-10 169:14 PLA-53 20:224 PLA-101 69:14 PLA-53 20:224 PLA-10 69:14 PLA-53 20:224 PLA-101 (22:10 PLA-53 20:224 PLA-53 20:224 PLA-54 (23:10 PLA-54 (24:10-12) PLA-54 (2 0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
PLA-953 190:13 205:24 2072-4,6.7 209:17.202 212:1 plasdings 2:20 17:15 plasdings	2 0		1 1		-	-
PIA510 fo9:14 20:15:20:17.8 20:17.20:22:12:1 18:01 prospect 18:01 problem 89:8 117:15 produce 6:20 problem 89:8 117:15 problem 89:8					-	
PLA-53 02:24 pleadings 2:20 17:15 64:4 please 15:9 25:21 190:14 122:10 please 15:9 25:21 190:17 194:22 190:17 194:22 190:17 196:22 pm 274 117:22.23.24 118:18 191-17 120:12 153:24 118:18 191-17 120:12 153:24 118:18 191-17 120:12 153:24 118:18 191-17 120:12 153:24 118:18 191-17 120:12 153:24 118:18 191-17 120:13 190:13.15 120:14 172:22 153:24 188:19 190:13.15 120:14 172:22 153:24 188:19 190:13.15 120:14 172:22 153:24 188:19 190:13.15 120:14 172:25 162:22 18:9 100:14:25 162:22 23:66 100:16 20:16 13.15 122 153:16 122 1125 153:26 1125 153:16 123 1125 153:16 123 1125 153:16 133 1125 153:16 133 1125 153:16 133 104:11 103:3 104:1						-
PLA-S3 20:224 2105.71.62 221.19 214.61.0 2155.7.9 244.61.0 2155.7.9 214.61.0 2155.7.9 221.11.0 21.0 214.61.0 2155.7.9 220.17.25 221.1.2 200.17.25 221.1.2 200.17.25 221.1.2 200.18						-
pleadings 2:20 17:15 6444 please 15-9 25:21 120:14 122:10 please 15-9 25:21 120:14 122:15 120:14 122:15 120:12 153:24 please 120:14 120:15 please						-
1.2 1.2					-	
please I5-9 25:21 59-22 119-132.1,25 120:14 122:10 188-8 189:11 190:17 194:22 201:7	pleadings 2:20 17:15	211:10 212:10	PowerPoint 120:3	presence 1:8,10	182:17 183:21	produced 1:23
please 15-9 25:21 215:22 2173 215:22 2173 25:20 36:13 373 39:9 40:9 61:16 25:11 131:16 27:11 131:16 27:11 131:16 27:11 131:16 27:11 131:16 27:11 131:16 27:11 131:16 27:11 131:16 27:11 131:16 27:11 131:16 27:11 131:16 27:11 131:16 27:11 131:16 27:11 131:16 27:11 131:16 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 144:10 27:11 131:17 27:11		214:6,10 215:5,7,9	122:11,16	present 4:16 18:11,15	184:8,13 216:10	production 6:24 61:17
59:22 119:13,21,25 120:14 122:10 185:8 189:11 190:17 194:22 201:7 pleasure 1:12 plugged 182:2 pm 27:4 117:22,23,24 pm 17:17 122:12 153:24, pm 17:18 19:17 122:12 153:24 pm 18:19 19:17 122:12 153:24 18:8 19 19:13,15 22 12:12 155:16 122,22 18:9 podium 7:19 14:24 155:6 16:22,22 18:9 podium 7:19 14:24 155:6 17:9 12:12 point 7:14 8:24,25 point 7:14 8:24,25 point 7:14 8:24,25 point 7:14 8:24,25 point 7:14 8:25 16:32,22 18:9 podium 7:19 14:24 15:6 17:7 10:2 182:6,18 18:7 19:15,17 27:10 28:6 33:22 38:20 39:7,17 4:15,21 28:7 19:15 138:16:14 18:7 19:15,17 27:10 28:6 33:22 38:20 39:7,17 4:13:15 20:12 10:2 182:6,18 18:7 19:15,17 27:10 28:6 33:22 38:20 39:7,17 4:13:15 20:12 10:2 182:6,18 18:7 19:15,17 27:10 28:6 33:22 38:20 39:7,17 4:13:15 11:13:14 34:2 2 10:17 25:16 13:3.15 20:12 11:13:14 34:2 2 18:16 19:3 22 11:25 13:8 16:14 18:7 11:15,17 27:10 28:6 33:22 38:20 39:7,17 4:13:25 11:25 13:8 16:14 18:11 18:3 14 18:11 18:3 14 18:11 18:3 14 18:11 18:3 16 18:11 18:3 16 18:11 18:3 16 18:11 18:3 16 18:11 18:3 16 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:11 18:3 16 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:11 18:3 16 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:11 18:3 16 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:11 18:3 16 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:11 18:3 16 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:11 18:3 16 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:11 18:3 16 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:11 18:3 16 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:11 18:3 16 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:11 18:3 16 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:11 18:3 16 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:11 18:3 16 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18:4 18:3 18:3 16:14 18			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-
12014 122-10 1901 152-34 1901 1901 1902 19			-		-	
Pol. 2 Pol. 3 P					-	-
2017 194:22 2018 203:3 205:24 217:2 2018 2018 25 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018		C				· ·
201.7 pools 87.9 pool 87.9 pool 87.9 pool 42:1 population 74:3.4.5 population 84:9.4 populous 163:13 pose 219:21 pose 219:21 pose 219:21 pose 219:21 pose 219:21 pose 219:21 pose 219:22 populous 163:13 pose 219:21 position 3:22,23 9:22 populous 163:13 position 3:22,23 9:22 populous 163:13 pose 219:21 position 3:22,23 9:22 populous 163:13 popul			1 1		•	
pleasure 1:12 plugged 182:2 pugged 182:2 pug						
population 74:3,4.5 population 84:3,4.5 population 149:4, populous 163:15 populations 149:4 populous 163:15 populations 149:4 populous 163:15 pose 219:21 pose 219:21 pose 219:21 pose 219:21 pose 219:21 position 3:22,23 9:22 point 7:14 8:24,25 point 7:14 8:24,2		-				
more continuation more	_	-				
18:18 119:17	1 00					
182:12 183:24 pose 29:21 pose 29:21 pose 29:21 postion 3:22,23 9:22 practicality 46:16 practicality 46:17 practicality 46:20 practicality 46:20 practicality 46:20 practicality 46:20 practicality 46	_					
188:19 190:13,15 posed 26:14 208:1 postition 3:22,23 9:22 15:25 16:22,22 18:9 podium 7:19 14:24 15:26 117:9 121:25 15:25 16:22,22 18:9 18:21,22 37:6 46:17 134:12 136:6 137.5 134:			-			
221:21	·	-		120:3 121:20 122:9		
Total Position P	188:19 190:13,15	posed 26:14 208:1	practicality 46:16	122:11,13,16 123:8	procedure 4:8 47:23	157:22 160:21
18:21.22 37:6 46:17 13:21 23 6:18 13:11 2 13:6 137:5 13:12 13:6 137:5 13:12 13:6 137:5 13:12 13:6 137:5 13:12 13:6 137:5 13:12 13:6 137:5 13:12 13:6 137:5 13:12 13:6 137:5 13:12 13:6 13:6 13:5 13:12 13:6 13:6 13:6 13:6 13:6 13:6 13:6 13:6	221:21	position 3:22,23 9:22	practically 186:3	123:21,22 124:2,8	48:4,14,15,22 50:4	161:3,24 162:10,23
15:6 17:9 121:25 50:5, 18 51:13, 16, 22 52:21 53:3 59:5 61:24 94:23, 25 70:14 71:15 73:19 97:14 94:24 77:15, 16 78:17 79:9 90:15, 22 91:10 90:15, 22 91:10 90:15, 22 91:10 90:15, 22 91:10 90:15, 22 91:10 90:15, 22 91:10 10:14 14:22 90:14 173:20, 21, 25 90:18 81:14 20:24 77:15, 16 78:17 90:58 78:18 79:14 84:14 20:24 77:15, 16 78:17 79:9 79:14 84:17 85:14 79:14 84:17 85:14 79:14 84:17 85:14 79:14 84:17 85:14 79:14 84:17 79:14 84:17 79:14 84:17 79:14 84:17 79:14	PO 50:19	15:25 16:22,22 18:9	practice 94:25 114:25	125:15 129:25	56:15 58:20 60:16	164:10,22 166:16
15:6 17:9 121:25 50:5, 18 51:13, 16, 22 52:21 53:3 59:5 61:24 94:23, 25 70:14 71:15 73:19 97:14 94:24 77:15, 16 78:17 79:9 90:15, 22 91:10 90:15, 22 91:10 90:15, 22 91:10 90:15, 22 91:10 90:15, 22 91:10 90:15, 22 91:10 10:14 14:22 90:14 173:20, 21, 25 90:18 81:14 20:24 77:15, 16 78:17 90:58 78:18 79:14 84:14 20:24 77:15, 16 78:17 79:9 79:14 84:17 85:14 79:14 84:17 85:14 79:14 84:17 85:14 79:14 84:17 85:14 79:14 84:17 79:14 84:17 79:14 84:17 79:14 84:17 79:14	podium 7:19 14:24	18:21,22 37:6 46:17	123:20 124:11	131:13 143:15	209:11	166:25 167:8 170:5
Doint 7:14 8:24,25 10:14,25 11:21,23 10:14,25 11:21,23 16:14 14:10 158:24 14:10 158:24 14:10 158:24 14:10 158:24 18:7 19:15,17 27:10 18:6,18 18:45,11,16 199:18 190:18,111,17,22 18:11 18:18 18:18 18:18 19:518 206:22 10:25 13:6 22:15 13:12 17 19:14 14:3 19:59 19:4 49:3 19:59 19:518 206:22 10:25 13:6 22:15 16:12 17:29 12:9 13:29 10:29 12:9 13:52 13:12 17 12:17 13:19	15:6 117:9 121:25	50:5.18 51:13.16.22	134:12 136:6 137:5	146:20 151:8	procedures 52:3 54:20	179:19 187:3
10:14,25 11:21,23 61:24 94:23,25 163:17 186:25 163:17 186:25 187:191:1,17 271:10 170:2 182:6,18 187:191:1,17 271:10 170:2 182:6,18 184:5,11,16 199:18 194:20 195:5 199:19 200:23 218:8 207:9,10,17,18 209:2,4,13 215:11 209:2,4,13 215:11 209:2,4,13 215:11 209:2,4,13 215:11 209:2,4,13 215:11 209:12,24 74:20 77:2 77:15,16 78:17 79:14 84:14 206:24 200:25 184:48 206:24 200:25 184:48 206:24 200:25 184:14 206:24 200:25 184:14 206:24 200:25 184:14 206:24 200:25 183:23 184:14 206:24 200:25 183:23 184:14 206:24 200:25 183:23 184:14 206:24 200:25 183:23 184:14 206:24 200:25 206:10 200:25 206:25					-	
11:25 13:8 16:14 18:7 19:15,17 27:10 18:6 33:22 38:20 39:7,17 41:5,21 42:2 46:8,19 53:5 60:12 62:1 63:13,15 60:12 62:1 63:13,15 64:20 71:6,7 72:2 72:12,24 74:20 77:2 77:15,16 78:1 79:9 79:14 84:7 86:9 90:15,22 91:10 90:15,22 91:10 173:20,21,25 possessing 3:20 possessing	-					
18:7 19:15,17 27:10		· ·				
28:6 33:22 38:20 39:7,17 41:5,21 42:2 46:8,19 53:5 54:22 59:10,12 60:8 60:12 62:1 63:13,15 64:20 71:6,7 72:2 72:12,24 74:20 77:2 77:15,16 78:1 79:9 79:14 84:7 86:9 90:15,22 91:10 97:18 99:24 101:1 103:3 104:11 105:16 107:4 108:1 115:16 188:16 15:18 11:16 15:24 187:4 15:21 187:6 15:21 187:6 15:21 187:6 15:21 187:6 15:21 187:6 15:21 187:6 15:21 187:6 15:21 187:6 15:21 187:6 15:21 187:6 15:21 187:6 15:21 187:6 15:21 187:6 15:21 187:6 15:21 187:6 15:21 170:23 171:5 163:12 187:6 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:5 170:23 171:7 56:5 63:21 170:61:1 170:61,17,18 181:12 170:61:1 18:14 182:8,18 170:16:1 18:14 182:8,18 170:16:2 170:23 18:8 170:24 187:4 170:33 104:11 170:32 194:14 170:33 104:11 170:32 194:14 170:33 104:11 170:32 194:14 170:33 104:11 170:32 194:14 170:34 184:15 11:16 170:32 194:14 170:34 184:15 11:16 170:32 194:14 170:34 184:15 11:16 170:32 194:14 170:34 184:15 11:16 170:32 194:14 170:34 184:15 11:16 170:32 194:14 170:34 184:15 11:16 170:32 194:14 170:34 184:15 11:16 170:32 194:14 170:34 184:15 11:16 170:32 194:14 170:34 184:15 11:16 170:32 194:14 170:34 184:15 11:16 170:32 194:14 170:34 184:15 11:16 170:32 194:14 170:34 184:15 11:16 170:32 194:14 170:34 184:15 18:18 170:39 170:23 171:5 170:21 184:14 18:18 170:39 171:79 170:23 171:5 170:23						
39:7,17 41:5,21 42:2 46:8,19 53:5 54:22 59:10,12 60:8 60:12 62:1 63:13,15 64:20 71:6,7 72:2 72:12,24 74:20 77:2 77:15,16 78:1 79:9 79:14 84:7 86:9 90:15,22 91:10 90:15,22 91:10 106:16 107:4 108:1 103:3 104:11 106:16 107:4 108:1 118:11 183:24 181:11 183:24 181:11 183:24 181:11 183:24 187:16 188:16 193:21 194:19 183:14 20:19 183:14 20:19 183:14 20:23 184:14 206:24 187:16 188:16 195:11,13 200:19 201:23 206:11 221:8 218:8 216:13 218:15 123:9 218:16 221:17 presented 20:24 37:14 23:9 presenting 124:9	1 T					
42:2 46:8,19 53:5 54:22 59:10,12 60:8 209:2,4,13 215:11 213:29 216:13 216:13 216:13 proceeded 5:21 proceeding 1:4 2:19 proceeding 1:4 9:10 17:20 21:30 17:11 18:11 18:9 proceeding 1:4 9:10 17:20 2:26 40:16 prolibition 185:14 proceeding 1:4 9:10 proced 1:51:1 proceding 1:4 9:10 17:20 2:26 40:16 proceding 1:4 9:10 proceding 1:4 9:10 17:20 2:26 40:16 proceding 1:4 9:10 17:20 2:26 40:16 proceding 1:4 9:10 17:20 2:26 40:16 proceding 1:4 9:10 17:20 2:26		, ,				•
54:22 59:10,12 60:8 60:12 62:1 63:13,15 64:20 71:6,7 72:2 72:12,24 74:20 77:2 77:15,16 78:1 79:9 79:14 84:7 86:9 90:15,22 91:10 90:15,22 91:10 106:16 107:4 108:1 115:14 144:22 158:16 153:8 176:16 188:16 188:16 188:16 193:22 194:14 181:11 183:24 190:19 106:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 181:11 183:24 190:19 106:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 181:11 183:24 190:19 106:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 115:7, 127:5 141:7 193:22 194:14 115:11 183:24 190:19 106:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 115:11 183:24 190:19 106:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 115:11 183:24 190:19 106:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 115:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 115:11 183:24 190:19 106:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 115:11 183:24 190:19 106:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 115:11 183:24 190:19 106:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 115:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 115:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 115:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 115:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 115:10 188:16 193:22 194:14 115:17 115:6 193:22 194:14 113:7, 7 127:5 141:7 193:22 194:14 113:7, 7 127:5 141:7 1163:12 187:6 163:13 184:15 11:16 162:4 175:11,13 200:19 183:14 184:14 206:22 185:16 185:18 185:14 185:11 185						• 0
60:12 62:1 63:13,15 64:20 71:6,7 72:2 72:12,24 74:20 77:2 77:15,16 78:1 79:9 90:15,22 91:10 97:18 99:24 101:1 106:16 107:4 108:1 1181:11 183:24 1181:12 10:19 1181:11 183:24 1181:11 183:24 1181:12 10:19 1181:12 10:19 1181:13 10:19 1181:14 144:22 1181:15 10:16 1181:15 10:16 1181:16 188:16 1181:16 188:16 1181:16 188:16 1181:16 188:16 1181:16 188:16 1181:16 188:16 1181:16 188:16 1181:16 188:16 1181:16 188:16 1181:181:19 1181:181:19 1181:11 183:24 1181:12 19:23 20:4 24:12.15 118:11 18:13 1181:11 181:12 118:11 181:12	•					
Positions 6:25 183:23 184:14 206:24 preamble 96:17 125:6 170:23 171:5 4:4 9:18 11:8,9 prohibited 150:9,10 prohibition 185:14 preambluar 192:5 precedence 180:12 preced		* *			-	
72:12,24 74:20 77:2 77:15,16 78:1 79:9 79:14 84:7 86:9 90:15,22 91:10 97:18 99:24 101:1 103:3 104:11 103:3 104:11 105:3 104:11 105:14 144:22 155:4 180:4 155:4 166:2 156:12 173:20,21,25 156:13 170:6,17,18 181:12 173:20,21,25 170:6,16 105:18 170:6,16 107:4 108:1 181:11 183:24 187:16 188:16 181:11 183:24 187:16 188:16 195:21 194:14 113:7,7 127:5 141:7 195:11,13 200:19 201:23 206:11 221:8 201:23 206:11 221:8 201:25 18:24 60:10 221:8 201:25 18:24 60:10 28:29 1:39 2:3 201:21 201:20 22:6 40:16 51:17 56:5 63:21 170:6,17,18 181:12 170:6,17,18 181:12 170:6,17,18 181:12 170:6,17,18 181:12 170:6,17,18 181:12 170:6,17,18 181:12 170:6,17,18 181:12 170:6,17,18 181:12 170:6,17,18 181:12 170:6,17,18 181:12 170:14,14,18,23 170:14,174:13,15 172:14,14,18,23 173:1,4 174:13,15 174:17,23 180:19 180:21 188:8 166:2 180:8 91:16 115:10 181:14 182:8,18 166:2 19resident 79:8 180:8 91:16 115:10 181:14 182:8,18 166:2 19resign 77:1 19retty 61:19 190:3 198:13 203:11 198:13 203:11 199:23 20:4 24:12,15 199:23 20:4 24:12,15 199:23 20:4 24:12,15 176:10 181:6,16 176:10 181:6,16 176:10 181:6,16 177:11 33:5,6 178:14 149:18 177:11 13:14 177:11 13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				•	1 0
77:15,16 78:1 79:9 79:14 84:7 86:9 90:15,22 91:10 90:15,22 91:10 173:20,21,25 possession 35:10 175:14 144:22 106:16 107:4 108:1 175:14 144:22 153:8 176:16 181:11 183:24 187:16 188:16 181:11 183:24 187:16 188:16 195:22 194:14 187:16 188:16 201:23 206:11 201:23 206:11 201:25 18:24 60:10 201:89:29 1:3 92:3 201:25 18:24 60:10 89:29 1:3 92:3 201:20 189:29 1:3 92:3 201:20 189:29 1:3 92:3 201:20 189:29 1:3 92:3 201:20 18:13 21:19 169:6,14 212:24 21:24 21:24 21:24 21:24 21:224 21:224 21:224 21:224 21:224 21:224 21:224 21:224 21:2224 21:227:11 33:5,6 22:22 27:11 33:5,6 23:16:22 27:11 33:5,6 23:18 24:10,13 23:8 23:8 24 21:		•	•			•
77:15,16 78:1 79:9 79:14 84:7 86:9 90:15,22 91:10 90:15,22 91:10 97:18 99:24 101:1 173:20,21,25 106:16 107:4 108:1 153:8 176:16 153:8 176:16 181:11 183:24 187:16 188:16 199:22 194:14 113:7,7 127:5 141:7 195:11,13 200:19 201:23 206:11 202:18 203:19 213 204:25 201:23 206:11 202:18 203:20 217:10 203:3 104:15 203:3 104:11 203:1 104:10 21:24 21						
90:15,22 91:10 possession 35:10 precedence 180:12 press 61:7 62:7,11 170:6,17,18 181:12 172:14,14,18,23 97:18 99:24 101:1 173:20,21,25 possessory 83:5 precipitation 165:18 80:8 91:16 115:10 181:14 182:8,18 173:1,4 174:13,15 106:16 107:4 108:1 106:16 107:4 108:1 possibilities 85:14 possibilities 85:14 precise 206:25 precise 206:25 pressing 77:1 precedengs 3:1 8:4 180:21 188:8 153:8 176:16 54:2 163:23 212:11 possible 28:2 38:2 precisely 23:2 39:21 87:24 115:20 pretty 61:19 190:3 8:10,15 9:17,20 projected 27:16 28:13 187:16 188:16 43:14 56:7 70:1 113:7,7 127:5 141:7 preclude 3:12,16 4:3 prevented 151:12 previous 131:4 139:18 25:12 27:11 33:5,6 projects 173:14 193:22 194:14 113:7,7 127:5 141:7 predecessor 140:2 previous 131:4 139:18 25:12 27:11 33:5,6 prompt 143:6 201:23 206:11 posted 61:1,7 115:6 postponeem 141:2 predecessor's 129:7 170:21 40:1,13 41:1,1,7 46:20,21 47:7,11,13 143:1 21:25 18:24 60:10 posture 90:1 posturing 78:13 predictive 156:4	T	-		156:12		
97:18 99:24 101:1 103:3 104:11 106:16 107:4 108:1 115:14 144:22 153:8 176:16 181:11 183:24 187:16 188:16 193:22 194:14 113:7,7 127:5 141:7 201:23 206:11 201:23 206:11 201:23 206:11 201:23 206:11 201:23 206:11 201:23 206:11 201:23 206:11 201:23 206:11 201:23 206:10 201:24 201:24 201:24 precedings 3:1 8:4 202:24 14:2 17:7,8,11 19:8 201:24 14:2 17:7,8,11 19:8 201:24 14:2 17:7,8,11 19:8 201:24 14:2 17:7,8,11 19:8 201:24 14:2 17:7,8,11 19:8 201:24 14:2 17:7,8,11 19:8 201:24 14:2 17:7,8,11 19:8 201:24 14:2 17:7,8,11 19:3 202:17:10 201:23 206:11 202:18 posted 61:1,7 115:6 201:3	79:14 84:7 86:9	possessing 3:20		President 79:8	121:19 169:6,14	145:7 171:23
103:3 104:11 106:16 107:4 108:1 106:16 107:4 108:1 115:14 144:22 125:38 176:16 122:24 123:20 217:10 201:23 206:11 201:28 201:23 206:11 201:28 201:23 203:39:21 201:28 201:23 203:39:21 201:28 201:23 203:39:30 201:20 201:23 203:39:30 201:20 201:23 203:30 201:20	90:15,22 91:10	possession 35:10	precedence 180:12	press 61:7 62:7,11	170:6,17,18 181:12	172:14,14,18,23
103:3 104:11 106:16 107:4 108:1 106:16 107:4 108:1 115:14 144:22 125:38 176:16 122:24 123:20 217:10 201:23 206:11 201:28 201:23 206:11 201:28 201:23 203:39:21 201:28 201:23 203:39:21 201:28 201:23 203:39:30 201:20 201:23 203:39:30 201:20 201:23 203:30 201:20	97:18 99:24 101:1	173:20,21,25	precipitation 165:18	80:8 91:16 115:10	181:14 182:8,18	173:1,4 174:13,15
106:16 107:4 108:1 15:14 144:22 possibilities 85:14 possibility 28:11 50:6 54:2 163:23 212:11 possible 28:2 38:2 183:14 187:16 188:16 193:22 194:14 113:7,7 127:5 141:7 163:12 187:6 possibly 38:8 200:18 201:23 206:11 201:23 206:11 201:23 206:11 201:23 183:14 4:15 11:16 12:25 18:24 60:10 posture 90:1						, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
possibility 28:11 50:6 54:2 163:23 212:11 possible 28:2 38:2 183:14 preclude 3:12,16 4:3 preclude 43:14 56:7 70:1 195:11,13 200:19 201:23 206:11 201:23 206:11 201:23 206:11 posted 61:1,7 115:6 postponement 141:1,2 posture 90:1 postur				2 0		
153:8 176:16 54:2 163:23 212:11 87:24 115:20 198:13 203:11 10:9,15,17 11:14 32:8 181:11 183:24 possible 28:2 38:2 183:14 preclude 3:12,16 4:3 prevented 151:12 19:23 20:4 24:12,15 176:10 181:6,16 193:22 194:14 113:7,7 127:5 141:7 163:12 187:6 preclude 3:12,16 4:3 previous 131:4 139:18 25:12 27:11 33:5,6 promote 126:7,20 201:23 206:11 possibly 38:8 200:18 predecessor 140:2 170:21 40:1,13 41:1,1,7 promptly 141:24 221:8 postponed 141:2 predecessor's 129:7 predictive 156:4 pre-1988 36:18 54:12,13 55:11,21 pronounce 153:15 12:25 18:24 60:10 posture 90:1 posture 90:1 premptive 25:14 prima 17:3 59:8 60:13,19 61:22 properly 17:16 18:4,8		-				
181:11 183:24 possible 28:2 38:2 183:14 212:24 14:2 17:7,8,11 19:8 projects 173:14 187:16 188:16 43:14 56:7 70:1 113:7,7 127:5 141:7 preclude 3:12,16 4:3 prevented 151:12 19:23 20:4 24:12,15 176:10 181:6,16 promote 126:7,20 promote 126:7,20 prompt 143:6		2		1 0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1 0
187:16 188:16 43:14 56:7 70:1 preclude 3:12,16 4:3 prevented 151:12 19:23 20:4 24:12,15 176:10 181:6,16 193:22 194:14 113:7,7 127:5 141:7 preclude 63:8 68:13 previous 131:4 139:18 25:12 27:11 33:5,6 promote 126:7,20 195:11,13 200:19 possibly 38:8 200:18 predecessor 140:2 170:21 40:1,13 41:1,1,7 promptly 141:24 221:8 postponed 141:2 predecessor's 129:7 predictive 156:4 pre-1988 36:18 54:12,13 55:11,21 pronounce 153:15 posture 90:1 posture 90:1 premptive 25:14 prima 177:3 55:23,24 57:9,10 50:24 properly 17:16 18:4,8						
193:22 194:14 195:11,13 200:19 201:23 206:11 213:20 217:10 221:8 posted 61:1,7 115:6 postponed 141:2 postponement 141:1,2 postponement 141:1,2 posture 90:1 89:2 91:3 92:3 precluded 63:8 68:13 precluded 63:8 68:13 precluded 63:8 68:13 previous 131:4 139:18 168:14 169:7 170:21 40:1,13 41:1,1,7 40:1,13 41:1,1,7 40:1,13 41:1,1,7 40:1,13 41:1,1,7 40:2,14 49:18 50:1 54:2,6 prompt 143:6 promptly 141:24 143:1 predictive 156:4 pre-1988 36:18 predictive 156:4 premptive 25:14 prima 177:3 primacy 94:15 primacy 94:15 promote 126:7,20 prompt 143:6 promptly 141:24 143:1 promote 126:7,20 prompt 143:6 promptly 141:24 promptly 141:24 143:1 promote 126:7,20 prompt 143:6 promptly 141:24 143:1 promote 126:7,20 prompt 143:6 promptly 141:24 143:1 promote 126:7,20 prompt 143:6 promptly 141:24 153:1 promote 126:7,20 prompt 143:6 promptly 14:24 15:11 15:4 169:7 15:4 169:4 169:7 15:4 169:4 169:7 15:4 169:4 169:7 15:4 169:4 169:7 15:4 169:4 169:7 15:4 169:4		•				1 0
195:11,13 200:19 163:12 187:6 precursor 65:9 168:14 169:7 35:1,6,11,15 39:17 prompt 143:6 201:23 206:11 possibly 38:8 200:18 predecessor 140:2 170:21 40:1,13 41:1,1,7 promptly 141:24 213:20 217:10 postponed 61:1,7 115:6 postponed 141:2 predecessor's 129:7 134:23 135:2 209:5 49:18 50:1 54:2,6 pronounce 153:15 points 3:18 4:15 11:16 postponement 141:1,2 predictive 156:4 pre-1988 36:18 54:12,13 55:11,21 proper 7:3 21:25 12:25 18:24 60:10 posturing 78:13 preemptively 15:1 prima 177:3 55:23,24 57:9,10 50:24 59:8 60:13,19 61:22 properly 17:16 18:4,8				_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
201:23 206:11 possibly 38:8 200:18 predecessor 140:2 170:21 40:1,13 41:1,1,7 promptly 141:24 213:20 217:10 posted 61:1,7 115:6 postponed 141:2 predecessor's 129:7 134:23 135:2 209:5 49:18 50:1 54:2,6 promounce 153:15 points 3:18 4:15 11:16 postponement 141:1,2 predictive 156:4 pre-1988 36:18 54:12,13 55:11,21 proper 7:3 21:25 12:25 18:24 60:10 posturing 78:13 preemptive 25:14 prima 177:3 55:23,24 57:9,10 50:24 89:2 91:3 92:3 posturing 78:13 preemptively 15:1 primacy 94:15 59:8 60:13,19 61:22 properly 17:16 18:4,8		,	-	_		• ′
213:20 217:10			-			
221:8 postponed 141:2 predecessor's 129:7 134:23 135:2 209:5 49:18 50:1 54:2,6 pronounce 153:15 points 3:18 4:15 11:16 postponement 141:1,2 predictive 156:4 pre-1988 36:18 54:12,13 55:11,21 proper 7:3 21:25 12:25 18:24 60:10 posture 90:1 preemptive 25:14 prima 177:3 55:23,24 57:9,10 50:24 89:2 91:3 92:3 posturing 78:13 preemptively 15:1 primacy 94:15 59:8 60:13,19 61:22 properly 17:16 18:4,8		2	-			
points 3:18 4:15 11:16 posponement 141:1,2 predictive 156:4 pre-1988 36:18 54:12,13 55:11,21 proper 7:3 21:25 12:25 18:24 60:10 posture 90:1 preemptive 25:14 prima 177:3 55:23,24 57:9,10 50:24 89:2 91:3 92:3 posturing 78:13 preemptively 15:1 primacy 94:15 59:8 60:13,19 61:22 properly 17:16 18:4,8		-				
12:25 18:24 60:10						
89:2 91:3 92:3 posturing 78:13 preemptively 15:1 primacy 94:15 59:8 60:13,19 61:22 properly 17:16 18:4,8	-		-	_		
		-		_		
106:22 116:17 post-hearing 39:14,16 prefer 162:10 183:4 primary 69:19 92:9 61:23 62:1,20 63:11 20:21 21:12 30:1	89:2 91:3 92:3		preemptively 15:1		59:8 60:13,19 61:22	properly 17:16 18:4,8
	106:22 116:17	post-hearing 39:14,16	prefer 162:10 183:4	primary 69:19 92:9	61:23 62:1,20 63:11	20:21 21:12 30:1
	1					
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

	1	1	ı	I	ı
47:14,17 48:17	155:19	114:17 117:12	71:2,23,23 78:18	24:21 31:22 32:8	211:15
49:22 52:19 72:22	provincial 89:10	124:17 125:11	90:17 103:23	42:20 43:17 214:21	realistic 180:19
76:7 142:4 212:11	91:12	133:15,17 150:25	105:12,17 113:9,11	rainfall 129:2,6	reality 44:16 84:5
property 149:2	provision 69:1 75:21	154:24 186:18	114:12 116:6	155:10 165:18,21	96:6
proportions 67:11	98:23 101:5,12,20	200:12 201:23	134:15 136:1	rainy 16:7	really 39:5 113:5
proposal 30:20 205:21	105:14,18 108:22	210:7 212:19	151:21 154:5	raise 23:16,18 25:1,2	184:1 203:19
	*	220:20		30:23 114:1 195:23	207:21 208:12
propose 5:17 19:19	110:11,11,21,25		169:13 170:9,11,14		
26:25 31:6 33:2	127:6,19 128:14	pursuant 1:1 6:6	171:3,14 177:21	198:2 212:8	real-time 62:11 166:1
39:18 97:25 102:7	129:18,23,24	135:18 139:17	178:4,13,14,21	raised 37:3 51:20	rearrange 152:12
111:10 129:9	130:16 134:12	150:8 189:1	179:4 182:16	52:19 118:5 174:19	rearranged 141:7
137:15	144:13 147:6	pursue 178:25 183:16	183:11 184:2	182:3 189:10 191:2	153:5
proposed 5:19 39:9,11	149:17 161:10	put 18:19 29:18 41:25	186:14,16,18 188:4	203:24 204:6	reason 22:3,4,22
39:12 130:14	178:1 200:3 203:14	47:24 56:14 60:9	188:11,17,18,21	214:20	39:18 42:2 43:8
134:25 135:12,16	provisions 10:11 13:1	61:3 63:20 77:11	189:9 195:5,14	raises 53:2 135:24	45:1 46:16 48:8
139:7 140:22	13:11 14:5 19:25	78:18 82:17 87:24	200:20,22 201:19	181:8	49:23 51:10 54:8
205:23	20:2,6 21:9,21	106:4 114:3,10,11	204:6,19 206:22	raising 54:6 109:16	55:19 57:11,25 58:9
proposes 30:4	33:21,24 50:17	178:4 181:3 185:11	211:1 212:18 215:5	Raja 2:4 1:10 8:1	59:2 60:14 71:11
prospective 173:9	57:12,15 58:16	189:7,11 191:15	215:18,19,23 216:1	range 31:19 76:19	144:1 150:9 162:15
protested 182:13	67:23 73:5 76:19,21	193:6 194:7 206:10	220:20	100:11 128:4	182:7 184:14
Protocol 6:6,14 24:25	93:6,6 98:13 99:1,8	209:25 211:4	questionable 80:22	208:24 220:10	186:24 193:1 195:2
41:13,14,22 60:25	102:1,7,19,22,23	212:17 215:2	questions 3:5,7,8,9,16	ranging 25:6	199:5 209:18
61:6 62:7 63:9	103:1 105:23	220:21	3:21 4:14,17,25 5:3	rapid 107:20	214:11,15
115:10	108:25 111:7,10	P-0058 147:12	10:3 15:7,11,13	rapture 67:10	reasonably 38:15
provenance 91:6 92:3	112:12 119:7 124:5	P-0184 140:6	18:2,19 21:6 23:11	rate 120:20	reasons 24:24 47:19
provide 11:16 23:8,25	124:7 125:12,17	P-0185 140:10	23:16,18 25:23 26:7	rather 4:6 18:25 19:1	49:20 59:25 74:11
25:10 31:12,16	133:18 136:2,4	P-0190 140:25	26:9,11,14 27:18	20:5 23:4 43:13	143:25 145:8 162:6
32:17 34:5,18 36:25	151:20 153:22	P-0192 141:8	31:18 32:15 41:23	44:10,13 45:20	196:15
40:4 82:21 86:25	158:18 172:7	P-0201 141:13	41:25 46:25 50:20	63:18 66:9,14 73:7	reassembled 59:21
116:19,23 117:1	173:22 177:25	P-0218 137:17	53:2 55:12 64:13	83:9,20 85:6 87:23	Recalibrating 219:14
129:11 133:10	185:6 192:6 195:1	P-0219 137:21	77:4 92:7 101:19	90:21 101:2,4,12,21	recall 28:8 32:14
134:8 136:5 138:3	198:14 203:2,5	P-0220 137:25	112:21,25 113:1,4,4	102:17 103:10	51:12 77:7,9,21
143:16,23 144:25	210:6 213:3,16	P-0328 138:1	121:14 126:23,25	110:25 121:1,7	90:20 118:20
146:23 147:15	218:6	P-0329 138:2	127:2 136:23	158:8 162:11	123:16 130:9
149:8 160:5,14	provoke 32:5	P-0331 148:4	152:10,13,15 153:9	174:20 183:10	188:25 192:8 200:8
161:18 166:1	préparatoires 27:25	P-0346 148:18 149:7	153:11,24 157:24	184:15 192:23	201:24 207:11
167:21,24 168:4,6,6	97:1	P-0567 129:8	167:10,13 177:20	199:6 211:9	213:4
171:4,9 177:15	public 25:6 49:3 61:22	P-0568 138:8	179:19 181:7	ratified 67:24	recalled 47:3
183:6 186:11 188:9	62:3,10,18 68:7	P-0569 138:20	183:13 187:18,25	Rationality 114:8	recalling 62:21
191:11 195:16	79:1 115:7,17 116:1	P-0571 146:14,22	189:18 190:3,8,23	Ratle 9:13 55:19 62:5	receipt 34:20 197:14
197:20 200:6	116:9 118:11 150:1	P-0572 146:14,25	190:24 191:3,8	86:23 141:16,20	receive 99:6 149:3,10
208:21 215:24	163:16 164:12	P-0573 146:14	199:20 201:4	Ravi 65:24 80:10,12	161:17,23 163:24
provided 28:23,25	publicly 47:23 61:4	P-0574 146:15	203:24 204:17,17	80:23 84:4 101:9,16	173:6,6,7 187:16
29:3 35:17 38:2	114:20 115:22	P-0575 150:3	204:20,21,23	124:20 149:3	received 3:2,4 135:21
100:12 101:22	118:10	P-0576 150:6	206:10,13,19	159:15 160:1	135:23 137:18
108:2 110:20	published 39:1 45:3	P-544 218:1	214:19 218:3	reach 8:25 145:2	142:14 145:16
129:15 133:3	47:23 62:7	P-549 47:25 60:17	quick 37:13	159:25 194:9	146:12 161:22
134:23 135:2	Punjab 65:6,7,9,19	P-550 49:2	quickly 36:21 102:11	217:23	receives 173:4
145:24 146:13,18	78:22,23,23 84:2	P-551 62:15	105:6 109:14 207:8	reached 3:23 4:18	receiving 163:25
146:19 147:14	88:8 89:5,6 90:24	P-556 62:15	quid 98:2	66:19 70:1 95:22	177:18
148:22,24 171:21	91:4	P-557 80:13	quite 37:17 38:19	160:16 191:14	recent 63:2 136:11,17
171:21 172:3	puns 65:18	P-561 80:13	45:12,22 50:4 52:13	193:14 194:8	137:10 142:5
182:25 197:19	purported 146:23	P-562 44:24	57:7 72:21 75:22	207:15	146:14 147:22
198:8,12,23 199:2	purportedly 48:16	P-565 79:15	77:21 78:3 100:18	reaches 174:22	149:20 150:24
207:12,15	purpose 21:20 22:3,13	P-566 79:15,18,25	106:11 108:13	reaction 89:2 90:5,8	184:4
provides 10:20 12:8	23:5 26:6 41:11	P-570 139:8	152:19 161:15	reactions 90:3	recently 62:4
69:2 109:22 110:12	42:14 43:20 46:5	P-586 206:5	163:5 164:7 170:18	read 20:1 44:17,18	recital 60:24 61:5
128:7,9,11 134:16	64:19 67:25 70:24		186:14 191:3 192:4	69:16 70:10 76:10	reckless 86:5
143:2 150:16	81:14 96:18 97:18		192:9 197:19 202:4	78:4 82:5 93:6 94:3	recognisance 30:22
155:18 159:3	111:12 123:8 126:5	qualified 122:21	210:22	122:1 169:17 210:5	recognises 125:24
161:12 181:1	133:23 146:7	qualify 169:24	quo 98:2	readily 69:11	128:6
197:23	156:20 163:10	quantity 148:23	quote 204:6	reading 77:19 81:25	recollect 170:8
providing 16:20 17:2	177:8	quantum 72:8	quotes 45:5	172:6,7 191:22	recollection 57:2,3
136:20 144:9 160:3	purposes 19:8 25:13	quantum 72:8 question 15:14,16,20		reads 81:5	113:22 192:4
160:22 162:15	30:23 31:1 36:1	20:7 21:9 22:19	R	ready 7:17 59:22	reconsider 3:8
167:7,22 168:1	38:14 61:12 74:7	23:4 26:19 33:13	Rabi 155:6	139:11	reconvene 95:16
170:6 176:8 188:12	75:12 80:6,15 91:3	39:15 50:12,15	radars 165:10 166:1,3	real 11:24 15:19 73:10	record 7:9 19:6 30:2
200:12	96:14 103:14	53:18 54:3 63:18	radio 159:5	85:11 88:7,19	35:5,9 38:22 50:23
provinces 89:8 155:18	104:18 106:1,3,9	64:14 68:24 69:22	Rae 2:15 2:6 24:8,15	148:24 206:6	60:16 61:4,23 63:16
1		07.14 00.24 07.22	xat 2.13 2.0 24.0,13		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

64:22 69:16 82:17 115:12,18 116:3 118:9 120:22 142:2 147:1 152:19 162:11,21 168:9 180:6,8 182:4 189:8 189:11 192:2 193:6 202:3 218:1,14	reflects 205:3 refrain 191:7 refresh 33:19 111:13 refusal 162:14,22 refused 148:19 169:2 refuses 87:15 144:18 regard 3:20 4:13 9:21 12:18 15:10,21	24:16 37:13 83:14 84:13 85:9 89:22 158:15 175:5 release 13:23 61:8 62:7 85:3,22,24 86:1 115:11 185:6 releases 150:7 relevance 33:14 34:2	reporter 2:13 reporting 80:9 reports 62:11,14 80:8 80:13 82:16 126:19 138:13 representative 1:21 representatives 6:11 126:13 152:23	resolve 127:1 137:20 143:11 153:24 180:16,23 206:18 resolved 9:22,25 50:15 135:18 136:1 153:25 171:20,20 resources 2:5 13:16 66:21 122:21,22,23	restrictions 133:8 218:21 rests 107:5 resubmit 118:6 result 4:5 18:10 45:22 128:19 135:1 149:8 resulted 13:12 resulting 85:21
recorded 50:2 218:4 218:15	17:24 18:14,19 20:5 23:3 30:2 36:12	36:2,11,16,21 37:25 39:22 64:11 94:11	REPRESENTED 2:17	122:24 123:3 164:8 166:22 174:4	resume 59:15 117:18 148:19 190:12
records 7:12 35:21	38:8 52:21 59:6	131:16 187:15	representing 1:9 2:18	respect 2:22 4:11 7:11	return 95:9 125:14
36:1,3,4,7,10 127:3	60:14 68:16 83:3	202:7 215:11	Republic 1:16,18 2:2	9:24 11:5,7 12:19	129:24
127:13 162:13 recounted 204:4	92:17 153:10 156:11 201:19	221:11 relevant 3:7 20:2,22	2:17 3:3,11,19 1:6,7 7:23 8:2 11:20 13:5	14:8 20:4 37:18 42:16 47:9,11,14,18	returning 111:14 reverse 30:13
rectification 69:23	regarding 19:18 26:19	21:4 35:22,23 37:1	190:20	48:23 49:19 50:1	review 36:2,11,24
70:8	50:5 60:4 62:1	37:22 39:5 61:15	request 4:1 5:8,8,9,11	51:3,22 54:10,12	39:22 96:3 139:1
redesign 26:20 redone 75:4	131:20,21 132:22 133:2 135:16	82:21 96:18 106:3 109:6,12,18,19	8:25 9:6,8,10,13 28:10 30:19 40:21	57:22 58:15 59:7 61:9,14 65:2,22	191:19 192:16,21 reviewed 36:16 37:2
reduce 159:24 164:24	143:24 147:16	123:12,17 125:17	51:7 115:13 128:23	66:17 68:12 70:25	180:8
176:14	148:13 202:22 203:25	133:16 161:17	132:21,22 141:24	82:24 90:10 93:16	revised 48:25
reduced 121:5,7,12 216:19	regardless 159:21	176:10 192:20 193:2 194:19 195:4	142:21 147:4 148:19 158:23	96:5 98:6,8,10 102:20 110:21	revisit 207:22 revisited 201:17
reduces 145:1	regards 12:14 22:20	196:18 200:13	178:9 195:22,25	111:3 113:12,20	rewrite 199:1,3
reduction 136:17,19	35:19 40:8 133:14	201:16	196:3 205:1,4	114:4 123:22 126:3	rewriting 76:3
Rees-Evans 2:13 3:14 3:17 2:1 27:24	region 5:13 24:14 44:22 45:2 154:16	reliability 166:13 reliance 51:1 115:24	requested 5:7 7:8 20:3 117:8 129:4,6 146:9	128:10 131:13 136:9 138:3 156:8	re-direct 3:17 27:23 187:20,20,21,23
64:17 96:25 119:13	156:1	164:24	147:10	181:13 187:13	188:1,3,20 189:17
119:15,18,22 120:8	registrar 5:24	relief 177:15 196:3 religious 73:15	requesting 19:23 146:18	197:19 204:14	re-examination 119:11
120:13 121:13 122:8 123:15	registry 2:12 35:8,14 117:7	relitigate 90:23 92:1	requests 86:21 138:6	205:14 206:17 217:25 219:5	RHEP 63:1,6,19,21
187:19,24 188:3,16	regret 2:17 8:12 23:23	rely 163:15 164:8	140:9 142:2,5,8,19	respected 74:10	right 12:10,11 50:25
188:20 189:4,7,13 189:18	regular 128:9 137:11 143:13,13	165:9,25 210:6 remain 94:19 172:15	162:17 188:6 require 18:4 23:19	respective 26:21 66:10 126:12 206:24	77:7 82:9 99:5,14 120:2 149:10 166:9
refer 22:10 38:22	regularly 126:18	181:7 209:7	26:6 36:15 56:13	respectively 131:21	195:2
114:18 147:25	137:1,4	remained 70:2 148:9	72:7 81:11 130:21	148:15	rightly 18:8
reference 14:16 21:19	regulate 13:15 regulated 41:17,20	148:16 194:10 204:23 207:2	190:25	respond 5:20 16:25	rights 10:22 12:6,9,10
25:13 45:17,24 49:21 50:7 69:24	42:5 125:4	remaining 61:25	required 8:16 15:2 17:25 18:3 29:21	25:25 48:12 56:23 57:1 115:1 170:11	12:11,13 46:14 65:1 65:20,22 66:16
77:10 79:13 82:6	regulates 42:6	204:23 205:15	43:10 48:15 54:8	171:14 178:20,22	70:12,22 71:15 83:5
84:11 87:21,23 94:3 96:20,20 99:10	regulating 106:2 125:13	remains 3:9 50:23 51:9 67:5 141:10	64:2 95:3,8 110:4 112:10 127:10	183:10,15 186:15 186:19 191:9	83:8,10,14,15 90:23 92:1,5 93:15 94:2
101:1 103:4 104:13	regulations 87:22	remarkable 197:20	129:15 134:24	responded 138:19	94:18 97:23 98:6,7
105:2 110:5 111:3	regulatory 42:9,25	remarks 3:1 2:16 7:13	147:7	146:21 183:8	98:9 151:13 169:20
114:7 115:16 116:10,14 118:10	44:18 114:19 rein 42:11	18:6 40:24 64:19 151:6 178:18	requirement 81:14 125:21 177:8	218:16 Respondent 17:12	169:21 202:13 rigorously 24:2
204:6 206:3 209:15	reinforces 99:13	200:22 201:6	requirements 87:23	23:22	rigour 92:14
217:18 219:12	reject 6:3	reminding 113:14	109:24 110:16	responding 170:2	riparian 13:6,7,21
referenced 33:12 146:24 188:11	rejecting 170:4 related 141:12 147:13	remiss 152:5 remit 52:25 55:17,18	125:18 130:15 133:14,16 135:13	response 3:2,4 6:2 13:13 26:6 61:16	15:25 80:3 84:19,24 91:15,15,22 92:4
197:1	157:3 184:24	162:3	146:11	137:18 141:5	93:13 127:9 128:21
references 19:10 47:2	relates 60:8 107:2	remotely 36:25	requires 22:1 74:9	146:25 149:13	129:24 167:15
47:4 188:10,13 referencing 79:18	188:4 197:11 relating 63:21 87:1	renew 89:7 160:12 186:4	96:14 132:10,12 134:8 147:15 179:9	159:22 163:15 164:9 179:18	Rippin 2:14 2:5 rise 17:21 19:16,20
204:8	116:22 131:11	renewal 160:10 186:5	209:20	187:10 188:6 189:9	54:1 171:10
referred 60:17 62:8	147:4 178:13	renewed 148:5 163:19	research 23:20	212:14 215:18,24	risen 79:5
75:19 127:5 138:24 142:9 192:3 204:3	185:23 188:22 199:15 205:5	renvoi 209:21 reopening 75:11	reservation 50:18 52:21	218:2 responses 26:13	rises 125:2 risk 11:24 15:19 78:19
204:22	relation 11:22 38:23	reorganisation 117:11	reserve 50:25	responsibilities	92:24 149:11 165:2
referring 19:4 37:19	55:22 126:22	repairs 108:22 135:5	reserved 51:13 59:5	126:12,15	166:22
172:4 refers 88:23 209:17	127:22 128:8 129:18,25 130:6,12	repeat 26:3 171:7 repeated 142:19	reserves 50:5 51:16 reservoir 128:25	responsibility 17:17 responsive 32:18 35:6	risked 149:21 risks 94:12 166:24
refilling 85:25	130:19,21 131:14	162:17	147:5 161:13	35:11 190:7	219:21
reflect 11:19 112:24	133:11 135:20,22	replacement 44:10	reservoirs 86:1 87:13	rest 1:22 33:1 83:13	river 80:10,12 81:9,12
220:2 reflected 26:24 30:17	142:2 188:17 200:6 relations 13:20 14:21	reply 49:6 report 126:18 138:11	93:8 129:20 155:11 resettlement 174:2	217:20 resting 210:11,12	81:12,17,18 85:9,19 125:2,3 128:18
42:18 66:9 96:12	74:19	138:16,23 139:14	resilience 157:7,17	restrain 9:9	134:10 139:24
98:3 reflecting 69:2	relationship 67:8 68:3 relatively 22:16 23:7	150:2 reported 139:4	resolution 126:22 136:23 143:4	restrict 13:22 94:24 restricted 43:11	140:24 145:10,15
Tenecung 09.2	1 Clauvely 22.10 23.7	1cported 139.4	130.23 143.4	168111C1CH 43.11	145:18 147:4,13

Page 17
Trevor McGowan
Amended

	T	T			1
148:8 149:24 154:8	salient 203:7	searching 37:10	Seeing 187:18	127:11,22 128:1	198:16
154:10 159:12,12	same 54:23 69:12	season 16:7 78:25	seek 24:2 27:20 79:2	129:6,10 132:9	shown 123:23 130:10
159:15,15 160:1,2	121:6 123:21	85:3 91:17 155:3,5	114:15 138:16	146:3 193:9	shows 147:22
172:5,12 174:8,12	160:10 180:12	155:6,7,7,13,17	seeking 14:9 71:6,15	sets 125:12 133:10	side 15:11 73:13,21
177:1 197:7 198:19	182:11,20 202:4	156:22 180:11	142:12 220:25	170:15 210:22	82:17 90:12,23
202:23 204:1,8	209:4 218:19	seasonal 155:2	seeks 4:25 87:8,10	setting 136:10 221:16	92:25 160:12
220:2	satisfaction 210:4	seasons 155:5,8	92:9,12	settle 143:1,5	163:24 168:20
River[s 218:24	satisfactory 43:23	seat 106:19	seem 25:15 39:4 83:20	settled 50:16 65:9	181:25 184:5
roadmap 22:7 32:25	95:6 104:3 218:11	seated 117:13,13	114:6	67:9 93:17 103:16	sides 65:21 71:1
roads 144:6	220:12	152:13	seemed 182:18	181:8	140:13 179:25
robust 86:17 179:21	satisfy 133:25 146:1	SEBASTIAN 2:21	seemingly 14:4	settlement 10:7 67:6	180:15 182:5
role 105:14 126:3,21	185:10 197:4	second 9:12 11:23	seems 71:5,12	86:16 90:18 95:22	217:24
170:5 192:24 193:3	save 60:20	23:21 33:10 34:24	seen 51:9 71:16	97:22 136:2 198:3	sight 38:15
room 15:2 18:16 38:13	saved 44:10	49:23 55:14 64:8	109:11 110:9	202:14	signal 216:7
90:12,23 92:25	saw 72:23 131:3 164:4	82:24 91:10 98:1	178:19 208:3	set-up 165:15	signed 112:17 138:14
117:12 152:21,24	192:18	113:11 114:15	212:22 214:22	seven 5:3 10:3 178:8	153:19 154:1
181:2	saying 16:11,18 71:8	121:2 123:11	sees 83:13	seven-day 213:15	significant 16:16
rooted 14:19 20:11	74:1 76:16 77:3,21	125:15 129:5	segment 211:4,5	several 88:23 89:2	31:21 45:11 75:25
83:4,12 88:8 98:19	182:19 211:8	130:25 132:24	segue 94:9	127:11 143:8 182:9	77:24 81:15 85:23
Ropar 160:2	says 46:15 50:10	135:3 143:18	seised 20:20 46:10	shadow 92:23	86:5 128:18 149:1
rotate 42:19	53:16 57:19 58:10	144:16 149:19	47:12 48:17 53:10	Shah 2:5 3:13,15 1:17	significantly 67:17
round 23:21 29:7,10	87:14,17 88:15	159:5,17 165:25	54:15 55:10 78:10	27:1,6,8,8,22 28:12	158:16 205:23
routed 165:22	106:9 182:11 192:4	167:20 168:25	80:6 92:8 96:3	113:6,15 117:7	207:16
row 1:25 2:5,7	192:9 194:22 197:2	176:16 188:17	112:9 195:20	118:2,17,19,23,25	signing 10:13
rule 21:16 73:19 92:10	199:9 209:13	196:20 217:1	196:10 202:1	119:1,9,11,13,19,24	silence 137:24 138:5
96:12 98:19 101:25	scale 20:12 27:6 45:16	Secondary 107:19	seismic 67:10	120:8,10,14 121:13	silent 162:21
103:6,9 111:21,25	219:11	109:24	seldom 43:6	121:16 122:3,7,10	silted 177:4
112:10 208:14	scarce 151:14	Secondly 31:20	selection 62:13	122:13,14 152:9,21	similar 144:24 161:18
rules 4:8 47:23 60:16	scarcer 151:15	second-round 23:17	self-denying 61:9,13	153:5 157:22	218:6
61:11,15 63:9 96:19	scenarios 56:7	Secretariat 7:25 35:14	61:20	167:12 175:3	similarly 3:2 178:10
209:11	schedule 28:13,16	Secretary 2:4,8,9,20	self-imposed 18:18	177:20 186:21	simple 86:10 162:14
ruling 3:12 61:19	54:19 144:20	1:11 8:1	senior 2:22 13:3 79:20	188:11 189:7,20	175:5 188:12
run 95:17 105:6	216:16	Secretary-General	sense 20:14 23:12	196:18 197:1,22	199:18
109:14 216:9	scheduled 28:8 49:9	35:13 79:8	30:13 34:8 38:1	198:8,24 202:18,24	simply 8:14 11:19
runoff 165:21,22	140:23	section 100:5	40:19 206:6 210:10	206:10 215:23	18:15 20:22 26:3
runs 24:17 80:2	scheme 27:12 28:24	Security 79:6,8	211:14	Shah's 28:3 95:18	29:21 30:13,21
203:19	30:5,21 31:6 32:19	sediment 24:13 85:6,7	sensitive 86:2	194:7	44:14 55:10,14 58:3
run-of-river 5:15	33:5 40:25 46:20,22	86:3 147:11 150:25	sent 140:2 141:21	shape 108:16 205:15	58:5 62:2 64:19
12:16 14:6,11 20:5	167:1 170:19	169:12 175:4,9,11	142:10 146:15	share 127:25 132:8	66:8,13 70:20 72:15
20:8 32:1,13 41:10	203:25 204:7 211:6	175:12,14,17,19,21	187:10	133:21 147:2 148:8	73:7 74:18 76:8
41:15,18 42:8,12,17	211:18	175:25 176:3,15,20	sentence 132:24	150:6 159:1,14	77:5 78:4 80:6
43:18 44:20 45:7,24	Schofield 2:20 117:2	176:22,24 191:1	169:17	160:18,21 163:17	82:11,21 83:21 95:3
46:13 53:10 86:11	scholarly 45:3	205:7 216:23 220:4	separate 141:23	164:4 172:10 176:9	97:6,18 98:17 105:2
87:2 93:2 95:5 96:6	scope 3:17 11:1 33:5	220:11,19	152:24 154:3	176:11 178:18	111:2,12 112:12
98:17 102:3 105:24	40:25 46:20,22 47:7	sedimentation 157:14	separated 14:12	179:3,9,12,13	114:16,22 116:10
107:23,24 108:9,14	47:15,18 48:17	sediments 176:10,19	September 39:12	shared 65:23 138:23	162:21 164:12
130:10,15 131:6,15	56:11 92:11,21	177:5,18	49:10 137:19 140:8	158:21 162:13	196:23 201:24
132:7 133:9,19,22	102:13 103:23	see 1:3,12,13 27:9	141:6 187:17	168:9 174:10,17	219:16
134:25 135:12,17	127:19 145:21	29:15,18 31:20	sequestered 27:9	178:19 179:17	simulates 166:6
143:24 145:25	179:25	32:20 38:6 40:6	152:18,22 189:22	shares 144:2	simulating 165:21
175:22 177:2,7,14	screen 19:12 48:10	48:3 60:23 61:5	series 48:11,20	sharing 145:13 159:3	simulation 169:12
197:3 206:20	49:11 50:9 98:25,25	71:10 79:18,19 80:8	serious 140:20 149:21	159:18,23	since 8:22 9:3 13:4
217:18 218:9,22	102:6 125:8	99:10,25 100:6	157:10 163:5	shepherded 65:16	34:20 51:20 63:4,6
219:4 220:23	script 18:24 120:4	103:4 104:9,12	served 13:18	shining 80:7	74:5 78:25 119:5
rupture 66:19,23	scripted 18:6 200:22	105:4 106:13 107:6	serves 38:25 52:6,9	short 27:10 59:19 65:5	120:25 121:6,8,10
	201:5	107:22 113:3	72:24 168:16 213:6	84:13 85:9 98:18	122:20 124:1
s	scripts 22:21	136:15 143:2	service 95:4,7	144:25 152:11	129:15 137:2 140:8
safeguard 46:14	scroll 198:5,6	147:11 149:25	serving 52:7	153:3 167:13	142:20,22 148:21
164:24	scrutinise 4:8	153:1 158:22,23	session 22:12 32:4	190:14 203:11	151:17 152:20
safety 150:18	scrutiny 18:12	161:16,20,20	111:16 153:6	shortages 86:2 155:20	156:16 163:25
Salal 38:24 149:24	se 9:20 82:11	162:12 164:20	190:16	shorter 32:9 168:15	179:14 191:14
150:8,11,20,24	Sea 124:25	166:23 176:23	sessions 24:20,21	shortform 191:6	206:10,11 216:4
151:5 153:14,14,16	sealed 112:13	177:1,3,10 179:18	set 4:1 5:4 8:19 11:1	shortly 23:4 35:2	single 141:17
153:19 181:23	seamlessly 159:20	179:24 182:4	18:20 22:14 23:6	40:14 83:23 180:20	sir 2:10 3:6,20 1:22
185:20 186:7	SEAN 1:10	194:22 198:6	37:19 38:7 47:1	200:25	7:15,16 8:18 11:12
188:23 191:25	search 35:25 40:15,17	209:10 210:22	50:18 72:10 86:20	show 83:24 154:14	13:17 16:2,25 17:3
192:1 202:22 203:6	searchable 36:22	211:3 214:23	91:23 92:20 109:9	showed 91:7	17:4,5 29:2,13 31:2
203:7	searches 39:21	221:18	119:7 123:5 126:13	showing 80:16 137:10	37:7 38:9 51:20
203.7				_	
<u></u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			

			I	I	I
52:5 54:23 55:3	small 60:3,10 79:14	141:17	starkly 46:4	stone 72:10 91:23	147:21 150:11
56:3 57:1 58:23	84:10 107:9 109:1	speak 15:17 28:15	start 8:6 27:11 34:13	stood 140:7	175:5 190:2 205:8
59:1,17,22,23 71:2	120:16 131:8,11	122:5 162:10	40:24 55:4 112:5	stop 81:3 82:11 167:8	209:5
72:1 75:8 77:7	smartly 16:9	186:21	145:7 157:25	216:8 221:8	submission 2:24 11:17
88:21 90:4 106:20	smile 214:24	speaking 13:3 185:13	159:18 160:3	stoppage 89:14,16	29:20 39:14,16,19
113:3,13 116:16,25	snow 129:2 155:10	speaks 32:11	171:24 172:5,12	stoppages 88:2	39:20,25 40:3 95:19
117:5,17,20,21	156:13	special 17:10 18:4	173:22,23 174:7,12	stopped 158:4 161:15	submissions 8:20
118:5,16 152:17	solar 32:14	68:10 70:23 73:9	176:20 177:18	stopping 80:11,23	11:18,19 22:5,8,11
166:17 167:5	solemnly 122:4	78:15 110:16	200:5	84:4	22:14,25 23:5,17,24
178:22 189:24	Solomonic 66:7	126:17 136:21	started 162:1 171:22	stops 172:9	24:7 25:10,15,18,24
190:2,17,18,21	solutions 43:7	140:12 142:1,20,21	171:23	storage 36:5 84:25	26:1,3,4,5,11,13,15
193:10,21 201:8	some 15:18 22:15,25	150:11 185:8 188:7	starting 12:2 108:1	85:21,25 92:11 93:7	27:13,14,16 28:4,24
·					
212:13 215:4,13	23:13,14 29:17	specific 15:23 16:18	138:12 154:14	101:23,25 102:1,2	29:16,17,22 30:5,10
216:4,14 221:20	30:15 33:4,16,24	77:4 161:10 164:20	159:19 175:3	104:7,8,19,20,20	30:11,14,15,21 31:9
sit 27:4 190:4	34:8,12 35:13 36:5	164:23 165:5	221:15	105:8,9,21,25	31:10,12,15,19,21
site 5:13,24 6:4,4,6,8	36:16 37:11 38:6	188:10	starts 162:5 174:4,6	109:24 110:8	32:20,21 33:1,19
6:10,12,13,13 8:6	40:24 41:23 56:17	specifically 129:3	state 73:11,12,16	111:22 112:1	34:6,7,10 46:8 49:8
24:9,24,25,25 26:9	58:2 61:18 77:4,22	192:4,9 193:3	140:14 170:19	150:17 155:11	56:22 64:1,18 66:7
32:10 34:24 41:4,8	82:1 83:5 86:8 90:8	213:12	192:23 195:21	175:7,9,13,15,18	77:14 78:19 94:7,21
41:13,14,22,22	97:12 103:14 109:4	specifications 200:4	197:20	176:14,17,21	96:24,25 100:18
60:25 61:6,8,12	110:18 111:6 113:8	specificity 186:11	stated 41:12 68:24	177:10,13,16 203:8	101:18 110:10
62:5,6,6,12,22 63:3	113:23 114:11	specified 129:13 197:9	95:1 170:3	203:9 214:13 217:2	113:17 115:4,15
63:4,8 110:16 115:9	115:20 124:8 130:3	197:15	statement 3:2,18 7:20	220:18,24	202:6,25 207:21
115:10 141:20	143:4 144:5 146:14	spectrum 76:3	7:22 8:13 16:4 49:5	storages 157:11,12,16	208:3 211:3,19
142:4 164:19	148:25 157:5,18	speculation 56:21	103:6,6 110:20	157:18	214:16 216:17
173:18,19,20,21,25	160:5 164:12	spend 124:8 191:2	119:4,5 120:4,5,15	store 87:8 88:13 92:16	217:12 221:7
213:5	169:11 173:15	211:10	120:18 121:3,4	101:23 175:17,24	submit 2:20,25 7:9,11
sites 63:1 86:23	176:9 179:13	spending 25:20	123:6,10,12,16,17	217:5	39:11 40:2 126:18
141:12,15 175:16	183:12 188:8 191:2	spent 151:9	123:18 125:9	stored 13:23 85:1	173:16
176:13,21	191:5 194:2,8,10	spillway 198:16,21	127:19 128:1 130:1	175:19	submitted 35:5,9
sits 28:3	196:14 202:5	203:10,10	131:10 134:12	straddle 93:16	40:12 62:23 119:5
sitting 1:24 208:11,14	205:15 206:23	spillways 30:12 43:10	136:11 137:10	straight 162:22,22	120:5
situate 8:14	208:4 209:5 210:9	87:11 103:19	138:4 149:19	straightforward 54:8	subparagraph 107:6
situating 211:6	211:2 213:5	110:14 181:22	157:23 161:16	198:13	112:3 127:16
situation 9:15 56:7	somehow 18:16 189:4	183:20 184:7 205:7	169:15 170:1	straitjacket 42:15,16	131:19,20 178:12
139:19	199:23	220:6	171:15 177:23	stream 166:7	subparagraphs 20:22
six 9:8 65:22 66:13,18	something 33:9 54:24	spirit 10:12 12:21	179:1 181:5 190:19	strengthen 10:14	21:4 26:17 32:22
123:24 124:16	72:15 73:7 78:15	113:25 126:1,2	209:8,13 218:16,17	18:14,17	47:5 94:22 99:4
134:9 145:17 154:8	104:16 154:3	145:4 149:15	statements 79:1 84:3	stress 82:20	216:24 217:6
172:5,11 174:7,20	162:18 171:22	158:16 180:2	88:9 124:9	stretches 84:13 85:9	subsequent 22:23
179:3 197:6,11,21	173:15,25 175:18	spoke 77:25	states 65:2,23 66:20	strict 60:19	76:8 119:4 146:24
197:22 198:8 200:2	179:5 181:2,23	spoker 177:24	67:1,4 73:8 74:25	strictly 42:5 170:6	173:21 186:5 187:1
204:16,19,19	185:15 191:17	sporadic 160:23	75:1 91:8 126:4	strings 161:21	187:4,4 191:5
six-hour 159:20	192:19 212:5,20	spurious 136:21 142:6	150:12 151:13	strings 101.21 strong 45:23 217:16	193:23,24 194:20
size 45:16 217:1	214:13 216:2	square-bracketed	179:22 218:20	strongly 163:6 179:20	195:5,5
skill 173:10	221:13	29:19	state-owned 169:9	struck 12:5 21:11	subsequently 39:2
	sometimes 88:17	stability 69:6,20 70:9	station 166:8		88:9 140:22 141:1
skipped 189:5	139:22			66:18 76:6 98:5	
skirted 57:4		70:24 71:6,25 72:12 74:8.15 91:24	stations 156:12,13 159:11 161:13.20	112:17 212:4 215:23	148:5 153:24 160:9
skirting 25:20	somewhere 44:22 45:2	,	159:11 161:13,20 164:25 166:9		160:20 204:2,15,21
slide 122:16 123:22,23	217:13	stable 70:3		structure 24:25 32:4	208:16
124:12 125:5,8,10	soon 141:7	stage 77:11 86:14	status 11:21 12:24	123:23 185:6	substance 66:11
125:21 126:15	Sorry 171:6	108:8 133:1 144:19	51:16 68:10 70:24	structured 23:24	substantial 145:11
127:3,20 128:1,3	sort 28:9 30:20 39:1	145:10,13 172:11	78:5	24:20 55:11	substantially 30:8
130:2,9,11,18,20	72:14 75:20 83:5	172:24,25 174:9,13	steep 177:1	studies 107:7	144:8
131:17 133:20	173:17 192:23	174:24 211:17	steeper 177:15	study 156:24 172:16	substantive 8:19
134:20 135:10	203:18 213:24	stages 172:14 180:21	stem 176:14	172:17	14:16,25 34:14
136:3,12,25 138:5	214:2	180:25	step 172:24	stuff 211:15	40:24 46:8 53:25
139:16 142:24	sorts 52:8 193:18	stance 174:21	Stephen 2:12 2:1 6:9	stumble 191:20	66:14 90:5 112:19
143:2,18 149:18	sound 95:6 104:1,2	stand 21:10 28:4	74:12	stumbled 191:18	113:5 201:8
150:3,15,15,16	218:10 220:12	49:14 93:9 120:1	steps 174:10,23	192:15 193:4	successful 127:7
151:6 181:5 208:13	sounds 90:20 188:2	140:19 183:5 189:5	180:21	stunt 94:24	140:17
slides 122:11 131:4	212:6	standard 37:19 42:24	sticking 184:11,15	subcontinent 64:23	successfully 174:3
149:25	source 70:25 151:16	76:17 218:23	still 29:9 35:16 36:6	subheading 102:15	sudden 72:9 75:15
slight 30:4,20	sources 101:8,15	standards 45:17	70:2 132:21 139:13	subject 4:24 9:23	160:11
slightly 72:13 77:20	150:1 163:15	219:12,14 220:1	139:15 140:19	61:19 63:23 65:25	suffice 21:8
207:23	Sovereign 169:21	standing 117:9	143:5 157:5 163:19	66:3 67:22 78:14	sufficient 171:21
slopes 177:1,15	so-called 161:22	stands 13:19 14:20	179:12 200:5	98:8,9 102:22 103:1	181:1 188:13
sluicing 85:6	space 53:15 59:9	161:21	stockpiling 144:6	109:10 119:7	sufficiently 146:1
		•			-

Page 19
Trevor McGowan
Amended

	1	1	1	1	·
suggest 139:11	112:21 113:1,9,15	termination 67:24	think 7:16,16 16:21	38:5 39:3 43:11	78:8 90:6 94:7
suggested 5:12 215:9	118:15 123:23	68:12 69:4 78:12	19:2,8 28:6,14,22	54:5 55:2 72:22	95:17 96:24 97:2
suggesting 29:12	129:9 140:23 156:5	terms 22:1,9 46:23	29:11,18 30:9,24	73:3 75:23 99:1	112:20,23 114:18
SULJUK 2:7	163:11 167:4	52:13 55:5 82:18,19	35:15 38:22 39:12	102:7 105:6 107:21	216:11,15 219:24
summer 5:12 155:6	168:22,24 185:12	90:2 93:22 97:6	48:18 52:9,11 58:17	109:8,9,14 124:22	221:14,16,17,19
156:22	186:6 189:23 190:9	98:3,12 103:25	59:21 66:5 72:12	136:17,18,20,22	tomorrow's 216:16
supercomputers	196:23 198:6 199:6	104:19,23,25 105:5	75:9 76:5 77:2,3,7,8	139:10 158:20	topic 94:9 95:10
208:11	204:5 216:1	105:7 114:23,24	77:16 89:21 90:6,12	159:5 165:2 175:22	123:25 124:4,6
Supplemental 4:7	taken 18:5,17 51:22	136:7 149:13	91:10 99:24 106:20	176:4 183:25	136:3,5 142:14
61:11,15 63:9	60:2 66:25 71:7	151:20 157:7,10	110:19 112:20	190:11 198:14	201:8 221:10
-		•			
supplementary 21:17	77:2 127:8,9 142:3	165:15 180:1 196:1	113:3,11 114:4,9,17	203:20,20 205:12	topics 27:14 33:2
47:22 60:15 96:20	143:10 164:23	209:25	115:11 117:2,4	212:24 214:4 220:4	34:14 64:8 123:24
112:11 209:10	194:9 208:6 218:7	territorial 67:3 70:22	152:21 153:5 158:1	throughout 24:14	124:4
supplemented 98:13	takes 53:15,21,25 83:7	territory 93:18 156:15	162:2 167:18	118:11 165:22	topographical 42:25
supplied 134:4	84:6,25 173:11,15	terrorism 82:19	175:14 176:7	throwing 44:4	total 45:9,13
supplies 89:12	173:20 174:1 207:9	test 24:2	177:21 178:2,6,14	Thursday 32:3 201:1	totally 219:23
supply 45:10 78:23	taking 19:9 80:18 89:7	tested 48:24	182:10 183:9,14,17	211:5 221:7	touch 139:6
	S				
132:16 133:1 147:7	142:7 152:11 156:7	testimony 118:17	184:22 185:19	tier 165:25 166:7,12	touching 84:17
148:2,20 199:14	203:2,14,17 207:23	120:22 124:6 153:7	186:14,21 187:11	166:13	tour 121:9 139:25
suppose 56:5 91:2	talk 74:12 176:11	177:24 189:21,22	188:18 189:13	tight 42:9	140:1,22 141:3,6,11
187:17 194:3	talking 154:8 175:21	Thailand 69:10	190:22 191:2,4,16	tightly 12:17 68:20	141:25 142:1,21
196:15 203:19	181:14	thank 1:16 2:10 15:3,5	192:21 193:1	time 1:14 2:14 16:15	185:8
213:10 221:17	talks 178:12 210:4	16:20 17:1,3,5 29:2	195:11,13,17,21	25:21 27:21 28:6	tours 86:22,23 121:5
Surcharge 105:21	tandem 40:16	29:13 31:2 37:7	196:24 198:24	29:19,21 31:21 32:9	121:11 126:17
109:24	Tanweer 2:8 2:9	38:9 55:25 59:17,23	199:6 201:3 202:24	37:13 63:3 68:17	136:20,21 139:16
		,			
sure 15:6 30:1 35:17	Tanzi 2:12 1:24	72:1 76:14 90:4	206:9 208:17	71:9 74:18 84:25	139:20 140:5,7,12
62:19 106:15 193:8	Tarar 2:7 1:20	113:3,13,18 116:16	212:16 214:1,3,4	93:24 102:9 113:7,8	140:15 142:3,18
202:3	Tarbela 175:11,20	117:17,20,21	215:1,8,16 216:10	117:19 124:8	143:13 168:7 169:4
surface 75:2,3	176:12	118:16 119:15,22	216:12 217:11	142:14 143:3,12	188:7
surprise 139:9 145:14	Tariq 2:13 2:6	119:22 120:8,13	220:20	144:2,14 148:24	towards 107:6 172:23
susceptible 71:19	task 10:16,17 14:22	121:13 122:3,7,10	thinking 40:1 54:22	157:15 165:20	town 73:13,14
suspect 216:14	20:10,21 33:14 43:4	122:14 152:8,9	74:25 82:2 211:25	166:15 168:15	traced 201:14
sustainability 31:14	43:12 64:11 83:25	153:7,12 154:17	212:21	169:8 171:21 172:1	track 113:18 184:18
Sutlej 65:24 101:10,16	94:13,14 110:1	157:19,20,22 161:3	thinks 187:21 189:25	173:11,15 174:1,16	trajectory 29:22
					u i
124:21 148:14	193:17	161:24 162:23	third 11:25 32:19	174:22 176:17,18	tranche 27:16 40:2
149:3 159:15 160:2	tasks 23:25 167:3	164:10,22 166:16	33:15 49:7 51:10	177:17 181:10	transboundary 66:21
swept 9:11	taster 211:15,20	166:25 167:8,12	59:2 95:10 98:14	183:23 187:16,21	70:13
Syed 2:5 3:13 1:17	team 1:23 23:9 35:24	169:5 170:13 171:2	111:17 131:4 139:7	189:25 191:3	transcript 1:23 104:11
118:19 119:24	36:2,11 38:12,12	175:1 176:7 179:11	159:6 166:7,12	207:20 211:25	105:2 116:4 178:20
synoptic 165:9	39:2 43:12 152:1	181:4 182:23	176:21 196:22	212:2,3,19 213:1,2	179:18 183:25
system 32:13 41:11	167:2 179:11 215:5	187:24 188:1,2,15	though 18:13 23:12	213:11 215:7 216:6	transferred 36:6
124:15,16 125:1	215:14,16	188:16 189:4,7,19	31:8 73:17 77:8	timeline 39:11 172:1	transition 152:10
157:8 166:5	teams 34:22 65:13	189:20 190:12,18	86:23 94:10 107:4	timelines 180:24	transmit 128:12
systematic 89:24	technical 2:14,15 6:12	193:10,21 215:13	109:7 113:22 191:8	timeliness 37:17	transparency 125:19
	,				
183:6	14:5,10 147:9 170:7	216:3,14 221:19,20	216:12	timely 143:16,23	125:22
systematically 3:18	170:7,23 173:10	thanked 180:10	thought 163:8 176:4	145:1	transparent 134:14
86:25 212:24	183:1 198:1	thankful 179:12	178:17 192:18	times 88:22 139:3,21	transport 175:22
systemic 4:25 20:11	Technology 122:25	their 5:17 17:19 24:19	210:15	164:18,20 171:18	176:15
53:8 55:12 63:17	telegrams 159:6	26:11,13 43:7,21	thousands 37:1	173:7,24 177:10	trap 176:3,24
205:8 206:19 217:8	telephonic 159:6,10	54:1 65:13 67:7	threads 61:18 83:23	207:22	travaux 27:25 97:1
S/2019/172 79:25	template 45:17 219:12	90:17 94:21 95:23	threat 66:19	timetable 197:20	215:8
	219:14 220:1	100:9 126:12 141:3	threaten 87:4	timing 13:23 85:4,15	treat 93:5 114:13
	Temple 69:9 70:5	143:8 160:14,25	threatening 79:21	timings 29:23	116:12
	_	•	C	C	
tab 44:24 47:25 49:2	71:13 73:18	164:18 183:5,19,22	threats 88:2	title 102:12 116:22	treaties 21:16 68:9,23
60:18 79:18	temporal 67:22	184:11,11,14,15	three 11:15 16:5 21:2	203:1	69:1,6 70:10 71:18
table 113:8 143:2	temporary 100:15	185:6 200:23	33:15 47:19 66:9,9	today 8:8,12 22:12	72:17 96:14 193:13
194:7 221:16	ten 86:21 143:10	202:11 221:7	66:13,13 84:13 94:9	27:2,4,7 49:14	193:18 194:1
tabs 62:16 79:16	168:18	themes 125:18	95:20,21 97:8 112:6	94:19 95:14 120:22	Treaty's 21:23 86:16
80:14	tender 15:1 172:25	themselves 10:13,23	125:5 135:19	125:15 146:21	145:23 146:4
tactics 143:16	173:1,2,4	109:15	141:14 146:23	177:24 179:2 181:6	202:15
	tension 79:9	therefrom 100:8	155:1 159:3,7	183:2 185:12	Treaty-compliant
take 1:8,9 2:13 15:25	tentative 214:3	thereto 6:2	191:16,21 197:14	189:10,21 202:10	87:18 220:11
16:22 17:17 18:10			197:16,21 197:14	T	Treaty-consistent
22:9,11 23:11 29:16	tenure 168:10	thing 43:6 163:5		207:9 217:12	•
31:25 38:19 41:3	ten-day 155:13	things 3:14 52:8 71:20	three-page 148:18	together 20:1 37:10	216:22
53:2,3 58:11 59:12	term 100:7 104:5,14	77:22 113:23	three-tiered 165:14	61:19 65:13 83:23	Treaty-unconstrained
59:15 73:10 75:5	131:17	144:21 152:12	through 12:14 13:1	told 123:2	45:25 217:19
99:24 100:4 101:3	termed 98:1	170:20 173:17	22:11 24:18 25:6	tomorrow 21:24 28:5	Trevor 1:23
102:8 109:23	terminating 68:21	184:12 213:10	29:16 31:6 33:24	31:11,24 64:18 66:7	tribunal 17:16
	Ī	I	I	1	1

	1	1	1	1	T
tributary 125:1	ultimately 145:8,24	undertaking 36:9	101:14,18 102:20	143:21	77:15,22 88:10,12
tried 164:15 178:20	215:12	127:17 139:16	102:23 103:1	VIII(4) 126:4	90:19 93:7 113:24
true 189:24	umbrella 153:18	191:20 208:15	104:24 111:22	VIII(4)(b) 141:23	121:19 135:15
trump 199:23	UN 79:7	undertook 62:4	112:1 113:7 119:6	142:24	143:18 151:7 161:1
_					
truth 72:5 91:2 122:5	unaddressed 204:23	undone 67:18	129:13 130:6	VIII(4)(c) 139:17	161:18 165:1,20
122:5,6	unarguable 92:3	undoubtedly 200:10	133:14 146:5	VIII(4)(d) 142:13	166:12 168:17
try 37:20 193:17	unarguably 91:14	unduly 37:4	156:21 194:24	185:9,13	170:23 175:9,24
211:17,24 216:17	undelimited 91:8	unfamiliar 96:9	195:2,3 202:11,13	VII(1) 127:11,13	177:12 179:7
trying 16:17 154:11	under 3:25 5:17 7:17	unforeseen 150:18	213:14,14 216:17	VII(1)(a) 128:6	184:12 188:1,3
175:4 178:15	10:7 11:11 16:2	unfortunately 63:8	used 12:13 36:13	VII(2) 130:24 131:21	190:11 200:13
200:16	39:13,18 47:15 48:4	143:1	45:25 129:13	132:10 167:14	204:9 212:9,11
tunnel 177:12	49:5 50:4 54:6,25	unilateral 93:13	139:20,22 154:24	200:6	214:3 217:3
tunnelling 44:8	55:4 61:10 64:2	uninterrupted 44:13	159:9 170:16	village 73:13,14,17	ways 75:14 136:6,15
turbine 44:10	79:24 81:5 83:1,8	unique 70:23	182:11,20	VILMANTE 2:22	weak 18:15
turbines 43:12 44:11	83:10,15,16 93:1,3	uniquely 68:10	useful 31:8 38:8 94:8	violation 13:10	weapon 16:9,11 79:3
turn 34:14 40:23	99:7,8,15 100:1	United 48:11 74:25	191:9 215:6	virtually 65:4	79:21 84:4
44:25 46:19 48:1	102:21 105:16	79:6	uses 163:12 217:19	visible 98:5	weaponisation 11:25
62:13 64:7 69:15	126:24 127:16,21	University 122:25	using 16:8,11 49:23	visit 5:13,19,21,25 6:4	12:24 14:3 15:19
76:23 79:14 80:19	127:24 128:2 129:4	unless 101:19 201:3	51:10 59:2,25 84:3	6:4,6,8,10,13,14 8:6	22:19 33:12 64:10
102:4 118:17	130:3,7,24,25 131:1	Unlike 11:10	154:11,12 164:5	24:9,24,25 25:1	78:19,21 79:10 80:1
125:16 130:16	131:5,7,9 132:14,25	unlikely 36:20	usual 117:19	26:9 32:11 34:24	83:12 84:1,5 85:12
133:7 136:3 143:18	133:7 135:11,21,23	unmatched 220:10	usually 138:13 146:13	41:4,8,13,14,22,23	88:7,19 94:12
187:19 189:24	137:1 140:4 144:1	unnecessary 25:16	utilisation 128:5,10	60:25 61:6,8,12	weaponise 88:3 92:22
turned 70:15 214:12	145:24 146:12	unpack 106:25 208:2	utterly 30:8	62:5,6,7,12,22 63:3	weather 165:10,17,25
Turning 125:21	147:3,21,23 149:16	unpacked 210:8	UZ 114:8	63:8 115:9,10 139:7	166:3
136:12	151:18 152:4	212:14		139:24 141:20	web 58:16
turns 62:17	153:17,20 154:2	unpacking 190:25		185:12 213:5	Webb 2:11 2:2 21:23
twelve 125:6 199:3	158:17 159:3 161:9	unprecedented	valid 144:17	visits 5:17	26:16 28:15 30:11
Twenty 2:10,11	161:12 167:14,20	140:14	valley 175:18	vis-à-vis 176:10	30:15 71:3 72:2
twice 110:4 120:21	171:5,11 180:13	unresolved 204:24		VI(1) 128:9,14 129:1,4	74:21 75:8 78:6
137:4	185:9,13 186:11	unrestricted 65:25	value 183:13 187:9	146:13	94:6,20 95:8 96:23
two 2:24 8:5 13:14	191:14 192:25	66:2 82:9 92:10	variability 207:25	VI(2) 128:22 147:3	97:16 98:18 103:3
			variation 30:5		
16:1 18:23,25 19:10	193:3 198:2 200:5,5	98:7,9 99:5,6,10	variations 157:1	voice 8:17 15:17	103:10 104:17
19:19 28:18 31:24	206:16 212:10	101:7,14 102:24	212:11 215:6	volume 37:23 38:1,13	105:1 110:10 187:3
32:21 34:23 35:15	219:1	103:1 111:22,25	various 42:18 80:15	72:9,11 85:4 92:15	191:4 194:3 195:9
57:12 59:13 60:10	underline 11:18 18:14	unsatisfactory 192:23	94:22 95:23 111:6	100:10,13,23 132:2	221:5
65:1,21,23 66:20,25	41:6 63:15 106:4	unsettled 181:7	140:9 177:25 179:4	volumes 87:9	website 47:24 49:1
67:4 69:18 71:1	underlining 217:11	until 27:4 117:23	180:21 191:13	vortex 54:4	61:2,7 62:8 115:6
73:8 75:1 76:13	underlying 184:13	144:9 148:9,16	213:3	vulnerabilities 91:22	164:18,21
79:10,12 80:20	undermine 83:15	159:19 168:24	varying 25:5	vulnerable 80:4	websites 164:3,6,11
89:12 91:3,8 92:2	underscore 42:3 94:11	174:7 183:4 187:17	Vaughn 1:23		164:13,15
98:16 113:4 115:6	111:2	190:5 200:2,2,21	verification 86:13,18	w	Wednesday 28:7,8,16
120:16 124:18	understand 6:24	205:13 208:9	version 19:3 102:6	W 104:6	32:1,11 201:20
125:17 126:13,19	16:17 18:21 29:8	221:22	versions 99:3	Waheed 2:7 1:20	week 22:5 26:1 27:11
129:25 134:24	35:7 36:3 56:14	unusually 24:16	Versions 99:3 Verulam 2:11,12	wait 183:4	29:9 89:3 115:16
135:22 136:10	61:1 76:15,20 89:22	unwarranted 58:20			139:8
137:7,14 138:5	154:11 158:4	update 34:18 138:4	veteran 24:11,15	waiting 48:12 196:11	weekly 212:1,18,19
139:23 144:12	161:25 162:3	149:19	VI 129:5 146:7 161:11	walk 29:15 33:23 99:1	213:16
148:6 150:12	184:20 189:16	updated 40:6 164:20	161:12	want 40:2 56:23 71:3	weeks 2:24 91:18
151:13 155:1,5,8	209:24	updates 129:25	video 150:2	73:16 74:6,16,20	weighed 3:22
158:6,10,17 160:9	understandably 39:15	136:10	Vienna 68:25 96:13	92:25 93:3,9 113:9	weight 10:6
			193:25	175:23 176:11	
160:11 161:5	understanding 37:11	upper 13:7,21 15:25	view 11:20 34:9 43:20	178:6 180:6 182:16	welcome 1:3 90:3
179:21 180:5	89:24 90:1 160:14	91:15 93:13 156:13	51:24 80:21 82:8	208:21 216:7	117:25
181:13 183:24	162:12 181:21	165:18 166:2	134:17 145:5,9,19	wanted 32:17 62:18	welcomed 187:14
184:25 185:24,25	184:12 186:16	upstream 84:19,22	150:4 158:1 166:20	118:2 121:15	welcoming 8:6
186:1 187:10,25	211:23 217:24	85:8 92:4 127:9	170:4 171:3,9 179:5	153:13	well 4:10,12 9:14,17
188:3 191:8 193:13	understands 27:8	175:15 176:18	179:8 180:24	wants 44:17 46:10	16:5,13 32:1 37:21
194:3 204:20,21	understood 15:9	urged 137:21	183:19 193:12	warning 163:12,19	38:23 42:22 56:22
205:14 211:10	89:17 117:14	urgently 15:3	200:14,17	164:9 166:5	57:6 59:15 66:11
213:10 216:9,21	180:22	usage 31:14	viewed 71:18 89:23,25	warnings 163:4	73:12,24 75:13 77:7
217:24	undertake 36:24	use 12:10,12,18 13:7	193:15 197:17	wasn't 66:12 106:15	101:6 102:7 110:14
twofold 123:9	86:22 119:10	13:15 28:10 33:18	views 17:21 124:10	192:21	115:13 116:24
type 76:24 129:3	141:24	39:20 47:17 49:20	136:5 179:12,13	watch 59:9	118:13 125:10
198:18,21	undertaken 6:6 20:21	65:25 66:2,20 70:12	Vihear 69:9 70:6	water-sharing 93:11	155:10 157:24
typed-up 192:23	39:22,23 45:17 97:5	70:17 72:17 79:2,21		O	162:19 164:14
types 15:23 147:12	140:11 150:24	82:9 83:2 87:3,13	71:13 73:19	way 16:16 24:18 32:4	165:19 167:9
Jpes 13.23 177.12	208:9,13 209:15	92:10 97:23 98:7,9	VII 127:3 132:24	38:5 40:23 43:21	170:18,22 179:3
	214:12	99:5,6,10 101:7,10	199:7,9,24	52:15 55:22,23	186:21 200:1
l ———	217.12	77.5,0,10 101.7,10	VIII 126:14 137:2	56:14 68:2 69:8	100.21 200.1
1					1

Page 21
Trevor McGowan
Amended

24-11 24-24 24-2			I			ı
well-defined 10:20 well-defined	216:11	while 1:13 4:3 5:20	104:6,7,9,13,14	7.	14 44:24 49:6 60:24	2
well-defined 10:20 48:12 57:16 67:15 0205:12/13 205:	well-archived 36:8				61:5 90:14 108:25	
veru-1;14:18:10 205:12:13 96:12:10:20:117:5 15:21:110:97:17:24 144:514:15:15.8 152:13:10:97:17:24 132:14:364:38:23 132:14:364:38:23 206:15:23:20:18 232:14:364:38:23 206:15:23:20:18 232:14:364:38:23 262:16:51:46:23 266:16:51:14 206:15:23:20:18 206:16:20:18 20			T			
20512.13				zone 193:25		
vere 4:15 18:18 2:11 15:21 3 1697 17:24 14:45 145:15.18 17:16 2:17:29 14:45 145:15.18 17:16 2:17:29 14:45 145:15.18 17:16 2:17:29 15:25 15:20 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:25 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20 15:20						
262-198-314 321-364-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-554-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-554-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-554-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-554-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-365-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-365-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-365-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-365-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-365-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-365-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-365-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-365-3825 3023-40.212-471 321-365-365-365-365-362 312-365-365-365-365-362 312-365-365-365-365-362 312-365-365-362 312-365-365-362 312-365-365-362 312-365-365-362 312-365-365-362 312-365-365-362 312-365-365-362 312-365-365-362 312-365-362 312-365-362 312-365-362 312-365-362 312-365-362 312-365-362 312-365-362 312-365-362 312-365-362 312-365-362 312-365-362 312-365-362 312				1		,
3234 364 3825 2006 153 221918 174-68.12 17512 316 365 483.25 2007 307 312 3117 42 51 316 322 3118 2011 316 322 31 318 322 31 318 322 31 318 322 31 318 322 31 318 322 31 318 322 31 318 31 318 31 31 318 31 31 318 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31				1 1:6 25:3 30:7 47:15		
39-23 a0-21.2 47				47:25 48:17.19.24		123:22 125:19
\$3.55.45.82.3.5 whole 211:32.13.118 c) 2.13.00.47 c) 2.13.12.3.118 c) 2.13.11.3.118 c) 2.13.118 c) 2.1			1 1			131:19,20 132:24
1-20-251-38-17 1-20	•				•	134:6 136:18 139:6
6.219 65:14 66:23 20:1417 22:142 24:15 75:10 76:7 27:14 86:34 87:24 21:16 12:15 21:17 12:15:18 21:17 12:15:18 21:17 12:15:18 21:17 12:15:18 21:18 12:18 12:18 21:19 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 21:10 12:18 12:18 2						148:18 149:8 194:1
7-66 781.2.11 742 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7510 7667 7445 7445 7445 7445 7445 7445 7445	62:19 65:14 66:23		203:11 209:1	*		
7-414 75-310 76-7 7-714 863-4 87-24 90.14 113:11 120.25 138:17 144:20 154:7 144:20 154:7 159.81 1,13 162.6 152.4 153:25 159-7 159.81 1,13 162.6 159.81 1,13	70:6 73:1,2,11 74:2	51:6 54:10 58:15	218:12 220:24			1 1
97-14 48-63-4 87-24 90-14 113:11 120-25 138:17 120-25 138:17 132-14 153:21 1511 120-25 138:17 132-15	74:15 75:10 76:7	95:25 96:15 98:3	world 3:19 9:3,12			
90141 13:11 144:20 154:7 world 27:12 world 27:12 13:23 13:13 15:13 16:11:12 13:22 13:13 16:11:12 13:23 16:11 16:11:12 13:23 16:11	77:14 86:3,4 87:24	113:16 122:5	65:16 151:14		151 81:22	
1902-1538-17 1903-19	90:14 113:11	144:20 154:7	world's 24:12		153 3:16	
145:19 146:17 1524 153:25 1597 1598,11,13 162:6 164:1169:6 181:7 182:59,20 184:25 166:1121:6 17 182:59,20 184:25 166:121:16 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 100:19 116:11 186:33 100:10 197:14 120:10 130:19 116:11 180:24 116:18 142:10 116:11 180:24 116:18 142:10 116:11 180:24 118:25 160:11 116:13 130:19 117:13 130:19 117:13 130:19 117:13 130:19 117:13 130:19 117:13 130:19 117:13 130:19 110:13 130:19 110:13 130:19 110:13 130:19 110:13 130:19 110:13 130:	120:25 138:17	wide 24:13	worth 217:11		16 111:2 133:20	` '
1598_11.13 162.66 writing 113.22 114:12 114:12 116:13 136:15 66:11 115:2 16818 197.9 197:16 125:2 16818 197.9 197:16 135:2 100:12 197:14 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:15 135:2 100:12 197:14 135:15 135:2 100:12 135:				*		
159-88,11,13 162:66 181:7 164:1134:02 181:52 181:52 181:818 197:9 191:18 182:59,00 184:25 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 205:18 196:22 206:18 196:22 206:18 17:14 265:18 196:22 206:18 17:14 265:18 17:14 265:18 109:22 206:18 17:14 265:18 109:22 206:18 17:14 265:18 109:22 206:18 17:14 265:18 109:22 206:18 17:14 265:18 109:22 206:18 17:14 265:18 109:22 206:18 109:22 206:18 109:22 206:18 109:22 206:18 109:22 206:18 109:22 206:18 109:22 206:18 109:22 206:18 109:22 206:18 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22 206:18 209:22				1.04 117:22		
164:1 169:6 181:7				1.1 41:12		
186.210.13 187.1 187.10 191.3 196.22 20518 196.22 20518 196.22 20518 201.12.17 203.16 201.12.17 203.18 201.1				1.10 97:14		
1862.10.13 187:1 96:22 205:18 96:22 205:18 96:22 205:18 96:22 205:18 96:22 206:18				1.2 35:12 41:14		
187:10 191:3	* *					
18/10/19/15 19/32 20/02/15 20/02/15						
201.E1,77 203.16 204.F17.18,19,21 204.F17.18,19,21 204.F17.18,19,21 205.51,2210.16 2135.56,24 215.22 216.9 West 65.7 78:23 89.5 West 65.7 8:23 89.5 West 61.7 8:24 89.7 West 12.20 14.7,12 15:20 214.9 Wish 10.25 15:15 27.7 215.9 Wish 10.25 15:15 27.7 216.9 Wish 10.25 15:15 27.7 217.23 16.8,12 20.8 Wish 10.25 15:15 27.7 218.10 20.33 16.8,12 20.3 218.20 12.13 10.2 218.20 21.35 15.15 2.1 218.20 20.33 16.2 20.31 22.10 20.3 Wish 10.25 15:15 27.7 218.10 20.33 16.8,12 20.3 218.20 21.35 2.1 218.20 21.35 2.1 218.20 21.35 2.1 218.20 21.35 2.1 218.20 21.35 2.1 218.20 21.35 2.1 218.20 21.35 2.1 218.20 21.35 2.1 218.20 21.35 2.1 218.20 21.35 2.1 218.20 21.35 2.1 218.20 21.35 2.1 218.20 20.35 2.1 218					-	2.09 122:12
201:12,17 203:18,19,21 208:55,12 210:16 208:57,12 210:16 213:56,24 215:22 216:9 West 65:77 1823 89:5 89:6 West cm 12:7,12,14 12:20 14:7,12 15:20 15:23 16:8,12 20.8 20:13 22:20 23:3 41:16,18 42:4,6,13 20:13 22:20 23:3 41:16,18 42:4,6,13 11 19 124:19,12 125:14 130:6 131:20 133:15,22 100:2 101:24 100:2 102:25 200:2 22:35 138:3 17 2 20:3 22:0 20:3 20:3 23:0 80:0 20:5 20:5 2 20:5 20:5 2 20:5 20:5 2 20:5 20:5 2 20:13 23:15 2 20:13 23:15 2 20:13 23:0 8 20:13 23:15 2 20:13 23:0 8 20:13 23:15 2 20:13 23:0 8 20:13 23:15 2 20:13 23:0 8 20:13 23:15 2 20:13 23:0 8 20:13 23:15 2 20:13 23:15						2.3 30:3,18 47:22 48:3
204:17,18,19,21 2085,12,2101:6 2135,6,24 215:22 216-9 West 65:7 78:23 89:5 89:6 Western 12:7,12,14 12:20 14:7,12 15:20 15:23 168,12 208 20:13 22:02 3:3 116:12 18:24 with 10:25 15:15 27.7 28:20 37:24 42:13 42:17 44:19 45:82,1 4						
2085.12 210:16 2135.62.42 215:22 216:9 West 657 78:23 89:5 89:6 Western 12-71,21,44 12:20 147.12 15:20 15:23 16:8,12 20:8 20:13 22:02 23:3 41:16,18 42:46,15 15:23 16:8,12 20:8 21:13 16:13 12:9 20:15 21:13 16:3 13:9:2 20:15 20:18 20:18 20:18 20:19 20						
2135,6,24 215:22 wings 196:11 123:10,12,16 133:15:2.0 139:21 199:2 114:20 131:7 20minute 190:9 200.459 849:219-9.20 200.459						
12:16:9 winter 155:5 vision 14:21 16:37 214:9 vision 14:21 16:37 213:21.16 vision 12:21 13:21.16 vision 12:22:20 13:31 16:31 2:200 37:24 42:13 vision 14:21 16:37 vision 14:31:21 v	213:5,6,24 215:22	wings 196:11	123:10,12,16	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	19 9:2 114:20 131:7	
West 65: 7 %:23 98: 98: 6 wisdom 14:21 163:7 136:10 137:9 11 34:17 35:4 9:10 1947 13:5,16 64:25 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 160:1 20.00 17:4 20.00 17:4 20.00 17:4 20.00 18:1 20.00 18:2 20.00	216:9	winter 155:5	127:18 130:1		136:3 195:23	
Western 12:7,12,14	West 65:7 78:23 89:5	wisdom 14:21 163:7	136:10 137:9		190 3:18,20	
Western 12.7, 12.14 12.7, 12.15 12.00 12.7, 12.14 12.20 12.15 12.21 12.21 12.21 12.22 12.23 12.23 12.24 12.23 12.24 12.23 12.24 12.23 12.24 12.23 12.24 12.24 12.23 12.24 12.24 12.25 12	89:6	214:9	177:23 208:3		1947 13:5,16 64:25	
15:23 16:8,12 20:8 15:23 16:8,12 20:8 20:13 22:20 23:3 41:16,18 42:4,6,13 44:17 44:19 45:8,21 45:24 46:12 66:1 81:8 84:10,13,15,16 86:11 87:1,5,20 93:2 95:5 97:17 100:2 101:24 102:14,20 111:18 111:19 124:19,21 111:19 124:19,21 112:14 130:6 111:19 124:19,21 125:14 130:6 131:20 133:15,22 137:8 144:4 166:20 206:21 217:15,18 218:22 219:4,10,21 we'll 22:5 93:24 72:25 74:11 189:13 190:10,12 210:9 we're 22:24 37:14 89:10 48:12 14:10:19 20:8 22:19 43:12 105:14 130:6 113:15 130:10 175:14 176:3 175:14 176:3 175:14 176:3 175:14 18:14 19:19 214:15,15 216:5 we've'1:24,25 2:2,5,6 216:5 we've'1:24,25 2:2,5,6 216:5 175:16 32:2 169:8 we're 13:14,18,24 19:19 214:15,15 216:5 175:16 32:2 169:8 175:17 workability 196:20 200:23 219:8 18,57,15 39:33,3,5 77:15 39:33,3,5 77:15 39:33,3,5 77:15 39:33,3,5 77:15 39:33,3,5 77:15 39:19 11:61 6 19:23,32 19:815,25 14(2:1) 19:15 11:65 105:20 107:18 108:18 109:19 11:61 6 19:23,32 19:815,25 14(2:1) 19:15 11:65 114:39 191:61 6 19:23,32 19:815,25 14(2:1) 19:16 16 19:23,22 19:81,15,25 14(2:1) 19:16 16 19:23,22 19:16,16 10:20 10:24 withdrawal 68:12 694 78:11 100:8,22 113:10:20 11.35 10:20 11.35 10:20 11.35 10:20 11.35 10:20 11.35 10:20 11.35 10:20 11.36 10:20 11.3	Western 12:7.12.14	wish 10:25 15:15 27:7		′ ′	67:19 70:15 97:23	
15:23 16:8, 12 20:8 20:13 22:02 23:3 41:16, 18 42:4, 6, 13 42:17 44:19 45:8, 21 44:16 18:41 16:25 45:24 46:16 66:1 87:15, 59 77:17 86:11 87:15, 59 77:15 18:14 13:06 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 22 13:12 13:15, 23 13:15			T			
20.13 22.20 23.3 41:16,18 42:4,6,13 41:16,18 42:4,6,13 42:17 44:19 45:8,21 46:12 66:1 87:1,52.0 93:2 95:5 97:17 93:2 95:5 97:17 93:2 95:5 97:17 100:2 101:24 102:14,20 111:18 111:19 124:19,21 123:13 13:2 133:6 133:1,52 133:6 133:1,52 133:1,53 133:	-			135:15,24 146:22		
42:17 44:19 45:8,21 42:16:25 87:19 152:16 wishes 14:21 16:25 87:19 152:16 withdrawa f8:12 69:4 78:11 100:8,22 131:25 87:19 152:16 withdrawa f8:12 69:4 78:11 100:8,22 131:25 87:19 152:16 withdrawa f8:12 69:4 78:11 100:8,22 131:25 87:19 100:2 101:24 100:21 101:24 102:11 13:25 106:21 13:25 112:18 131:20 133:15,22 133:18 152:18 131:20 133:15,22 137:8 144:4 166:20 206:21 217:15,18 218:22 219:4.10,21 we'll 22:5 39:24 72:25 words 42:11 72:16 96:16 151:7 181:15 184:21 19:12 109:9 144:15,15 216:5 216:5 156:23 169:11 190:11 20:19 9 we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 133:4 44:10:19 214:15,15 216:5 169:11 190:11 20:19 9 work 32:11 190:11 20:20 153:15 175:14 151:10 152:20 169:18 180:19 190:14 175:21 181:14 48:25 89:20 126:18 180:12 132:2 183:2 190:14 190:11 20:20 159:15:17 workshillity 196:20 20:18 38:15 133:17 134:20 133:15 133:17 134:20 133:15 133:17 134:20 133:15 133:17 134:20 133:15 133:17 134:20 133:15 133:17 134:20 133:15 133:17 134:20 133:15 133:17 134:20 133:15 133:17 134:20 133:15 133:17 134:20 133:15 133:17 134:20 133:15 133:17 134:20 135:21 180:10 159:11 190:11 190:11 180:5 114:39:11 135:21 180:10 135:21 120:20 1180:11 130:20 120:20 1180:12 130:20 120:20 120:11 130:20 120:20 120:11 130:20 120:11 130:20 120:11 130:20 120:11 130:20 120:10 130:20 120:11 130:20 120:11 130:20 120:11 130:20 120:11 130:20 120:11 130:12 120:10 120:10 130:10	-			146:25 198:3		
42:17 44:19 45:8,21 45:24 46:12 66:1 48:18 48:101,31,51,61 86:11 87:1,5,20 93:2 95:5 97:17 93:7,11,7 99:7,16 100:2 101:24 100:2 101:24 111:19 124:19,21 125:14 130:6 131:20 133:15,22 137:8 144:4 166:20 206:21 217:15,18 218:22 219:4,10,21 we'll 22:5 39:24 72:25 74:11 189:13 190:10,12 210-9 we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 190:10,12 210-9 we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 175:21 181:14 191:19 124:15,15 216:5 28 87:19 152:16 X X 53:7 XII 68:1 139:1 X 53:7 XII 68:1 139:1 Y year 49:6,7,10 80-9 120:21,21 121:10 121:10 122:22 137:8 144:4 166:20 206:21 217:15,18 218:22 219:4,10,21 we'll 22:5 39:24 72:25 74:11 189:13 190:10,12 210-9 we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 175:21 181:14 191:19 124:15,15 216:5 228 29:18 38:7,15 39:3,3,5 77:15 39:3,3,5 77:15 39:3,7,7,15 39:3,3,5 77:15 39:10 38:15,25 169:11 190:11 199:15,17 39:3,3,5 77:15 39:3,3,5 77:15 39:15,10 31:20 200:18 works 21:22 1180:5 works 21:22 1180:5 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,191:16.16 192:3,22 198:15,25 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,191:16.16 192:3,22 198:15,25 200:3,3 60:17 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 200:3,3 70:3 20				212:23		
45:24 46:12 66:1 81:8 84:10,13,15,16 86:11 87:15,20 93:2 95:5 97:17 98:7,11,17 99:7,16 100:2 101:24 100:21 01:24 100:11:24 101:11:18 111:19 124:19,21 125:14 130:6 131:20 133:15,22 137:8 144:4 166:20 206:21 217:15,18 218:22 219:4,10,21 we'll 22:5 39:24 72:25 74:11 189:13 190:10,12 210:9 we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 175:21 181:14 19:19 214:15,15 216:5 216:5 28 29:18 38:7,15 39:3,3,5 77:15 99:15,17 worksbillty 196:20 20:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:39,19 1:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,12,20,20,23,25 114:30:20 113.310:20 113.310:20 113.310:20 115:41,20,20 118:810:20 113.310:20 118:810:20 118:810:20 118:810:20 118:810:20 118:810:20 118:810:20 118:810:20 118:810:20 118:810:20 118:810:20 118:810:20 118:810:20 118:810:20 119:12 27:57:519 77:18 81:20,22:3 18:52 115:41 85:24 186:25 2014:50:20:5 2014:20:15 20:16 200:18 200:			Wullar 145:8 176:24	11.06 59:18		
Si.8 84:10,13,15,16 withdraw 71:11 withdrawal 68:12 69:4 78:11 100:8,22 131:25 withdrawal 68:12 131:25 withdrawals 75:3 111:19 124:19,21 125:14 130:6 133:10 2133:15,22 137:8 144:4 166:20 206:21 217:15,18 218:22 219:4,10,21 we'll 22:5 39:24 72:25 74:11 189:13 39:10 48:12 72:12 we'ls 22:4 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 139:10 48:12 72:12 151:15 163:22 165:5 157:5 163:22 166:8 157:5 163:22 166:8 157:5 163:22 166:8 157:5 163:22 169:8 157:5 163:22 169:8 169:11 190:11 99:15,17 workability 196:20 200:18 200:18 200:19 200:19 200:18 200:19 200:19 200:18 200:19 200:19 200:18 200:19 200:19 200:19 200:19 200:18 200:19						2006-2008 205:13
86:11 87:1,5,20 93:2,95:5,97:17 98:7,11,17,99:7,16 100:2 101:24 100:2101:24 102:14,20 111:18 111:19 124:19,21 125:14 130:6 131:20 133:15,22 137:8 144:4 166:20 206:21 217:15,18 218:22 219:4,10,21 we'll 22:5 39:24 72:25 74:11 189:13 190:10,12 210:9 we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:21 175:21 181:14 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 we've 1:24,25 2:2,5,6 2:8 29:18 38:7,15 39:33,5 77:15 97:12 103:5 105:16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 100:19 20:22 114:10 158:15 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 188:15,25 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 188:1,25 100:19 49:6,710 86:12 XSii 68:1 139:1 XSii 68:1 139:1 XII 18:105:4 112 72:25 75:19 77:18 81:20 81:20 82:3 94:5 1113 3:10 115 81:20 1115 81:20 118 3:12,13 119 3:14 119 3:14 119:3 149:13 119 3:14 119:3 149:13 119:3 149:14 119:3 149:13 139:1 133:10 115 81:20 118 3:12,13 1199:14:10,22 118 3:12,13 1199:14:10,22 118 3:12,13 1199:14:10,22 118 3:12,13 1199:14:10,22 118 3:12,13 1199:14:10,22 118 3:12,13 1199:14:10,22 118 3:12,13 1199:14:10,22 1199:14:15,20 115 81:20 1118 13:20 114:12 192:13 139:14:12 121:10 122:22 118 3:12,13 1199:14:14:12 1199:14:19:13 139:14:12 139:14:14:10 139:14:10 153:19 139:14:14:10 139:14:14:10 139:14:14:10 139:14:14:10 139:14:14:10 139:14:14:10 139:14:15:10 139:14:14:10 139:14:14:10 139:14:14:10 139:14:14:10 139:14:14:18 120:22 118:119:13 139:12 139:13 130:13 130:1 133:10 133:10 133:10 133:10 133:1						2007 147:9 206:16
93:2 95:5 97:17 98:7,11,17 99:7,16 100:2 101:24 100:14,20 111:18 111:19 124:19,21 1125:14 130:6 131:20 133:15,22 137:8 144:4 166:20 206:21 217:15,18 218:22 219:4,10,21 182:21 184:4 191:19 22:25 74:11 189:13 190:10,12 210:9 184:21 190:12 120:9 184:21 190:14 121:15 184:21 190:14 125:15 184:21 190:14 125:15 184:21 190:14 125:15 184:21 190:14 125:15 184:21 190:14 125:15 184:21 190:14 15,15 216:5 190:10 48:22 19:40 2014 63:2 120:25 118 31:20 2013:3,19 208:9,9 214:12 203:3,19 208:9,9 214:12 203:3,19 208:9,9 214:12 1962 69:8 1968 18:21 1976 189:13 1976 189:13 1976 189:13 1976 189:13 1976 189:13 1978 38:25 150:16 154:1 139:25 118:21 119:8 120:12 139:14 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 157:5 163:22 169:8 169:11 190:11 23:8 38:35 46:3 48:25 89:20 126:18 169:11 190:11 23:8 38:35 46:3 48:25 89:20 126:18 169:11 190:11 175:21 181:44 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 157:5 163:22 169:8 169:11 190:11 175:21 181:40:1 190:10 137:14,6 138:12 189:12 193:5 189:13 130:0 118 31:05 118 31:05 118 31:07 118 31:05 118 31:07 119 31:41 19 31:14 19 31:14 19 31			X 53:7			2008 204:15
98:71.17 99:7.16 100:22 101:24 131:25 withdrawing 68:21 withdrawing 68:21 witness 110:20 119:4 119:19 124:19,21 125:14 130:6 131:20 133:15,22 133:8 152:18 wondering 66:5 156:3 175:14 176:3 182:22 184:4 words 42:11 72:16 96:16 151:7 181:15 190:10,12 210:9 we're 22:24 37:14 88:25 89:20 126:18 132:64,72,3 133:6 132:65; 56:5 we've 1:24.25 2:2,5,6 2:8 91:18 185:18 199:15,15 199:15,15 97:12 103:5 105:16 105:20 107:18 108:18,02,22,32,55 114:3,9 191:16,16 105:20 107:18 108:18,02,22,32,55 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:5,25 108:18 152:18 worked 122:21 180:5 working 8:22 92:20 144:10 158:15 108:18,02,02,23,35; 114:19 196:10 157:12 works 115:10 157:12 108:15 108:18,02,02,23,35; 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:5,25 108:18 13:2 136:1 199:15,17 worksbility 196:20 200:18 worked 122:21 180:5 working 8:22 92:20 124:10 158:15 108:18,02,02,23,35; 114:16:19 196:15 108:18,02,02,23,35; 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,32 198:15,25 164:1 169:9 196:17 worksbility 196:20 200:18 worked 122:21 180:5 working 8:22 92:20 124:10 158:15 133:16 135:6,17 worksbility 196:20 200:18 worked 122:21 180:5 working 8:22 92:20 124:10 158:15 133:16 135:6,21 1992 206:21 115:10 157:12 200:3,310 208:9,9 121:14 192:13 181:24 186:25 191:14 192:13 181:24 186:25 191:14 192:13 185:24 1185:14 185:24 186:25 191:14 192:13 185:24 186:			XII 68:1 139:1			201 45:20
987,11,17 997,16 100:2 101:24 withdrawals 75:3 withdrawing 68:21 witness 110:20 119:4 129:14 120:6 129:51 120:3.5 131:20 133:15,22 137:8 144:4 166:20 206:21 217:15,18 218:22 129:4,10,21 we'll 22:5 39:24 72:25						2014 63:2 120:25
100:2 101:24	98:7,11,17 99:7,16	131:25	Y		185:24 186:25	
102:14,20 111:18	100:2 101:24				191:14 192:13	
111:19 124:19,21 125:14 130:6 131:20 133:15,22 137:8 144:4 166:20 206:21 217:15,18 218:22 219:4,10,21 we'll 22:5 39:24 72:25 74:11 189:13 190:10,12 210:9 we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 175:21 181:14 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 we've 1:24,25 2:2,5,6 2:8 29:18 38:7,15 39:3,3,5 77:15 97:12 103:5 105:16 105:22 0107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 19:16,16 119:32 198:15,25 123:18 152:18 121:10 122:22 137:4,4,6 138:12 139:14,21,23 148:6 148:10 153:19 156:17 158:13 160:8 163:22 168:24,25 180:10 180:12 186:1 180:12 186:1 180:12 186:1 190:10,12 210:9 we're 22:24 37:14 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 we've 1:24,25 2:2,5,6 28 29:18 38:7,15 39:3,3,5 77:15 97:12 103:5 105:16 105:22 017:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 1192:3,22 198:15,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 1192:3,22 198:15,25 164:1 169:9 196:17 200:22 2014:12 214:12 214:12 1196:8 182:11 1193:14 119 3:14 119 3:14 119 3:14 119 3:14 119 3:14 119 3:14 119 3:14 119 3:14 119 3:13 119 3:14 119 3:13 119 3:14 119 3:13 119 3:14 119 3:14 119 3:14 119 3:14 119 3:14 119 3:14 119 3:14 119 3:14 119 48:10 133:16,23 138:6 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 12 7:5 9:4 30:3,4 63:2 155:1 108:22 118:21 1108:22 119:125 192:22 200:22 118:21 110:220 121:10 122:20 137:4,4,6 138:12 139:14 119 3:14 119 13:14 119 13:14 119 137:16,23 138:6 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 12 7:5 9:4 30:3,4 63:2 155:1 108:22 119:1.5 103:20 120:1.10 139:12 139:13 12 7:5 9:4 30:3,4 63:2 155:1 108:22 119:1.5 12:10 2015 21:1 10 2016 9:2,4,16 195:23 2015/2016 137:5 2016 9:2,4,16 195:23 2015/2016 137:5 2016 9:2,4,16 195:23 205:4 2017 9:16 129:7 2018 63:5 120:20 121:1,16,12 123:2 133:13 13:10 13:13 13:10 13:14 119 th 137:16,23 138:6 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 12 7:5 9:4 30:3,4 63:2 154:1 108:22 119:1.2 139:13 12 7:5 9:4 30:3,4 63:2 154:1 108:22 119:1.2 139:13 12 7:5 9:4 30:3,4 63:2 154:1 108:22 119:1.2 130:9 133:13 13:10 138:21 110 2016 9:2,4,16 195:23 2015/2016 137:5 200:3,4 63:2 2015 121:1 10 2016 9:2,4,16 195:23 2016 9:2,4,16 195:23 2016 9:2,4,16 195:23 2017 9:16 129:7 2018 63:5 120:0 121:1,16,21 23:0 133:10 13:10 127:5 9:4 30:3,4 63:2 133:10 13:3 13:	102:14,20 111:18	withdrawing 68:21	1 *		203:3,19 208:9,9	
125:14 130:6 131:20 133:15,22 123:18 152:18 137:44,6 138:12 139:14,21,23 148:6 139:14,21,23 148:6 139:14,21,23 148:6 139:14,21,23 148:6 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 139:13 138:12,13 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 138:10,21 139:12 139:13			T			
131:20 133:15,22 137:8 144:4 166:20 206:21 217:15,18 218:22 219:4,10,21 218:22 219:4,10,21 218:22 219:4,10,21 219:13 219:22 39:24 72:25 74:11 189:13 190:10,12 210:9 219:22:4 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 175:21 181:14 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 216:5 28 29:18 38:7,15 39:3,3,5 77:15 97:12 103:5 105:16 105:20 107:18 105:20 107:18 105:20 107:18 105:20 107:18 105:20 107:18 105:20 107:18 105:20 107:18 105:20 107:18 105:20 107:18 105:20 107:18 105:20 107:18 105:20 20:22 114:3,9 19:1:6,16 119:3:12 139:14,21,23 148:6 148:10 153:19 156:17 158:13 160:8 163:22 168:24,25 180:10 180:12 186:4 189:12 193:5 216:5 216:5 216:5 216:5 216:5 216:5 216:5 216:5 2175:21 180:14 2175:21 181:14 218:21 119:8 218:22 184:4 218:21 119:8 218:22 184:4 218:21 119:8 218:21 119:8 218:22 180:9 131:5 133:17 134:20 135:3,23 206:2,11,16 122 3:15 138:23 50:7,9,19 51:2 51:23 52:1,22 53:15 542: 56:6,13,20 578:8,10,10,17 60:3 80:14 108:23 119:14:3,9 19:16,16 119:23,22 198:15,25 164:1 169:1 196:17 158:23 2015:20165 2016 9:2,4,16 195:23 205:4 2017 9:16 129:7 2018 63:5 120:20 121:16,01 122:20 140:6,10,24 141:4,6 122:3 3:15 138:10,21 139:12 139:13 127:5 9:4 30:3,4 63:2 165:11 108:22 118:21 119:8 121:18,22 130:9 131:5 133:17 134:20 135:3,23 203:20,23 204:6,11 205:10 200:18					1962 69:8	
137:8 144:4 166:20 206:21 217:15,18 218:22 2194;10,21 we'll 22:5 39:24 72:25 74:11 189:13 190:10,12 210:9 we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 175:21 181:14 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 we've 1:24,25 2:2,5,6 2:8 29:18 38:7,15 39:3,3,5 77:15 97:12 103:5 105:16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 19:16,16 119:16,16 119:23,22 198:15,25 202:3 208:6 212:22 202:22 184:40:19 1976 189:13 1976 189:13 1976 189:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 199:25 192:22 202:22 188 38:17 158:13 2016 92,4,16 195:23 205:4 2017 9:16 129:7 2018 63:5 120:20 121:16,610 122:20 121:18,22 130:9 134:20 139:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:23 20:22 15988 38:17 158:13 203:20,23 204:6,11 205:10 180:11 180:12 139:13 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 159:43 199:25 192:22 202:22 188 38:17 158:13 203:20,23 204:6,11 205:10 180:11 180:1 180:12 186:4 189:12 193:5 206:21,1,16 1192:3 22 3:15 138:10,21 139:12 199:25 192:22 202:22 118:21 119:25 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 160:21 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 160:19 163:18 153:17 138:5 153:17			1 1			
175:14 176:3 175:14 176:3 182:22 184:4 words 42:11 72:16 96:16 151:7 181:15 180:12 186:4 189:13 190:10,12 210:9 we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 181:14 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 157:5 163:22 169:8 132:6,17,23 133:6 127:5 138:17 138:17 138:17 138:17 138:18,114 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 216:5 157:5 163:22 169:8 132:6,17,23 133:6 127:5 138:13 139:12 1978 38:25 150:16 151:4 153:14,20 154:1 185:14 151:4 132:20 154:1 185:14 2017 916 129:7 2018 63:5 120:20 121:1,61 101:22 120:20 121:1,61 101:22 120:20 120:20 120:1,61 101:22 120:20 120:20 120:1,61 101:22 139:13	,					
218:22 219:4,10,21 we'll 22:5 39:24 72:25 74:11 189:13 190:10,12 210:9 we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 175:21 181:14 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 28 29:18 38:7,15 39:33,5 77:15 97:12 103:5 105:16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 1192:3,22 198:15,25 202:3 208:6 21:22 182:22 184:4 words 42:11 72:16 96:16 151:7 181:15 184:21 180:12 186:4 189:12 193:5 years 8:25 9:8 36:4,7 65:11 86:24,25 180:10 180:12 186:4 189:12 193:5 years 8:25 9:8 36:4,7 65:11 86:21 90:14 107:9,11,15 121:5,6 121:12 123:2 136:17 138:5 139:13 12 7:5 9:4 30:3,4 63:2 65:11 108:22 118:21 119:8 118:21 119:8 121:18,22 130:9 131:5 133:17 134:20 135:3,23 20:2,2 191:25 192:22 20:22 20:22 20:22 1918:3:15 151:4 153:14,20 154:1 185:21 191:25 192:22 20:22 1918:3:14:4,20 151:4,15:14 2017 9:16 129:7 2018 63:5 120:20 121:16,610 122:20 140:6,10,24 141:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 120:12 12:22 140:6,10,24 141:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 121:18,22 130:9 131:5 133:17 134:20 135:5,33 206:2,11,16 122 3:15 138:23 50:7,9,19 51:2 158:12,14,22 159:2 158:12,14,22 159:2 148:19,21 160:12 168:15 200:18 160:11 186:2 11998 147:25 148:3,5 148:12,20 158:3,9 151:4 153:14,20 151:4 15		_		-		7 7
we'll 22:5 39:24 72:25 words 42:11 72:16 160:8 163:22 168:24,25 180:10 160:8 163:22 154:1 185:21 2018 63:5 120:20 190:10,12 210:9 we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 184:21 184:21 189:12 193:5 138:25 9:8 36:4,7 131:5 133:17 23:8 38:5 46:3 121:18,22 130:9 131:5 133:17 134:20 135:3,23 203:20,23 204:6,11 203:20,23 204:6,11 205:10 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 191:19 214:15,15 169:11 190:11 132:6,17,23 133:6 157:5 163:22 169:8 169:11 190:11 138:01 146:23 158:21 14:40:1 1989 147:25 148:3,5 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 141:10 142:11,20 148:19,21 160:12 168:15 200:18 158:21 14:22 53:15 158:23 50:7,9,19 51:2 158:10,10,17 60:3 158:10,10,17 60:3 158:12,14,22 159:2 158:11 160:11 186:5 200 148:17 149:7 160:12 186:4 160:11 186:5 160:11 186:5 200 148:17 149:7 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 160:11 186:5 160:11 186:5 160:11 186:5 160:11 186:5 160:11 186:5 160:11 186:5 160:11 186:5 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>						
74:11 189:13 190:10,12 210:9 we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 175:21 181:14 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 we've 1:24,25 2:2,5,6 2:8 29:18 38:7,15 39:3,3,5 77:15 97:12 103:5 105:16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 202:3 208:6 212:22 180:10 180:12 186:14 189:12 193:5 years 8:25 9:8 36:4,7 65:11 86:21 90:14 107:9,11,15 121:5,6 121:12 123:2 136:17 138:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 143:8,10 146:23 147:22,24,25 151:10 157:12 161:17 181:24 189:12 186:4 189:12 193:5 years 8:25 9:8 36:4,7 65:11 86:21 90:14 107:9,11,15 121:5,6 122 3:15 138:23 50:7,9,19 51:2 51:23 52:1,22 53:15 143:8,10 146:23 157:5,63:22 169:8 169:11 190:11 199:15,17 workability 196:20 200:18 worked 122:21 180:5 working 8:22 29:20 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 106:41 169:9 196:17 works 21:23 46:2 96:16 151:7 181:15 180:12 186:4 189:12 193:5 years 8:25 9:8 36:4,7 65:11 86:21 90:14 107:9,11,15 121:5,6 122 3:15 138:23 50:7,9,19 51:2 51:23 52:1,22 53:15 54:2 56:6,13,20 57:8,9,10,11 58:1,1 58:12,14,22 159:2 191:25 192:22 202:22 1988 38:17 158:13 203:20,23 204:6,11 205:10 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 169:11 190:12 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 140:6,10,24 141:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 140:6,10,24 141:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 140:6,10,24 141:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 140:10 43:17:0 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 140:10 42:11,20 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 141:10 142:11,20 148:16 158:4 169:11 106:12 160:12 186:3 17:10 18:21 11:8:21 180:12 11:8:21 119:8 18:21 119:8 18:21 119:8 18:10 118:21 119:8 18:21 119:8 18:10 118:21 119:8 18:10 18:21 119:8 18:10 118:21 119:8 18:10 118:21 119:8 1	, ,			12 7:5 9:4 30:3,4 63:2		
190:10,12 210:9 we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 175:21 181:14 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 we've 1:24,25 2:2,5,6 2:8 29:18 38:7,15 39:3,3,5 77:15 97:12 103:5 105:16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 202:22 188:21 19:8 189:12 193:5 years 8:25 9:8 36:4,7 65:11 86:21 90:14 107:9,11,15 121:5,6 121:12 123:2 136:17 138:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 15 134:20 135:3,23 205:20,23 204:6,11 205:10 1989 147:25 148:3,5 148:12,20 158:3,9 158:11 19:15 138:21 119:8 202:22 1988 38:17 158:13 203:20,23 204:6,11 205:10 1989 147:25 148:3,5 148:10,14:10 142:11,20 148:10 158:15 139:23 140:8 142:5 159:3,10 160:8,12 160:19 163:18 179:23 185:22 186:2 188:23 191:22,23 1990 182:11 1990 8205:20 206:1 1891 14:40 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:15 139:23 140:8 142:0 158:15 133:17 134:20 135:3,23 1590 148:17 149:7 158:21 19:8 189:12 193:5 144:6,10,24 141:4,6 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:15 148:10 152:10 1598 38:17 158:13 203:20,23 204:6,11 205:10 1989 147:25 148:3,5 148:10 148:16 158:15 139:12 18:21 119:8 131:5 133:17 134:20 135:3,23 148:10 140:6,10,24 141:4,6 148:16 158:14 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:15 148:10 159:3,23 149:6,10,24 141:4,6 148:16 158:14 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:14 148:16 158:14 148:16 158:14 148:16 158:14 148:16 158:14 148:16 158:14 148:16 158:14 148:16 158:14 148:16 158:14 148:16 158:14 148:16 158:14 148:16 158:14 148:16 158:14 148:16 158:14 148:16 158:14 148:10 142:14,6 148:16 158:14 148:10 142:14,6 148:16 158:14 148:10 142:14,6 148:16 158:14 148:10 142:14,6 148:16 158:14 148:10 142:11,6 148:10 142:14,6 148:16 158:14 148:10 142:14,6 148:16 158:14 148:10 142:14,6 148:16 158:14 148:10 142:14,6 148:16 158:14 148:10 142:14,6 148:16 158:15 138:23 50:7,9,19 51:2 159:3,10 160:12 159:3,10 160:12 159:3,10 160:12 160:19 163:18 179:23 185:22 18				65:11 108:22		
we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 175:21 181:14 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 we've 1:24,25 2:2,5,6 2:8 29:18 38:7,15 39:3,3,5 77:15 97:12 103:5 105:16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,3,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 202:3 208:6 21:22 189:12 193:5 years 8:25 9:8 36:4,7 65:11 86:21 90:14 107:9,11,15 121:5,6 121:12 123:2 136:17 138:5 139:31 40:8 142:5 139:32 3 40:8 142:5 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 149:10 14:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 149:10 14:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 149:10 14:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 149:10 14:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 149:10 14:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 149:10 14:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 149:10 14:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 149:10 14:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 149:10 14:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 149:10 14:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 149:10 14:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 149:6,10,24 141:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 149:10 14:4,6 148:16 158:4 160:11 180:5 138:23 50:7,9,19 51:2 159:8,10 160:8,12 159:8,10 160:8,12 159:8,10 160:8,12 159:8,10 160:8,12 159:8,10 160:8,12 159:8,10 160:8,12 159:8,10 160:8,12 159:8,10 160:8,12 159:8,10 160:8,12 159:8,10 160:8,12 159:8,10 1			180:12 186:4	118:21 119:8		1 1
we're 22:24 37:14 39:10 48:12 72:12 175:21 181:14 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 work 3:12 4:4 10:19 48:25 89:20 126:18 132:6,17,23 133:6 157:5 163:22 169:8 169:11 190:11 199:15,17 years 8:25 9:8 36:4,7 65:11 86:21 90:14 107:9,11,15 121:5,6 121:12 123:2 136:17 138:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 147:22,24,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 192:3,22 198:15,25 106:21 189:17 108:18 2022,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 202:23 208:6,21 206:2,11,16 107:9,11,15 121:5,6 122 13:5 138:23 50:7,9,19 51:2 138:23 50:7,9,19 51:2 138:23 50:7,9,19 51:2 54:2 56:6,13,20 57:8,9,10,11 58:1,1 58:10,10,17 60:3 80:14 108:23 125:8 130:18 131:5 130:18 131:5 130:1989 147:25 148:3,5 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 148:16 158:4 160:11 186:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 168:15 200:18 130:18 131:5 130:18 131:5 1			189:12 193:5			140:6,10,24 141:4,6
175:21 181:14 191:19 214:15,15 216:5 132:6,17,23 133:6 157:5 163:22 169:8 169:11 190:11 199:15,17 workability 196:20 200:18 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 202:3 208:6,212:22 203:20 204:0,11 205:20 204:0,11 205:20 204:0,11 205:20 204:0,11 205:20 204:0,11 205:20 204:0,11 205:20 204:0,11 205:20 204:0,11 205:20 205:10 1989 147:25 148:3,5 148:12,20 158:3,9 158:12,14,22 159:2 158:12,14,22 159:2 159:8,10 160:8,12 160:11 180:5 2019 79:7 121:8 140:1 141:10 142:11,20 148:19,21 160:12 168:15 148:19,21 160:12 168:15 159:8,10 160:8,12 169:11 180:5 159:8,10 160:8,12 169:11 180:5 160:11 180:5 160						148:16 158:4
175:21 181:14			65:11 86:21 90:14			160:11 186:5
191:19 214:15,15 216:5 we've 1:24,25 2:2,5,6 2:8 29:18 38:7,15 39:3,3,5 77:15 97:12 103:5 105:16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 202:3 208:6 212:22 132:6,17,23 133:6 157:5 163:22 169:8 169:11 190:11 132:6,17,23 133:6 157:5 163:22 169:8 169:11 190:11 136:17 138:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 139:23 140:8 142:5 151:10 157:12 160:19 163:18 179:23 185:22 186:2 188:23 1990 182:11 141:10 142:11,20 148:19,21 160:12 168:15 179:23 185:22 186:2 188:23 1990 182:11 1990 205:20 206:1 137:19,22,25 142:11 146:16						
216:5 we've 1:24,25 2:2,5,6 2:8 29:18 38:7,15 39:3,3,5 77:15 97:12 103:5 105:16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 202:3 208:6 21:222 108:18 20:22221 108:18 20:223 46:2 136:17 138:5 138:23 50:7,9,19 51:2 51:23 52:1,22 53:15 54:2 56:6,13,20 57:8,9,10,11 58:1,1 58:10,10,17 60:3 80:14 108:23 125:8 138:23 50:7,9,19 51:2 51:23 52:1,22 53:15 54:2 56:6,13,20 57:8,9,10,11 58:1,1 58:10,10,17 60:3 80:14 108:23 125:8 139:23 140:8 142:5 159:3 52:1,22 53:15 159:3 124:10 158:3,9 158:12,14,22 159:2 159:3 158:12, 14,22 159:2 159:4 160:12 168:15 2020 148:17 149:7 158:25 2021 146:16,22,25 187:11 2022 8:23 45:5 137:14 137:19,22,25 143:19,21 160:12 168:15 191:23 18:23 50:7,9,19 51:2 159:3 52:1,22 53:15 159:3 124:10 160:12 168:15 19223 185:22 186:2 188:23 1990 182:11 137:19,22,25 143:19,21 140:16 191:1 146:16 1923 18:23 50:7,9,19 51:2 159:3 158:10,10,10 160:12 168:15 159:3 158:10,10,10 160:12 168:15 159:3 148:19,21 160:12 168:15 159:3 158:10,10,10 160:12 168:15 159:3 158:10,10,10 160:12 168:15 159:3 158:10,10,10 160:12 168:15 159:3 158:10,10,10 160:12 168:15 159:3 158:10,10,10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 150:10 160:12 168:15 159:4 160:12 168:15 159:4 160:12 168:15 159:4 160:12 168:15 159:4 160:12 168:15 159:4 160:12 168:15 159:4 160:12 168:15 159:4 160:12 168:15 159:4 160:12 168:15 159:4 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:12 169:10 160:		, ,			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
we've 1:24,25 2:2,5,6 169:11 190:11 139:23 140:8 142:5 51:23 52:1,22 53:15 158:12,14,22 159:2 168:15 2:8 29:18 38:7,15 39:3,3,5 77:15 workability 196:20 143:8,10 146:23 147:22,24,25 51:23 52:1,22 53:15 159:8,10 160:8,12 160:19 163:18 160:19 163:18 179:23 185:22 158:25 158:25 2021 146:16,22,25 158:25 2021 146:16,22,25 186:2 188:23 179:23 185:22 187:11 187:11 2022 8:23 45:5 137:14 139:3,17 134:20 1990 182:11 139:23 140:8 142:5 159:25 50:4,27 25 158:25 159:20 104:8:17 149:7 158:25 2021 146:16,22,25 187:11 158:12,14,22 159:2 158:15 158:25 2020 148:17 149:7 158:25 2021 146:16,22,25 158:25 158:25 2021 146:16,22,25 187:11 158:25 2021 146:16,22,25 187:11 158:25 2021 146:16,22,25 187:11 158:25 2021 146:16,22,25 187:11 158:25 187:11 2022 8:23 45:5 137:14 137:19,22,25 133:17 134:20 1990 82:21 1990 82:21 142:11 146:16 142:11 146:16 2022 8:23 45:5 137:14 137:19,22,25 142:11 146:16 2022 8:23 45:5 137:14 137:19,22,25 142:11 146:16 2022 8:23 45:5 137:14						
2:8 29:18 38:7,15 39:3,3,5 77:15 97:12 103:5 105:16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 200:18 worked 122:21 180:5 124:10 158:15 129:3,22 198:15,25 129:3 208:6 212:22 129:18 208:18 130:18 131:5 129:3,22 198:15,25 129:3 208:6 212:22 129:18 208:18 209:25 129:18 208:18 209:25 129:18 208:18 209:25 129:18 208:18 209:25 129:18 208:28 209:25 129:28 208:28 209:25 129:28 208:28 209:25 129:28 208:28 209:25 129:28 208:28 209:25 129:28 208:28 209:25 129:28 208:28 209:25 120:18 208:28 209:2						· ·
39:3,3,5,7:15 97:12 103:5 105:16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 202:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 124:10 158:15 129:3,22 198:15,25 202:3 208:6 212:22 208:28 209:20 147:22,24,25 151:10 157:12 161:17 181:24 184:4 204:12 206:25 209:25 161:17 181:24 184:4 204:12 206:25 209:25 202:18 160:19 163:18 179:23 185:22 186:2 188:23 191:22,23 191:22,23 1990 182:11 137:19,22,25 142:11 146:16 1992 206:2 11	2:8 29:18 38:7,15					
97:12 103:5 105:16 105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 202:3 208:6 212:22 works 21:23 46:2 200:18 worked 122:21 180:5 working 8:22 29:20 124:10 158:15 164:1 169:9 196:17 206:25 209:25 207:3 208:6 21:22 208:18 130:18 131:5 130:18 221 1990 820:20 206:1 142:11 146:16	39:3,3,5 77:15	workability 196:20	· ·		160:19 163:18	
105:20 107:18 108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 202:3 208:6 212:22 working 8:22 29:20 124:10 158:15 164:1 169:9 196:17 206:25 209:25 207:3 208:6 212:22 works 21:23 46:2 worked 122:21 180:5 161:17 181:24 184:4 204:12 206:25 209:25 215:21 206:25 209:25 215:21 207:3 208:6 212:22 works 21:23 46:2 worked 122:21 180:5 161:17 181:24 184:4 204:12 206:25 209:25 133:17 134:20 1390s 205:20 206:1 1992 206:2 11 2021 140:10,22,23 187:11 2022 8:23 45:5 137:14 137:19,22,25 142:11 146:16	97:12 103:5 105:16	200:18			179:23 185:22	
108:18,20,22,23,25 114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 202:3 208:6 212:22 202:3 208:6 212:22 108:18,20,22,23,25 124:10 158:15 164:1 169:9 196:17 206:25 209:25 215:21 206:25 209:25 215:21 207:3 208:6 212:22 215:21 208:23 125:8 130:18 131:5 130:18 131:5						
114:3,9 191:16,16 192:3,22 198:15,25 202:3 208:6 212:22 203:3 208:6 212:22 203:3 208:6 212:22 205:3 46:2 205						
192:3,22 198:15,25		C				
202:3 208:6 212:22 works 21:23 46:2 215:21 135:6,21 1992 206:2 11 202:3 2.4 4.00 5.10 12						
				135:6,21		
214.20.20.21.64			yellow 29:19	130 100:6		2023 3:14 4:20 5:10,12
young 169:10 134 99:2 1995 130:17 46:24 62:22 138:1	217.20,20 210.4	70.21 101.24 104.3	young 169:10	134 99:2	1770 100.17	46:24 62:22 138:1
			L			

13812 3944 141-22 25 35 578 307 5917 547 5715 1079 1164 1212 22 548 578 307 5917 547 5715 1079 1164 1212 1213 121		1	Ī		1
203-30 1: 3 2034 10: 11-225 34 57: 807 50: 75 54 77: 90-91 10: 82.7 77: 90-91 10: 82.7 80.8 48,9.10 215 221 136-25 224 53-45: 138-5 23 65: 10: 12.5 138-5 23 65: 10: 12.5 138-5 23 65: 10: 12.5 138-5 23 65: 10: 12.5 138-5 24 11: 14-224 145-19 213: 42.0 247: 16: 23 247: 16: 23 25: 10: 11: 12: 10: 4 247: 16: 23 25: 10: 11: 12: 51: 10-4 25: 10: 11: 12: 51: 10-4 25: 10: 11: 12: 51: 10-4 25: 10: 11: 12: 51: 10-4 25: 10: 11: 12: 51: 10-4 25: 10: 11: 12: 51: 10-4 25: 10: 11: 12: 51: 10-4 25: 10: 11: 12: 51: 10-4 26: 10: 12: 10-4 27: 16:	138-12 139-14	48% 175·11	8(c) 105·16 19 106·9		
2024-01-13 2024 16-11-225-34 578-307-5017-547 5715-107-91-11-38-13-19-15-1 21-10-15-12-3-1-3-1-3-1-3-1-3-1-3-1-3-1-3-1-3-1-		40 / 0 1 / 3.11			
2024 is il-225-34 5.23 6.51 5.97 197 5.97 197 197 197 197 198 197 197 197 197 197 197 197 197 197 197					
5-23 6-51,519 7-4,8 7-10-94 1182-27 13813,19 13915 149-23 208-48-9.10 149-23 208-48-9.10 149-23 208-48-9.10 149-23 213-16 22 125-34 6-15 185 25 123-16 24 1114-142-24 1815 213-16 24 1114-142-24 1815 213-16 24 1114-142-24 1815 213-17 25 107-11,15 185.9 143-18 25 503-19 141-19 159-18 25 107-11,15 185.9 149-18 25 107					
7:10 49.1 188.2.7 138.13.1 91.91.1 138.13.1 91.91.1 138.13.1 91.91.1 139		5 7:8 30:7 50:17 54:7			
138.13,9 139.15 149.22 139.13 149.23 149.23 149.23 149.24	7 7	57:15 107:9 116:4			
139-23	,	123:5 125:10			
149:23 21 136:23 23 23 36:15 138:5 23 25 109:139:16 24 112:422 15:19 24 113:16 22 31:16 23 116:25 23 116:21 15:21 15:2 23 107:11,5 138:9 25 107:11,5 138:9 25 107:11,5 138:9 25 107:11,5 138:9 25 107:11,5 138:9 26 107:12 138:11 28 510 51:14 14:16 149:23 105:15 15:16 28 510 51:14 14:16 149:23 105:11 14:16 149:23 105:15 15:16 28 510 51:14 14:16 149:23 105:15 15:16 28 510 51:14 14:16 149:23 105:15 15:16 28 510 51:14 14:16 149:23 105:14 14:16 149:23 105:14 14:16 149:23 105:14 14:16 149:23 105:14 14:16 149:23 105:14 14:16 149:23 105:15 15:16 28 510 51:14 14:16 149:23 105:15 15:16 28 510 51:14 14:16 149:23 105:14 14:16 149:23	138:13,19 139:15	129:10 130:25	8(f) 206:4		
208.489,10 2113625 2115.25 215.26 215.27 216.10.02.119.16 22.22.25.34.615.138.5 23.65.10.02.119.16 23.65.10.02.119.16 24.horr.111.5.213.29 24.716.23 24.716.23 24.716.23 24.716.23 25.71.11.13.35.9 14.318 25.71.11.13.35.9 14.318 25.71.11.13.35.9 14.318 25.71.11.13.35.9 14.318 25.71.11.13.35.9 14.318 25.71.11.13.35.9 14.318 25.71.11.13.35.9 14.318 25.71.11.13.35.9 14.318 25.71.11.13.35.9 14.318 25.71.11.13.35.9 14.318 25.71.11.13.35.9 14.318 25.71.11.13.35.9 14.318 25.71.11.13.35.9 14.318.71.13.35.9 14.318.71.13.35.9 14.318.71.13.35.9 14.318.71.13.35.9 14.318.71.13.35.9 14.31.30.30.12.13.31.9 26.25.25.25.35.3 30.01.10.30.80.15.31 30.30.10.10.30.80.15.31 30.30.12.12.13.13 30.30.12.12.13 30.30.12.12.13 30.30.12.12.13 30.30.11.12.51 30.30.12.14.211 30.30.15.38 30.30.12.27 32.24.48.47.14.21 48.15.10.21.10.12 11.12.23 44.11.13.23 44.13.23.23 44.13.23.23 44.13.23.23 45.13.23.23	149:23	131:9 134:7 137:1.9	8.12 105:3		
21 15 625 21 5 201 22 22 23 3 4 6 15 138-5 23 6 15 192 192 192 192 192 192 192 192 192 192	208 48:9,10		88 3:9		
212 22 23 34 615 138.5 23 65 109.2 139.16 24 41194 142.24 1815 213.16 213.17 213.18 213.17 213.17 213.17 213.17 213.17 213.17 213.17 213.17 213.18 213.17 213.18 213.17 21	21 136:25				
22 225 34 6:15 138:5 24 1114 14224 1815 24 1114 14224 1815 213:16 24 1114 14224 1815 213:16 25 52:12:1 213:14:19 247 16823 25 107:11 151359 143:18 26 50 32.19 141:19 149:18 26 52 32 7:12 34:21 141:19 26 52 74 75:21 94:15 149:18 29 65 74 75:21 94:15 29 65 74 75:21 94:15 20 75 75:15 65:86 20 119 20 75:22 94:15 20 75 75:15 65:86 20 20 119 20 75:22 94:15 20 75 75:15 65:86 20 20 119 20 75:22 12 618 26 22 26 23 26 23 24 818 26 22 23 26 23 24 818 26 22 23 26 23 24 818 26 22 23 26 23 24 818 26 22 23 26 23 24 818 26 22 23 26 23 24 818 26 22 23 26 23 418 26 23 25 25 134:61 26 25 75 75:15 65:86 27 75 75:15 65:86 28 10 10 12 10 10 12 20 10 12 10 14 12 20 10 14 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12			9		
23 65 1092 139:16 24 1113 14224 185; 213:16 213:16 213:16 213:16 213:16 213:16 213:16 213:16 213:16 213:16 213:16 213:16 213:16 213:16 23 502.1115 135:9 23 107:11,15 135:9 23 107:11,15 135:9 26 593.19 141:19 26 593.19 141:19 27 1092 22 27:12 28 5:10 51:14 141:6 192 23 1505:15:16 28 5:10 51:14 141:6 192 23 1505:14 141:16 192 23 1505:14 141:16 193 24 1505:15:16 21:16 68:1 98:20 20 5:14 141:16 20 5:14 141:16 20 5:15 14:14 11:6 20 5:14 141:16 20 5:15 14:14 11:6 20 5:14 141:1		, -			
24.114.14.224.18.15 213.16 24-hour 1115.213.29 213.14.20 24.7 [6323 25 [107.11].15.15.9 143.18 25 [25 [107.11].15.15.9 143.18 25 [25 [107.11].15.15.9 143.18 25 [27 [10.12].20 25 [27 [10.12].20 25 [27 [10.12].20 26 [27 [10.12].20 27 [27 [10.12].20 27 [27 [27 [10.12].20 27 [27 [27 [10.12].20 27 [27 [27 [10.12].20 27 [27 [27 [10.12].20 27 [27 [27 [27 [10.12].20 27 [27 [27 [27 [27 [10.12].20 27 [27 [27 [27 [27 [27 [27 [27 [27 [27 [
243-16					
24-bour 1115 2152-9 213:142-0 247 163:23 25 107:11; 1315-9 143:18 25 05:31.9 14:19 149:18 27 619 26:23 27:12 3421 14:19 150:15 150:15 28 5:10 51:14 141:6 149:23 150:5 151:6 28 5:10 51:14 141:6 149:23 150:5 151:6 28 5:10 51:14 141:6 149:23 150:5 151:6 28 5:10 51:14 141:6 149:23 150:5 151:6 28 5:10 51:14 141:6 142:75 47 75:15 62:16 681 98:20 101:45 107:21.22 107:23 108:16,24 116:4 123:5 124:12 133:8 134:6 136:20 30:91 21 442:1 133:8 134:6 136:20 30:91 21 442:1 133:91 39:15 194:1 3,030 91:2 142:11 137:17 30,000 159:18 310:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 449:21 500:7 547 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 11:20:24 112:3 125:134:6 136:20 20:19 34-49:1 501.7 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 11:20:24 112:3 125:134:6 136:20 20:19 449:1 501.7 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 11:20:24 112:3 125:134:6 136:22 20:23 25:25 43:18 36(o) 21:7 20:23 20:34 59:15 20:25					
243/14.20 247/16323 25 107:11.15 135:9 143:18 26 503.19 141:9 149:18 27 6:19 26:23 27:12 34:21 144:19 138:71.5 32:11.12 5:11.04 28:10 51:14 141:6 149:23 1505 151:6 29.25 167:37 157:15 138:71.5		5.25 221:21	127:20 131:5		
247 163:23 25 107:11,15 135:9 143:18 26 50:3,19 141:19 149:18 27 619 26:23 27:12 34:21 141:19 38:10 51:14 141:6 149:23 150:5 151:6 28 5:10 51:14 141:6 149:23 150:5 151:6 29 6:5 74 75:21 94:15 138:7.15 28 5:10 51:14 141:6 142:7 547 57:15 62:16 68:19 88:20 101:45, 107 21/22 107:23 108:16.24 116:4 123:7 128:13 138:19 139:15 134:19 139:15 134:19 139:15 134:19 139:15 134:19 139:15 134:19 139:15 134:19 139:15 135:19 141 20:23 3 30:91 121 121 137:30,000 159:18 31 39:31 12 142:11 33,000 159:18 31 39:31 12 142:11 33,000 159:18 31 39:31 12 142:11 33,000 159:18 31 138:19 139:15 144 149:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 144:1 118:21 145:24 145:24 145:24 145:25 145:24 14	-	51 3:7 80:17	133:17,20,23		
25 107:11,15 135:9 143:18 26 503,19 141:19 149:18 27 6:19 26:23 27:12 342:1141:19 150:15 138:7.15 28 5:10 5:114 141:6 149:23 150:5 151:6 149:23 150:5 151:6 149:23 150:5 151:6 149:23 150:5 151:6 149:23 150:5 151:6 149:23 150:5 151:6 149:23 150:5 151:6 16 68:1 98:20 10:24 112:1 133:8 134:6 136:2 10:24 10:1 130:8 133:4 138:19 139:15 138:7 196:23 197:1 117:5 199:12 130:24 141:1 130:25 131:9 140:4 140:4 125 10:4 149:1 50:17 54:7 158:25 194:1 133:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:5 138:191:191:191:191:191:191:191:191:191:19		54 131:10	135:21 140:10		
2	24/7 163:23	57 131:11	141:22 145:24		
2	25 107:11,15 135:9				
28 503.19 141:19 149:18 27 6:19 26:23 27:12 342:1141:19 150:15 138:7.15 28 5:10 5:114 14:6 149:23 15:05 15:16 29 6:57 47-57:15 20 6:216 68:19 82.0 20 16:45 197:22 12:04 20 17:23 16:16.24 116:4 123:5 12:4:12 20 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:8 13:16 13:20 21 13:10 13:12 20 13:10	143:18	6			
149:18 27 6:19 6:23 27:12 34:21 141:19 150:15 28 5:10 5:145 149:23 150:5 151:6 29 6:5 7:4 75:21 94:15 138:7.15 3 3:2:11.12 5:1 10:4 427 5:47 57:15 62:16 6:81 98:20 101:4.5 107:21, 22 101:4.5 107:21, 22 116:4 123:5 124:12 120:23 30:912 148:17 1497 138:23 194:1 200:23 30:912 148:17 1497 138:23 194:1 200:23 30:912 142:11 187:17 30,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 35(a) 20:19 20:23 22:62 32:62 33:18 22:17 29:55 94:23 95:12 99:59:90:67 13.19 20:624 21:625 20:13 4.11 12:25 4.11 12:25	26 50:3,19 141:19				
27 6.19 26.23 27.12 34.21 141.19 150.15 28 510.51.14 141.6 149.23 150.5 151.6 29 6.5 7 34 75.21 94.15 6.21 16.91.0 150.15 29 6.5 7 34 75.21 94.15 6.21 16.91.0 150.15 20 6.5 7 34 75.21 94.15 6.21 16.91.0 150.15 20 6.15 7 34 75.21 94.15 6.21 16.91.0 14.5 10.72.1.2 101.4, 5 10.72.1 10.4, 5	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,			
34-21 141-19 150-15 150-		· ·	i i		
150.15 28 5:10 5:114 141:6 149:23 150:5 151:6 169:28 150:5 151:6 169:28 150:5 151:6 20:19 29:45 7:21 29:15 20:19 29:45 7:21 29:15 20:19 29:45 7:21 29:15 20:19 29:45 7:21 29:15 20:19 29:45 7:21 29:15 20:19 29:45 7:21 29:15 20:19 29:45 7:21 29:15 20:19 29:45 7:21 29:15 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 29:45 7:51 7:51 29:45 7:51 7:51 29:45 7:51 7:51 7:51 7:51 7:51 7:51 65:8 68:1 10:12 10:10:12 10					
28 5:10 5:144 141:6 149:23 1505:151:6 29 6:5 7:4 75:21 94:15 138:71.5 3 3 2:11,12 5:1 10:4 42:7 54:7 57:15 62:16 68:1 98:20 101:4.5 107:21, 22 107:23 108:16.24 16:4 123:5 124:12 133:8 134:6 136:20 139:2 148:17 149:7 158:25 194:1 220:23 30; 94:10 30.90 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 33 46:91.5 35 53:4 472.178:12 35(a) 20:19 36(a) 20:19 36(a) 20:19 30.90 159:18 77 72.181:5 73.0400 159:18 73 196:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 34 69:15 35 53:4 472.178:12 35(a) 20:19 36(c) 21:7 449:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 10:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 49:6 45:91.3 217:14 44:1 118:21 49:6 45:91.3 217:14 44:1 118:21 49:6 59:5 109:2 200:15 40:6 20:2 40:15 40:7 40:7 40:7 40:7 40:7 40:7 40:7 40:7		· ·			
149:23 150:5 151:6 29 6:5 74 75:21 94:15 138:7.15 3 3 2:11,12 5:1 10:4 42:7 547 57:15 62:16 68:1 98:20 101:45 1072.1.2 107:23 108:16.24 1164 123:5 124:12 138:8 134:6 136:20 139:2 148:17 1497. 158:25 194:1 200:23 30; 91:12 142:11 187:17 30,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 34 69:15 35 5:3 47:2 178:12 36(a) 201:19 35(c) 21:7 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:11 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 115:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 44, 41:18:21 41.1 118:21 4					
29 65 74 75:21 94:15 138:71,5 3 32:11,12 51:104 42:7 54:7 57:15 62:16 68:1 98:20 101:4,5 107:21,22 107:23 108:163 123:2 107:23 108:163 123:2 108:23 134:1 149:7 158:25 194:1 220:23 3(c) 40:10 3,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 318:19 138:15 194:1 187:17 30,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 138:15 194:1 187:17 35(a) 20:19 4 449:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 112:20,24 112:3 112:20,24 112:3 112:20,24 112:3 112:20 110:12 111:20,24 112:3 112:20 110:12 111:20,24 112:3 112:23 41.1 12:23 41.1 12:23 41.1 12:23 41.1 12:23 41.1 12:23 41.1 12:23 41.1 18:19 4.15 190:13 435 190:10,15		130:25 131:9			
3 2:11,12 5:1 10-4 42:7 54:7 57:15 62:16 68:1 98:20 101:45 1072.1.22 107:23 108:16.24 116:4 123:5 124:12 133.8 134:6 136:20 139:2 148:17 1497 5.82.5 198:1 20:02.3 36:0 40:10 3.08 153:4 30.900 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 199:1 34 69:15 34 59:15 235:2 124:2 135:6 20:19 22:12 56:8 20:19 22:1 26:18 25:0 20:19 25:0 20:19 25:0 20:19 25:0 20:19 25:0 20:19 25:0 20:15 44:41 118:21 41.1 12:23 41.1 1		169:18 190:5,6			
1.58:/1.5 3 3.211.12 \$\frac{3}{1.32 \text{1.92}} \		201:19	90th 217:22 218:14		
Canal Street	138:7,15		96% 219:13		
3 2:11,12 5:1 10:4 42:7 54:7 57:15 62:16 68:1 98:20 101:45,107:21,22 107:23 108:16,24 116:4 1235:124:12 133.8 134:6 136:20 139:2 148:17 149:7 158:25 194:1 220:23 30; 94:10 330; 153:4 30; 39:12 142:11 187:17 30,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 34 69:15 35 54 47:2 178:12 35(a) 20:19 35(c) 21:7 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 44:1 112:12 41 118:21 41.1 112:12 41.1 18:21 41.1 121:23 41.2 188:19 435 190:13 4.35 190:13 4.35 190:13 4.35 190:10,15					
3 2:11,12 5:1 10:4 427 547 57:15 62:16 68:1 98:20 101:4,5 107:21,22 107:23 108:16,24 116:4 123:5 124:12 1220:23 130: 31:2 148:17 149:7 158:25 194:1 220:23 16: 40:10 187:17 187:17 180:00 159:18 139:13 19:15 194:1 138:19 139:15 194:1 138:19 139:15 195:1 194:1 101:21 104:12 11:20,24 11:23 101:21 104:12 11:20,24 11:23 11:20,24 11:23 125: 134:6 136:22 204:15 44 49:1 50:17 54.7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 11:23 125: 134:6 136:22 204:15 44 49:1 50:17 54.7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 11:23 125: 134:6 136:22 204:15 44 41:1 121:23 41.1 121:23 41.1 121:23 41.1 121:23 41.1 121:23 41.1 190:13 435 190:10,15	3				
42:7 54:7 57:15 62:16 68:1 98:20 101:45:107:21,22 107:23 108:16;244 116:4 1235: 124:12 1338 134:6 136:20 139:2 148:17 149:7 158:25 194:1 220:23 30:4 153:4 187:17 30,000 159:18 31 96:15 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 144:1 150:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 44:41.1 121:23 4.11 18:21 4.11 18:21 4.13 18:19 31 66:15 13:12 109:20 119 35(c) 21:7 41 4.11 12:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.15 190:13 4.15 190:13 4.15 190:13 4.15 190:13 4.15 190:13 4.15 190:13 4.16 119:15 206:2 (2) (3) 68:25 64 36:4,7 67 131:12 68 131:12 7 7 3:2.4 48:4.7,14,21 49:5.6.9,13 50:4 53:6 54:25 55:8 97:15 126:15 204:12.13 71 3.8 120:17 72 218:15 73 121:3 8 8 1:6 1:1 19:25 20:23 21:59 22:1 26:18 26:22 32:62.3 43:18 26:22 32:62.3 43:18 36:21:6 87:7 92:8,13 39:35:5 94:25 30:35:94:25 30:35:94:25 30:35:94:25 30:36:20 30:36:20 30:36:20 30:36:20 30:36:20 30:36:20 30:36:20 30:36:20 30:36:20 30:36:20 30:36:20 7 7 3:2.4 48:4.7,14,21 49:5.6.9,13 50:4 53:6 542:5 55:8 97:15 126:15 204:12.13 71 3 38 120:17 72 181:5 73 13:1 120:1 71 3 38 120:17 71 3 38	3 2.11 12 5.1 10.4				
62:16 68:1 98:20 101:45 107:21,22 107:23 108:16,24 1164 123:5: 124:12 133:8 134:6 136:20 139:2 148:17 149:7 158:25 194:1 220:23 3(c) 40:10 30,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 187:17 33 69:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 187:17 35(a) 20:19 35(c) 21:7 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 4% 45:9,13 217:14 4,11 18:21 4,11 18:21 4,11 18:21 4,11 18:21 4,11 18:21 4,11 18:123 4,12 188:19 4,35 190:10,15	*	_			
101:4.5 107:21,22 107:23 108:16,24 1164 123:5 124:12 133:8 134:6 136:20 139:2 148:17 149:7 158:25 194:1 220:23 3(c) 40:10 3.08 153:4 30 39:12 142:11 187:17 30,000 159:18 1319:15 194:1 34 69:15 35 5:4 47:2 178:12 35(a) 20:19 35(c) 21:7 21:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20;24 112:3 12:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 4.11 18:21 4.11 18:21 4.11 18:21 4.11 18:21 4.11 18:21 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10.15 8 130:10.15 48 135 190:10.15					
107:23 108:16;24 116:4 123:5 124:12 133:8 134:6 136:20 139:2 148:17 149.7 158:25 194:1 220:23 3(c) 40:10 30.98 153:4 30 39:12 142:11 187:17 30,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 34 69:15 35 5:4 47:2 178:12 35(c) 21:7 4 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20;24 112:3 129:55 134:6 136:22 204:15 474 45:9,13 217:14 4.1.1 18:21 4.1.1 18:21 4.1.1 18:21 4.1.1 18:21 4.1.1 18:21 4.1.1 12:23 4.1.2 188:19 4.35 190:10,15 88 131:12 7 7 3:2.4 48:4,7,14,21 49:5,6,9,13 50:4 53:6,94:23 55:8 97:15 126:15 204:12,13 71 3.8 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 8 8 16:1:1 19:25 20:23 21:59 22:1 26:18 26:22 32:6;23 43:18 26:22 32:6;23 43:18 26:22 32:6;23 43:18 26:23 23:6;24 47:2 107:22,25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:31,5 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 161:9 197:6 199:22 200:15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 126:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 21:7 7 218:25 220:3 21:7 7 218:25 220:3 21:7 7 218:25 220:3 21:7 7 218:25 220:3 21:7 7 218:25 220:3 21:7 7 218:25 220:3 21:7 7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8 131:12					
116:4 123:5 124:12 133:8 134:6 136:20 139:2 148:17 149.7 158:25 194:1 220:23 3(c) 40:10 3.08 153:4 30.30:12 142:11 187:17 30.000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 34 69:15 35:54 47:2 178:12 35(c) 20:17 4 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:2 111:20,24 112:3 1129:2 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 47 4 45:5,13 217:14 4.1 118:21 4.1 118:21 4.1 118:21 4.15 190:13 4.15 190:13 4.15 190:13 4.15 190:13 4.16 14:23 148:47 17 138:19 17 17 13:24 48:4,7,14,21 49:5,0,9,13 50:4 53:6 54:25 55:8 53 64:25 55:8 53 (5 43:25 55:8 53 (5 43:25 55:8 53 (5 43:25 55:8 53 (20:40:10 53:6 54:25 55:8 53 (20:40:10 54:6 54:6 54:10 54:6 54:6 54:10 54:6 54:6 54:10 54:6 54:6 54:10 54:6 54:6 54:10 54:6 54:6 54:10 54:6 54:6 54:10 54:6 54:6 54:		67 131:12			
133:8 134:6 136:20		68 131:12			
139:2 148:17 149:7 158:25 194:1 220:23 3(c) 40:10 3.08 153:4 30 39:12 142:11 187:17 30,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 34 69:15 35 5:4 47:2 178:12 35(c) 21:7 4 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 112:20 24:12:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 44 64:9,13 217:14 41 118:21 41.1 18:21 41.1 121:23 41.1 121:23 41.1 121:23 41.1 121:23 41.1 121:23 41.1 121:23 41.5 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 7 3:2,4 48:4,7,14,21 49:5,6,9,13 50:4 53:6 54:25 55:8 97:15 126:15 204:12,13 7 13:8 120:17 7 2 181:5 73 121:3 8 8 1:6 1:1 19:25 20:23 21:5,9 22:1 26:18 26:22 32:6,23 43:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 107:22,25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:13,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 16:19 197:6 199:22 200:15 206:3 221:7 221:7 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 201:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 201:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 201:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 201:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 201:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 201:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 201:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 201:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 201:5 47:5 109:9 206:3					
158:25 194:1 20:20:23 3(c) 40:10 3.08 153:4 30 39:12 142:11 187:17 30,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 34 69:15 35(a) 201:19 35(c) 21:7 449:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 10:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 444:1 118:21 41.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.35 190:10,115 499:6,91,3 50:4 53:6 34:25 55:8 97:15 126:15 204:12,13 71 3.8 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 11 38 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 11 38 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 11 38 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 11 38 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 11 38 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 11 38 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 11 38 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 11 38 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 11 38 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 11 38 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 11 38 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 12 13:3 120:13 12 15:5 92:1 26:18 26:22 32:6,23 43:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 107:22,22 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:13,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 16:19 197:6 199:22 200:15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 216:25 217.7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8bb 206:3 8 1:6 1:1 19:25 20:23 21:7 72 18:25 20:23 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8bb 206:3	133:8 134:6 136:20	7			
158:25 194:1 220:23 3(c) 40:10 3.08 153:4 30 39:12 142:11 187:17 30.000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 34 69:15 35 5:4 47:2 178:12 35(a) 201:19 35(c) 21:7 27:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 44.51 182:13 44.51 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 8(b) 206:3 40:06:3 4	139:2 148:17 149:7				
220:23 3(c) 40:10 3.08 153:4 30 39:12 142:11 187:17 30,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 34 69:15 35:4 47:2 178:12 35(a) 201:19 4 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20.24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 44/4 45:9,13 217:14 41.1 18:21 41.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 4 435: 190:10,15 4 435: 190:10,15 4 436: 153: 454:25 55:8 97:15 126:15 204:12,13 72 181:5 73 121:3 8 8 1:6 1:1 19:25 20:23 21:5,9 22:1 26:18 26:22 32:62,3 43:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 107:22.25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:13,15 112:23 14.12 188:19 44:41 118:21 4.11 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.35 190:10,15 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3	158:25 194:1				
3(c) 40:10 3.08 153:4 30 39:12 142:11 187:17 30,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 35 (a) 201:19 35(c) 21:7 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20.24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 4% 45:9,13 217:14 41.1 181:21 4.1.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.35 190:10,15 3(3) 39:2 142:11 204:12,13 71 3:8 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 8 1:6 1:1 19:25 20:23 21:5, 9 22:1 26:18 26:22 32:6,23 43:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5, 5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5, 7 107:21 107:22,25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 121:3,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 161:9 197:6 199:22 200:15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3 8(c) 206:3 81:6 1:1 19:25 20:23 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3 87:15 126:15 204:12,13 71 3:8 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 121:3					
3.08 153:4 30 39:12 142:11 187:17 30,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 34 69:15 35 5:4 47:2 178:12 35(a) 201:19 35(c) 21:7 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 112:02,24 112:3 112:02,24 112:3 113:20,24 112:3 118:21 44.1 118:21 4.11 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 201:5 204:3 204:15 204:12,13 71 3:8 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 8 8 1:6 1:1 19:25 20:23 21:5,9 22:1 26:18 26:22 32:6,23 43:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 107:22,25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:13,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 161:9 197:6 199:22 200:15 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3					
30 39:12 142:11 187:17 30,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 35 (a) 201:19 35(c) 21:7 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 44.1 118:21 4.1.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 204:12,13 71 38 120:17 72 181:5 73 121:3 8 8 1:6 1:1 19:25 20:23 21:5,9 22:1 26:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 107:22,25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:13,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 161:9 197:6 199:22 200:15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 216:25 211:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3 8(b) 206:3 8(c) 21:7 8 (a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3					
187:17 30,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 34 69:15 35 5:4 47:2 178:12 35(a) 201:19 35(c) 21:7 4 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 4% 45:9,13 217:14 4.1 118:21 4.1.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 18 16 1:1 19:25 20:23 21:5,9 22:1 26:18 26:22 32:6,23 43:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 109:20,121 113,15 1109:20 112:13,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 16:19 197:6 199:22 200:15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3 8(b) 206:3		204:12,13			
30,000 159:18 31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 34 69:15 35 5:4 47:2 178:12 35(a) 201:19 35(c) 21:7 4 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 49(4 59:9,13 217:14 4.1 118:21 4.1.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 72 181:5 73 121:3 8 8 1:6 1:1 19:25 20:23 21:5,9 22:1 26:18 26:22 32:6,23 43:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 107:22,25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:13,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 161:9 197:6 199:22 200:15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3 8(b) 206:3 8(c) 206:3		71 3:8 120:17			
31 96:13 129:7 138:13 138:19 139:15 194:1 34 69:15 35 5:4 47:2 178:12 21:5,9 22:1 26:18 26:22 32:6,23 43:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 107:22,25 108:13 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 44.1 118:21 44.1 118:21 44.1 118:21 44.1 12:23 44.12 188:19 44.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 40.2		72 181:5			
138:19 139:15 194:1 34 69:15 35 5:4 47:2 178:12 26:22 32:6.23 43:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 107:22.25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:13,15 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 440:41 118:21 4.1 118:21 4.1 118:21 4.1 118:21 4.1 118:21 4.1 118:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 88 16 1:1 19:25 20:23 20:6:2 3 20:6:23 34:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 107:22.25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:13,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 161:9 197:6 199:22 200:15 20:19 206:7,13,19 20:6:24 216:25 21:7 21:8:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 8(b) 206:3 4.15 190:10,15 4.15 190:10 4.15 19		73 121:3			
194:1 34 69:15 35:4 47:2 178:12 26:22 32:6,23 43:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 107:22,25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:13,15 127:3 134:6 136:22 204:15 4% 45:9,13 217:14 4.1 118:21 4.1 112:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 48 69:15 34:6 136:22 206:3 4.35 190:10,15 48 69:15 34:6 136:22 206:3 4.35 190:10,15 48 69:15 34:6 136:22 206:3 4.35 190:10,15 48 69:15 205:19 206:3 206:3					
34 69:15 35 5:4 47:2 178:12 35(a) 201:19 21:5,9 22:1 26:18 26:22 32:6,23 43:18 26:22 32:6,23 43:18 449:1 50:17 54:7 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 57:15 65:8 68:1 107:22,25 108:13 101:21 104:12 107:22,25 108:13 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 44.1 118:21 4.1 118:1 206:24 216:25 4.1.1 121:23 207:7 218:25 220:3 4.1.2 188:19 206:3 4.1.5 190:13 206:3 4.35 190:10,15 8(b) 206:3		8			
35 5:4 47:2 178:12 35(a) 201:19 35(c) 21:7 21:5,9 22:1 26:18 26:22 32:6,23 43:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 107:22,25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:13,15 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 4% 45:9,13 217:14 4.1 118:21 4.1 118:19 4.15 190:13 4.25 188:19 4.15 190:10,15 21:5,9 22:1 26:18 26:22 32:6,23 43:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 107:22,25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:13,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 161:9 197:6 199:22 200:15 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 4.35 190:10,15					
35(a) 201:19 35(c) 21:7 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 44.1 118:21 4.1.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 26:22 32:6,23 43:18 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 107:22,25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:13,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 161:9 197:6 199:22 200:15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3					
35(a) 20:17 35(c) 21:7 4 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 44.1 118:21 41.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 62:16 87:7 92:8,13 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 107:22,25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:13,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 161:9 197:6 199:22 200:15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3	35 5:4 47:2 178:12				
4 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 449:1 50:17 54:7 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 199:20 200:15 206:24 216:25 206:3 4.1 118:21 206:24 216:25 4.1.1 121:23 217:7 218:25 220:3 4.15 190:13 206:3 4.35 190:10,15 8(h) 206:3	35(a) 201:19				
4 93:5,5 94:23 95:12 4 49:1 50:17 54:7 96:5 97:5,7 107:21 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 109:20 112:13,15 111:20,24 112:3 127:3 134:2 146:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 149:17 161:9 197:6 204:15 199:22 200:15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 217:7 218:25 220:3 4.13 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 3(b) 206:3					
4 49:1 50:17 54:7 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 4% 45:9,13 217:14 4.1 118:21 4.1.1 121:23 4.1.1 121:23 4.1.5 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 107:22,25 108:13 108:17,19 109:3,7 109:20 112:13,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 161:9 197:6 199:22 200:15 206:4 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 4.35 190:10,15	` ′	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
4 49:1 50:17 54:7 107:22,25 108:13 57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 149:17 161:9 197:6 4% 45:9,13 217:14 199:22 200:15 4.1 118:21 206:24 216:25 4.1.1 121:23 217:7 218:25 220:3 4.15 190:13 206:3 4.35 190:10,15 8(b) 206:3	4	96:5 97:5,7 107:21			
57:15 65:8 68:1 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 4% 45:9,13 217:14 4.1 118:21 4.1.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 108:17,19 109:53,7 109:20 112:13,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 161:9 197:6 199:22 200:15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3		107:22,25 108:13			
109:20 112:13,15 101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 4% 45:9,13 217:14 4.1 118:21 4.1.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 109:20 112:13,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 161:9 197:6 199:22 200:15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3		108:17,19 109:3,7			
101:21 104:12 111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 4% 45:9,13 217:14 4.1 118:21 4.1.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 127:3 134:2 146:3 149:17 161:9 197:6 199:22 200:15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3					
111:20,24 112:3 125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 4% 45:9,13 217:14 4.1 118:21 4.1.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 149:17 161:9 197:6 199:22 200:15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3					
125:5 134:6 136:22 204:15 4% 45:9,13 217:14 4.1 118:21 4.1.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 199:22 200:15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3					
204:15 4% 45:9,13 217:14 4.1 118:21 4.1.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 205:19 206:7,13,19 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3	125:5 134:6 136:22				
4% 45:9,13 217:14 4.1 118:21 4.1.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 206:24 216:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3	204:15				
4.1 118:21 4.1.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 206:24 210:25 217:7 218:25 220:3 221:7 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3					
4.1.1 121:23 4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 8(h) 206:3					
4.12 188:19 4.15 190:13 4.35 190:10,15 8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9 206:3 8(b) 206:3					
4.15 190:13					
4.35 190:10,15		8(a) 21:5 47:5 109:9			
4.35 190:10,15 8(b) 206:3		206:3			
45 119:2 190:7		8(b) 206:3			
	45 119:2 190:7				
	L				

Page 23