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:

Sean D. Margley

Professor Sean D. Murphy Chairman

CERTIFIED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 19 OF ANNEXURE G

9 July 2024

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 2

Tuesday, 9 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 -and-THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA

Transcript produced by Trevor McGowan Georgina Vaughn and Lisa Gulland

APPEARANCES

FOR THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN

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

Opening submissions on behalf of1
the Islamic Republic of Pakistan (continued)
By Sir Daniel Bethlehem1
Day 2 Overview10
By Sir Daniel Bethlehem10
Submissions on Negotiating the Treaty
By Ms Rees-Evans21
Court questions
Court questions
Court questions
Court questions
Questions from THE COURT
Submissions on Principles of Treaty
Interpretation
By Professor Webb74
Court questions
Court questions
Court questions
Questions from THE COURT
Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability124
By Mr Fietta124
Court questions
Court questions
Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation:188
An Engineering Perspective

By Dr Morri	s		•••••	188
Cour	t question	s		

09:08 1	Tuesday, 9 July 2024	09:34 1	addressing the Baglihar and Kishenganga decisions, will
2	(9.32 am)	2	also address the Court's question (a), which related to
2	THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, everyone. This is the second	3	the weight and authority of previous decisions. And
4	day of the hearing on the first phase in the proceeding.	4	I don't propose to trespass unduly onto his issues, but
- 5	We finished yesterday with Sir Daniel not quite	5	only anticipate one point: the Baglihar Neutral Expert
	finished with his opening presentation, so we'll start		
6		6	determination of February 2007 was dispositive of the
7	back up with that, and then proceed. Sir Daniel.	7	differences in contention between the parties with
8		8	respect to the Baglihar plant.
9	Opening submissions on behalf of	9	This follows from paragraph 11 of Annexure F, which
10	the Islamic Republic of Pakistan (continued)	10	we touched upon yesterday. I don't think I need to take
11	SIR DANIEL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman.	11	you to it, but it's there. This provides that:
12	Mr Chairman, if you see that I'm standing a little	12	"The decision[s] of the Neutral Expert on all
13	bit further away from you, it's not because I'm a little	13	matters within his competence shall be final and
14	bit more distant: it's just because a much bigger screen	14	binding, in respect of the particular matter[s] on which
15	has been put in front. And for those of us who are	15	the decision is made, both upon the Parties and upon any
16	vertically challenged, we can't exactly see the bottom	16	Court of Arbitration"
17	of the screen from close proximity. I won't be using	17	So it's quite clear that this provision is
18	that, but Mr Fietta and others will be doing so.	18	unambiguous. The Court in the Kishenganga arbitration
19	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I, yesterday, was	19	accepted that the Baglihar determination of 2007 was
20	almost through my submissions, and the last part of my	20	dispositive in respect of the Baglihar plant. And
21	submissions was dealing with the genesis of the present	21	insofar as the Court took issue as they did, very
22	dispute, the opposition of the parties on the key	22	heavily with the Neutral Expert's determination in
23	issues, and the relevance of the Kishenganga and	23	Baglihar, they did so for systemic purposes, but not
24	Baglihar decisions. I had addressed the genesis of the	24	with regards to Baglihar. And it is no part of
25	dispute and the opposition of the parties, and I hope	25	Pakistan's contention in these proceedings to reopen the
	Page 1		Page 3
	1 420 1		1 450 5
09:33 1	that that point also had dealt with some of the issues	09:36 1	Baglihar determination or to contest the application of
09:33 1 2	that had arisen in questions over pondage.	09:36 1 2	the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant.
	that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to		the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions
2	that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the	2	the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant.
2 3	that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for	2 3	the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in
2 3 4	that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC	2 3 4	the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from
2 3 4 5	that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for	2 3 4 5	the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here.
2 3 4 5 6 7	that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar	2 3 4 5 6 7	the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it informs the analysis in the Memorial more widely. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of disputes over design.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it informs the analysis in the Memorial more widely. And I note in particular, for the record, paragraphs 8.50 to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of disputes over design. You will recall that Mr Shah yesterday drew
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it informs the analysis in the Memorial more widely. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of disputes over design.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it informs the analysis in the Memorial more widely. And I note in particular, for the record, paragraphs 8.50 to 8.55 of chapter 8 of the Memorial, which also addresses 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of disputes over design. You will recall that Mr Shah yesterday drew attention to paragraph 10 of Annexure D is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it informs the analysis in the Memorial more widely. And I note in particular, for the record, paragraphs 8.50 to 8.55 of chapter 8 of the Memorial, which also addresses this issue. But, as I say, the Baglihar/Kishenganga dimension	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of disputes over design. You will recall that Mr Shah yesterday drew attention to paragraph 10 of Annexure D is the objection that Pakistan may make. And then paragraph 11
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it informs the analysis in the Memorial more widely. And I note in particular, for the record, paragraphs 8.50 to 8.55 of chapter 8 of the Memorial, which also addresses this issue. But, as I say, the Baglihar/Kishenganga dimension infuses all of the submissions. And when you come to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of disputes over design. You will recall that Mr Shah yesterday drew attention to paragraph 10 of Annexure D is the objection that Pakistan may make. And then paragraph 11 of Annexure D contemplates a process for addressing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it informs the analysis in the Memorial more widely. And I note in particular, for the record, paragraphs 8.50 to 8.55 of chapter 8 of the Memorial, which also addresses this issue. But, as I say, the Baglihar/Kishenganga dimension infuses all of the submissions. And when you come to hear in particular from Dr Miles and Professor Webb, who 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of disputes over design. You will recall that Mr Shah yesterday drew attention to paragraph 10 of Annexure D is the objection that Pakistan may make. And then paragraph 11
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it informs the analysis in the Memorial more widely. And I note in particular, for the record, paragraphs 8.50 to 8.55 of chapter 8 of the Memorial, which also addresses this issue. But, as I say, the Baglihar/Kishenganga dimension infuses all of the submissions. And when you come to hear in particular from Dr Miles and Professor Webb, who will be dealing with the paragraph 8 aspects in response 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of disputes over design. You will recall that Mr Shah yesterday drew attention to paragraph 10 of Annexure D is the objection that Pakistan may make. And then paragraph 11 of Annexure D contemplates a process for addressing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it informs the analysis in the Memorial more widely. And I note in particular, for the record, paragraphs 8.50 to 8.55 of chapter 8 of the Memorial, which also addresses this issue. But, as I say, the Baglihar/Kishenganga dimension infuses all of the submissions. And when you come to hear in particular from Dr Miles and Professor Webb, who will be dealing with the paragraph 8 aspects in response to the questions that you posed in advance of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of disputes over design. You will recall that Mr Shah yesterday drew attention to paragraph 10 of Annexure D is the objection that Pakistan may make. And then paragraph 11 of Annexure D contemplates a process for addressing differences that arise in respect of the design criteria
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it informs the analysis in the Memorial more widely. And I note in particular, for the record, paragraphs 8.50 to 8.55 of chapter 8 of the Memorial, which also addresses this issue. But, as I say, the Baglihar/Kishenganga dimension infuses all of the submissions. And when you come to hear in particular from Dr Miles and Professor Webb, who will be dealing with the paragraph 8 aspects in response to the questions that you posed in advance of the hearing, we will be introducing, even more than we have 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of disputes over design. You will recall that Mr Shah yesterday drew attention to paragraph 10 of Annexure D is the objection that Pakistan may make. And then paragraph 11 of Annexure D contemplates a process for addressing differences that arise in respect of the design criteria of a plant. So this reference to "a Plant", the Neutral Expert determination in respect of "a Plant", follows from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it informs the analysis in the Memorial more widely. And I note in particular, for the record, paragraphs 8.50 to 8.55 of chapter 8 of the Memorial, which also addresses this issue. But, as I say, the Baglihar/Kishenganga dimension infuses all of the submissions. And when you come to hear in particular from Dr Miles and Professor Webb, who will be dealing with the paragraph 8 aspects in response to the questions that you posed in advance of the hearing, we will be introducing, even more than we have done in the written Memorial, a reference to India's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of disputes over design. You will recall that Mr Shah yesterday drew attention to paragraph 10 of Annexure D is the objection that Pakistan may make. And then paragraph 11 of Annexure D contemplates a process for addressing differences that arise in respect of the design criteria of a plant. So this reference to "a Plant", the Neutral Expert determination in respect of "a Plant", follows from the coincidence of two provisions: paragraph 11 of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it informs the analysis in the Memorial more widely. And I note in particular, for the record, paragraphs 8.50 to 8.55 of chapter 8 of the Memorial, which also addresses this issue. But, as I say, the Baglihar/Kishenganga dimension infuses all of the submissions. And when you come to hear in particular from Dr Miles and Professor Webb, who will be dealing with the paragraph 8 aspects in response to the questions that you posed in advance of the hearing, we will be introducing, even more than we have done in the written Memorial, a reference to India's submissions both in Baglihar and in Kishenganga. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of disputes over design. You will recall that Mr Shah yesterday drew attention to paragraph 10 of Annexure D is the objection that Pakistan may make. And then paragraph 11 of Annexure D contemplates a process for addressing differences that arise in respect of the design criteria of a plant. So this reference to "a Plant", the Neutral Expert determination in respect of "a Plant", follows from the coincidence of two provisions: paragraph 11 of Annexure D, which is cast in terms of "the design of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it informs the analysis in the Memorial more widely. And I note in particular, for the record, paragraphs 8.50 to 8.55 of chapter 8 of the Memorial, which also addresses this issue. But, as I say, the Baglihar/Kishenganga dimension infuses all of the submissions. And when you come to hear in particular from Dr Miles and Professor Webb, who will be dealing with the paragraph 8 aspects in response to the questions that you posed in advance of the hearing, we will be introducing, even more than we have done in the written Memorial, a reference to India's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of disputes over design. You will recall that Mr Shah yesterday drew attention to paragraph 10 of Annexure D is the objection that Pakistan may make. And then paragraph 11 of Annexure D contemplates a process for addressing differences that arise in respect of the design criteria of a plant. So this reference to "a Plant", the Neutral Expert determination in respect of "a Plant", follows from the coincidence of two provisions: paragraph 11 of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 that had arisen in questions over pondage. I have got just some very brief submissions to conclude from yesterday, about the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, and then I will take on my role as MC and just address what you're going to be hearing for the rest of the day. On the question of the relevance of the Baglihar determination and the Kishenganga award for these proceedings, this is a point that is expressed at paragraphs 1.18 to 1.24 of Pakistan's Memorial, but it informs the analysis in the Memorial more widely. And I note in particular, for the record, paragraphs 8.50 to 8.55 of chapter 8 of the Memorial, which also addresses this issue. But, as I say, the Baglihar/Kishenganga dimension infuses all of the submissions. And when you come to hear in particular from Dr Miles and Professor Webb, who will be dealing with the paragraph 8 aspects in response to the questions that you posed in advance of the hearing, we will be introducing, even more than we have done in the written Memorial, a reference to India's submissions both in Baglihar and in Kishenganga. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 the Baglihar determination to the Baglihar plant. Determinations of Neutral Experts of the questions of and here I'm quoting "whether or not the design of a Plant conforms to the criteria set out in Paragraph 8" are plant-specific, and that follows from the language of paragraph 11 of Annexure D. So we've got multiple paragraph 11s here. Paragraph 11 of Annexure F talks about the "final and binding" quality of Neutral Expert decisions. But paragraph 11 of Annexure D is the provision which is the gateway into dispute settlement in the context of disputes over design. You will recall that Mr Shah yesterday drew attention to paragraph 10 of Annexure D is the objection that Pakistan may make. And then paragraph 11 of Annexure D contemplates a process for addressing differences that arise in respect of the design criteria of a plant. So this reference to "a Plant", the Neutral Expert determination in respect of "a Plant", follows from the coincidence of two provisions: paragraph 11 of Annexure D, which is cast in terms of "the design of

		1	
09:38	Annexure F, which is the Neutral Expert's competence.	09:41 1	of the Court if this is too broad a brush stroke, that
	2 I'm just looking at members of the Court: would you	2	would benefit from further unpacking and explanation,
	3 like me to take you through those provisions, or are you	3	but this is something that Mr Fietta will be dealing
	4 content that those are on the record and you have the	4	with tomorrow when he responds to the Court's
	5 interaction of all of these provisions? I would be very	5	question (a).
	6 happy to take you to them if it would help.	6	The point that I would like to leave you with and
	7 THE CHAIRMAN: I think we reasonably understand the	7	this is almost the conclusion of my opening
	8 progression, so no need to take us through them. Thank	8	observations the point that I would like to leave you
	9 you.	9	with is straightforward.
	0 SIR DANIEL: Thank you. I should say that with a little bit	10	Pakistan considers that the Baglihar Neutral Expert
1		11	determination was fundamentally flawed in both its
	 2 haze, so I'm not quite sure whether I'm reading facial 	12	methodology and its outcomes. You've heard this from us
	a expressions entirely correctly.	12	before, you've seen it in our Memorial: it's not
	4 So paragraph 1, subparagraph 11 of Annexure F	13	a surprise. While the Baglihar determination has
	5 affords the Neutral Expert competence in respect of	15	binding effect in respect of the Baglihar plant, it has
	6 differences over conformity with the paragraph 8 design	16	no presumptive effect beyond that plant, and will only
	 criteria and essentially provides that they do not have 	10	be relevant insofar as you may be persuaded by the
	 wider effects beyond the plant-specific. So Neutral 	18	detail of its analysis.
	9 Expert determinations are not generic statements of	10	On this, we hope to persuade you that the Neutral
	0 interpretation. They do not apply beyond the plant that	20	Expert determination in 2007 is critically unsafe and
2		20	unreliable, and failed to approach the interpretation of
	2 It follows from that, of course, that Neutral Expert	21 22	the Treaty in a manner that was consistent with the
	determinations do not have any presumptive systemic	22	terms of the Treaty, with its object and purpose, and
	4 interpretative effect. Whether a Neutral Expert	23	with the bargains that were struck by the parties in
	5 determination will have any wider influence will	24	1960. And certainly this was the view of the
2	s determination will have any wider influence will	25	1900. And certainly this was the view of the
	Page 5		Page 7
09:39	1 therefore depend on the persuasiveness of the analysis	09:42 1	Kishenganga Court, which expressly rejected key elements
	 therefore depend on the persuasiveness of the analysis that underpins that determination. 	09:42 1 2	Kishenganga Court, which expressly rejected key elements of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions.
	2 that underpins that determination.	2	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions.
	2 that underpins that determination.3 Of course we are not at all saying, you will	2 3	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the
	 that underpins that determination. Of course we are not at all saying, you will appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond 	2 3 4	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour
	 that underpins that determination. Of course we are not at all saying, you will appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of 	2 3 4 5	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India
	 that underpins that determination. Of course we are not at all saying, you will appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that 	2 3 4 5 6	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the
	 that underpins that determination. Of course we are not at all saying, you will appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that his analysis is correct, then of course it is within 	2 3 4 5 6 7	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the
	 that underpins that determination. Of course we are not at all saying, you will appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that his analysis is correct, then of course it is within your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe
1	 that underpins that determination. Of course we are not at all saying, you will appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that his analysis is correct, then of course it is within your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will
1	 that underpins that determination. Of course we are not at all saying, you will appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that his analysis is correct, then of course it is within your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty, then it is within your competence and remit to declare 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to
1	 that underpins that determination. Of course we are not at all saying, you will appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that his analysis is correct, then of course it is within your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty, then it is within your competence and remit to declare that it is faulty and that it will not apply on 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to flush. And it has adopted the Baglihar approach to the
1 1 1	 that underpins that determination. Of course we are not at all saying, you will appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that his analysis is correct, then of course it is within your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty, then it is within your competence and remit to declare that it is faulty and that it will not apply on a systemic basis. And indeed, that is exactly what the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to flush. And it has adopted the Baglihar approach to the calculation of maximum allowable pondage.
1 1 1 1 1	 that underpins that determination. Of course we are not at all saying, you will appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that his analysis is correct, then of course it is within your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty, then it is within your competence and remit to declare that it is faulty and that it will not apply on a systemic basis. And indeed, that is exactly what the Court in the Kishenganga arbitration did with respect to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to flush. And it has adopted the Baglihar approach to the calculation of maximum allowable pondage. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the parties are,
1 1 1 1 1	 that underpins that determination. Of course we are not at all saying, you will appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that his analysis is correct, then of course it is within your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty, then it is within your competence and remit to declare that it is faulty and that it will not apply on a systemic basis. And indeed, that is exactly what the Court in the Kishenganga arbitration did with respect to drawdown flushing: it doubted and rejected the Neutral 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to flush. And it has adopted the Baglihar approach to the calculation of maximum allowable pondage. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the parties are, once again, in fundamental dispute about these issues. This is why we are here. This is the reason that Pakistan, through the then PCIW, concluded in
1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 that underpins that determination. Of course we are not at all saying, you will appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that his analysis is correct, then of course it is within your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty, then it is within your competence and remit to declare that it is faulty and that it will not apply on a systemic basis. And indeed, that is exactly what the Court in the Kishenganga arbitration did with respect to drawdown flushing: it doubted and rejected the Neutral Expert's determination and moved on. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to flush. And it has adopted the Baglihar approach to the calculation of maximum allowable pondage. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the parties are, once again, in fundamental dispute about these issues. This is why we are here. This is the reason that
	 that underpins that determination. Of course we are not at all saying, you will appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that his analysis is correct, then of course it is within your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty, then it is within your competence and remit to declare that it is faulty and that it will not apply on a systemic basis. And indeed, that is exactly what the Court in the Kishenganga arbitration did with respect to drawdown flushing: it doubted and rejected the Neutral Expert's determination and moved on. So this position with regard to the reach and authority of Neutral Expert determinations contrasts materially with the weight and effect of findings of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to flush. And it has adopted the Baglihar approach to the calculation of maximum allowable pondage. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the parties are, once again, in fundamental dispute about these issues. This is why we are here. This is the reason that Pakistan, through the then PCIW, concluded in February 2016 that the only way to resolve the dispute between the parties, this long-running dispute, was not
	2that underpins that determination.3Of course we are not at all saying, you will4appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond5Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of6course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that7his analysis is correct, then of course it is within8your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt9it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty,0then it is within your competence and remit to declare1that it is faulty and that it will not apply on2a systemic basis. And indeed, that is exactly what the3Court in the Kishenganga arbitration did with respect to4drawdown flushing: it doubted and rejected the Neutral5Expert's determination and moved on.6So this position with regard to the reach and7authority of Neutral Expert determinations contrasts8materially with the weight and effect of findings of the9Court of Arbitration. The findings of a Court of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to flush. And it has adopted the Baglihar approach to the calculation of maximum allowable pondage. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the parties are, once again, in fundamental dispute about these issues. This is why we are here. This is the reason that Pakistan, through the then PCIW, concluded in February 2016 that the only way to resolve the dispute between the parties, this long-running dispute, was not to refer the matter to a Neutral Expert but to refer the
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	2that underpins that determination.3Of course we are not at all saying, you will4appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond5Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of6course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that7his analysis is correct, then of course it is within8your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt9it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty,0then it is within your competence and remit to declare1that it is faulty and that it will not apply on2a systemic basis. And indeed, that is exactly what the3Court in the Kishenganga arbitration did with respect to4drawdown flushing: it doubted and rejected the Neutral5Expert's determination and moved on.6So this position with regard to the reach and7authority of Neutral Expert determinations contrasts8materially with the weight and effect of findings of the9Court of Arbitration. The findings of a Court of0Arbitration the Kishenganga Court; in due course, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to flush. And it has adopted the Baglihar approach to the calculation of maximum allowable pondage. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the parties are, once again, in fundamental dispute about these issues. This is why we are here. This is the reason that Pakistan, through the then PCIW, concluded in February 2016 that the only way to resolve the dispute between the parties, this long-running dispute, was not to refer the matter to a Neutral Expert but to refer the matter to a Court. Because the issues in dispute
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2	2that underpins that determination.3Of course we are not at all saying, you will4appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond5Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of6course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that7his analysis is correct, then of course it is within8your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt9it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty,0then it is within your competence and remit to declare1that it is faulty and that it will not apply on2a systemic basis. And indeed, that is exactly what the3Court in the Kishenganga arbitration did with respect to4drawdown flushing: it doubted and rejected the Neutral5Expert's determination and moved on.6So this position with regard to the reach and7authority of Neutral Expert determinations contrasts8materially with the weight and effect of findings of the9Court of Arbitration. The findings of a Court of0Arbitration the Kishenganga Court; in due course, the1findings of this Court with respect to systemic views of	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to flush. And it has adopted the Baglihar approach to the calculation of maximum allowable pondage. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the parties are, once again, in fundamental dispute about these issues. This is why we are here. This is the reason that Pakistan, through the then PCIW, concluded in February 2016 that the only way to resolve the dispute between the parties, this long-running dispute, was not to refer the matter to a Neutral Expert but to refer the matter to a Court. Because the issues in dispute between the parties were not just technical design
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	2that underpins that determination.3Of course we are not at all saying, you will4appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond5Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of6course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that7his analysis is correct, then of course it is within8your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt9it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty,0then it is within your competence and remit to declare1that it is faulty and that it will not apply on2a systemic basis. And indeed, that is exactly what the3Court in the Kishenganga arbitration did with respect to4drawdown flushing: it doubted and rejected the Neutral5Expert's determination and moved on.6So this position with regard to the reach and7authority of Neutral Expert determinations contrasts8materially with the weight and effect of findings of the9Court of Arbitration. The findings of a Court of0Arbitration the Kishenganga Court; in due course, the1findings of this Court with respect to systemic views of2interpretation will have systemic implications and	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to flush. And it has adopted the Baglihar approach to the calculation of maximum allowable pondage. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the parties are, once again, in fundamental dispute about these issues. This is why we are here. This is the reason that Pakistan, through the then PCIW, concluded in February 2016 that the only way to resolve the dispute between the parties, this long-running dispute, was not to refer the matter to a Neutral Expert but to refer the matter to a Court. Because the issues in dispute between the parties were not just technical design issues associated with the Kishenganga plant or the
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	2that underpins that determination.3Of course we are not at all saying, you will4appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond5Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of6course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that7his analysis is correct, then of course it is within8your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt9it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty,0then it is within your competence and remit to declare1that it is faulty and that it will not apply on2a systemic basis. And indeed, that is exactly what the3Court in the Kishenganga arbitration did with respect to4drawdown flushing: it doubted and rejected the Neutral5Expert's determination and moved on.6So this position with regard to the reach and7authority of Neutral Expert determinations contrasts8materially with the weight and effect of findings of the9Court of Arbitration. The findings of a Court of1findings of this Court with respect to systemic views of2interpretation will have systemic implications and3are more widely authoritative and dispositive insofar as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to flush. And it has adopted the Baglihar approach to the calculation of maximum allowable pondage. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the parties are, once again, in fundamental dispute about these issues. This is why we are here. This is the reason that Pakistan, through the then PCIW, concluded in February 2016 that the only way to resolve the dispute between the parties, this long-running dispute, was not to refer the matter to a Neutral Expert but to refer the matter to a Court. Because the issues in dispute between the parties were not just technical design issues associated with the Kishenganga plant or the Ratle plant, but they were much wider questions of
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	2that underpins that determination.3Of course we are not at all saying, you will4appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond5Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of6course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that7his analysis is correct, then of course it is within8your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt9it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty,0then it is within your competence and remit to declare1that it is faulty and that it will not apply on2a systemic basis. And indeed, that is exactly what the3Court in the Kishenganga arbitration did with respect to4drawdown flushing: it doubted and rejected the Neutral5Expert's determination and moved on.6So this position with regard to the reach and7authority of Neutral Expert determinations contrasts8materially with the weight and effect of findings of the9Court of Arbitration. The findings of a Court of0Arbitration the Kishenganga Court; in due course, the1findings of this Court with respect to systemic views of2interpretation will have systemic implications and3are more widely authoritative and dispositive insofar as4they reach findings of general interpretative effect.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to flush. And it has adopted the Baglihar approach to the calculation of maximum allowable pondage. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the parties are, once again, in fundamental dispute about these issues. This is why we are here. This is the reason that Pakistan, through the then PCIW, concluded in February 2016 that the only way to resolve the dispute between the parties, this long-running dispute, was not to refer the matter to a Neutral Expert but to refer the matter to a Court. Because the issues in dispute between the parties were not just technical design issues associated with the Kishenganga plant or the Ratle plant, but they were much wider questions of systemic interpretation that went to the interpretation
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	2that underpins that determination.3Of course we are not at all saying, you will4appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond5Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of6course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that7his analysis is correct, then of course it is within8your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt9it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty,0then it is within your competence and remit to declare1that it is faulty and that it will not apply on2a systemic basis. And indeed, that is exactly what the3Court in the Kishenganga arbitration did with respect to4drawdown flushing: it doubted and rejected the Neutral5Expert's determination and moved on.6So this position with regard to the reach and7authority of Neutral Expert determinations contrasts8materially with the weight and effect of findings of the9Court of Arbitration. The findings of a Court of1findings of this Court with respect to systemic views of2interpretation will have systemic implications and3are more widely authoritative and dispositive insofar as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to flush. And it has adopted the Baglihar approach to the calculation of maximum allowable pondage. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the parties are, once again, in fundamental dispute about these issues. This is why we are here. This is the reason that Pakistan, through the then PCIW, concluded in February 2016 that the only way to resolve the dispute between the parties, this long-running dispute, was not to refer the matter to a Neutral Expert but to refer the matter to a Court. Because the issues in dispute between the parties were not just technical design issues associated with the Kishenganga plant or the Ratle plant, but they were much wider questions of
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	2that underpins that determination.3Of course we are not at all saying, you will4appreciate, that you should not look at Raymond5Lafitte's Neutral Expert determination in Baglihar. Of6course you must do so. Were you to be persuaded that7his analysis is correct, then of course it is within8your scope of competence to echo that analysis and adopt9it. If you were persuaded that his analysis is faulty,0then it is within your competence and remit to declare1that it is faulty and that it will not apply on2a systemic basis. And indeed, that is exactly what the3Court in the Kishenganga arbitration did with respect to4drawdown flushing: it doubted and rejected the Neutral5Expert's determination and moved on.6So this position with regard to the reach and7authority of Neutral Expert determinations contrasts8materially with the weight and effect of findings of the9Court of Arbitration. The findings of a Court of0Arbitration the Kishenganga Court; in due course, the1findings of this Court with respect to systemic views of2interpretation will have systemic implications and3are more widely authoritative and dispositive insofar as4they reach findings of general interpretative effect.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	of the Baglihar methodology and conclusions. India's position is to essentially ignore the Kishenganga Court's analysis and conclusions in favour of adopting the Baglihar determination. And India persists in insisting that drawdown flushing the depletion of dead storage is permitted under the Treaty for sediment management, and that it can construe the paragraph 8 design criteria in a manner that will allow it to design HEPs that will thereafter be able to flush. And it has adopted the Baglihar approach to the calculation of maximum allowable pondage. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, the parties are, once again, in fundamental dispute about these issues. This is why we are here. This is the reason that Pakistan, through the then PCIW, concluded in February 2016 that the only way to resolve the dispute between the parties, this long-running dispute, was not to refer the matter to a Neutral Expert but to refer the matter to a Court. Because the issues in dispute between the parties were not just technical design issues associated with the Kishenganga plant or the Ratle plant, but they were much wider questions of systemic interpretation that went to the interpretation

09:44 1	Annexure D.	09:47 1	straddle the lunch break.
2	So that, as it were, puts its arms or at least	2	Then the day will be completed by Dr Gregory Morris,
3	I hope it does so around the whole of the case.	3	who is not in the room just at the moment because he is
4	So Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I come to my,	4	responding on paper to questions that were posed
5	as it were, concluding observations of the opening	5	yesterday and just adjusting his script. And he will
6	observations. This is not intended to be Churchillian:	6	address you on Himalayan run-of-river and HEP design and
7	this is not the end, it's not even the beginning of the	7	operation issues from an engineering perspective.
8	end, it's just the end of the beginning. Almost	8	It may be that, to the extent that there are
9	everything that I have to say will be revisited,	9	a considerable number of questions from the Court, which
10	unpacked and elaborated upon by my colleagues, and	10	we will certainly try and accommodate in the course of
10	we will spend a good deal of time addressing you on the	10	the proceedings today, rather than simply defer them to
11	detailed issues of interpretation of Article III and	12	the second round, it may be that Dr Morris, who has
12	paragraph 8 of Annexure D of the Treaty.	12	a formal presentation to make, but it may be that we
13	We have approached our submissions like a pyramid,	13	will hold some of that over until tomorrow morning.
14	with a broad foundation leading to a pinnacle. The	14	I make just two observations there, before I just
15	pinnacle, of course, will be the detailed submissions on	15	give you a little summary of the issues that will be
10	the interpretation of the subparagraphs of paragraph 8,	10	addressed.
18	which you will hear on Thursday and Friday. But the	18	The first observation is that each of those who will
10	pinnacle is only a pinnacle because it rests on a broad	10	be making submissions during the course of today will
20	foundation, and the pyramid can only be climbed from	20	endeavour to pick up at least some of the questions that
20	below, which is why we are building up systematically.	20	were posed yesterday that fall within their remit. So
21	Let me, with that, turn to my MC role and just	21	what we have found as we've been preparing overnight is
22	sketch out what you are going to be hearing for the rest	22	that the anticipated timing of the submissions may
23	of today. But before I do so, Mr Chairman, perhaps	23	perhaps be a little bit longer than the outline that
25	I should just pause there, as that draws a line under my	25	I gave you yesterday. I think, for example, we
		_	
	Page 9		Page 11
09:46 1	substantive submissions and enquire whether there are	09.48 1	indicated that Professor Webb would be speaking for
09:46 1	substantive submissions, and enquire whether there are	09:48 1	indicated that Professor Webb would be speaking for about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little.
2	any questions from the Court or issues that I can help	2	about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little.
2 3	any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point.	2 3	about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of
2 3 4	any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions	2 3 4	about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme.
2 3 4 5	any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of	2 3 4 5	about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something
2 3 4	any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point.THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role.	2 3 4	about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee
2 3 4 5 6 7	any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of	2 3 4 5 6 7	about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little.But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme.The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore
2 3 4 5 6	any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point.THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role.SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into	2 3 4 5 6	about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point.THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role.SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little.But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme.The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little.But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme.The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview SIR DANIEL: So let me then just turn briefly to give you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly available information from a number of dams to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview SIR DANIEL: So let me then just turn briefly to give you the menu for what will follow today, and to situate the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly available information from a number of dams to illustrate the point. This is all publicly available.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview SIR DANIEL: So let me then just turn briefly to give you the menu for what will follow today, and to situate the submissions within the overall framework of Pakistan's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly available information from a number of dams to illustrate the point. This is all publicly available. I think that there are two instances of additional
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview SIR DANIEL: So let me then just turn briefly to give you the menu for what will follow today, and to situate the submissions within the overall framework of Pakistan's case. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly available information from a number of dams to illustrate the point. This is all publicly available. I think that there are two instances of additional exhibits that we would like to put on the record, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview SIR DANIEL: So let me then just turn briefly to give you the menu for what will follow today, and to situate the submissions within the overall framework of Pakistan's case. You will have four submissions today, all laying the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly available information from a number of dams to illustrate the point. This is all publicly available. I think that there are two instances of additional exhibits that we would like to put on the record, and we will apply to do so, in response to Dr Blackmore's
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	 any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview SIR DANIEL: So let me then just turn briefly to give you the menu for what will follow today, and to situate the submissions within the overall framework of Pakistan's case. You will have four submissions today, all laying the foundations for the interpretative exercise that will 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly available information from a number of dams to illustrate the point. This is all publicly available. I think that there are two instances of additional exhibits that we would like to put on the record, and we will apply to do so, in response to Dr Blackmore's question. But that will come to you in writing during
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview SIR DANIEL: So let me then just turn briefly to give you the menu for what will follow today, and to situate the submissions within the overall framework of Pakistan's case. You will have four submissions today, all laying the foundations for the interpretative exercise that will begin in earnest tomorrow.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly available information from a number of dams to illustrate the point. This is all publicly available. I think that there are two instances of additional exhibits that we would like to put on the record, and we will apply to do so, in response to Dr Blackmore's question. But that will come to you in writing during the course of the morning, in advance of Dr Morris's
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ \end{array} $	any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview SIR DANIEL: So let me then just turn briefly to give you the menu for what will follow today, and to situate the submissions within the overall framework of Pakistan's case. You will have four submissions today, all laying the foundations for the interpretative exercise that will begin in earnest tomorrow. You will hear first from Ms Laura Rees-Evans, who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly available information from a number of dams to illustrate the point. This is all publicly available. I think that there are two instances of additional exhibits that we would like to put on the record, and we will apply to do so, in response to Dr Blackmore's question. But that will come to you in writing during the course of the morning, in advance of Dr Morris's presentation.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview SIR DANIEL: So let me then just turn briefly to give you the menu for what will follow today, and to situate the submissions within the overall framework of Pakistan's case. You will have four submissions today, all laying the foundations for the interpretative exercise that will begin in earnest tomorrow. You will hear first from Ms Laura Rees-Evans, who will address you on the negotiations that led to the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly available information from a number of dams to illustrate the point. This is all publicly available. I think that there are two instances of additional exhibits that we would like to put on the record, and we will apply to do so, in response to Dr Blackmore's question. But that will come to you in writing during the course of the morning, in advance of Dr Morris's presentation.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview SIR DANIEL: So let me then just turn briefly to give you the menu for what will follow today, and to situate the submissions within the overall framework of Pakistan's case. You will have four submissions today, all laying the foundations for the interpretative exercise that will begin in earnest tomorrow. You will hear first from Ms Laura Rees-Evans, who will address you on the negotiations that led to the conclusion of the Indus Waters Treaty and its travaux préparatoires. She will be followed by Professor Webb, who will address you on principles of treaty 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly available information from a number of dams to illustrate the point. This is all publicly available. I think that there are two instances of additional exhibits that we would like to put on the record, and we will apply to do so, in response to Dr Blackmore's question. But that will come to you in writing during the course of the morning, in advance of Dr Morris's presentation.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview SIR DANIEL: So let me then just turn briefly to give you the menu for what will follow today, and to situate the submissions within the overall framework of Pakistan's case. You will have four submissions today, all laying the foundations for the interpretative exercise that will begin in earnest tomorrow. You will hear first from Ms Laura Rees-Evans, who will address you on the negotiations that led to the conclusion of the Indus Waters Treaty and its travaux préparatoires. She will be followed by Professor Webb, who will address you on principles of treaty interpretation. Professor Webb will then be followed by 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly available information from a number of dams to illustrate the point. This is all publicly available. I think that there are two instances of additional exhibits that we would like to put on the record, and we will apply to do so, in response to Dr Blackmore's question. But that will come to you in writing during the course of the morning, in advance of Dr Morris's presentation. So I'm not proposing to anticipate the takeaway points that each of the advocates will be making during the course of today, but let me just briefly situate their submissions within the overall scheme of Pakistan's case, so that you have a sense of how it all
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview SIR DANIEL: So let me then just turn briefly to give you the menu for what will follow today, and to situate the submissions within the overall framework of Pakistan's case. You will have four submissions today, all laying the foundations for the interpretative exercise that will begin in earnest tomorrow. You will hear first from Ms Laura Rees-Evans, who will address you on the negotiations that led to the conclusion of the Indus Waters Treaty and its travaux préparatoires. She will be followed by Professor Webb, who will address you on principles of treaty interpretation. Professor Webb will then be followed by Mr Stephen Fietta, who will make submissions on water 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly available information from a number of dams to illustrate the point. This is all publicly available. I think that there are two instances of additional exhibits that we would like to put on the record, and we will apply to do so, in response to Dr Blackmore's question. But that will come to you in writing during the course of the morning, in advance of Dr Morris's presentation. So I'm not proposing to anticipate the takeaway points that each of the advocates will be making during the course of today, but let me just briefly situate their submissions within the overall scheme of Pakistan's case, so that you have a sense of how it all fits together.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview SIR DANIEL: So let me then just turn briefly to give you the menu for what will follow today, and to situate the submissions within the overall framework of Pakistan's case. You will have four submissions today, all laying the foundations for the interpretative exercise that will begin in earnest tomorrow. You will hear first from Ms Laura Rees-Evans, who will address you on the negotiations that led to the conclusion of the Indus Waters Treaty and its travaux préparatoires. She will be followed by Professor Webb, who will address you on principles of treaty interpretation. Professor Webb will then be followed by 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly available information from a number of dams to illustrate the point. This is all publicly available. I think that there are two instances of additional exhibits that we would like to put on the record, and we will apply to do so, in response to Dr Blackmore's question. But that will come to you in writing during the course of the morning, in advance of Dr Morris's presentation. So I'm not proposing to anticipate the takeaway points that each of the advocates will be making during the course of today, but let me just briefly situate their submissions within the overall scheme of Pakistan's case, so that you have a sense of how it all
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 any questions from the Court or issues that I can help you with at this point. THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think there are no questions Sir Daniel. So please proceed with your master of ceremonies role. SIR DANIEL: I can tell that the Court is eager to get into the detail of the issues. (9.46 am) Day 2 Overview SIR DANIEL: So let me then just turn briefly to give you the menu for what will follow today, and to situate the submissions within the overall framework of Pakistan's case. You will have four submissions today, all laying the foundations for the interpretative exercise that will begin in earnest tomorrow. You will hear first from Ms Laura Rees-Evans, who will address you on the negotiations that led to the conclusion of the Indus Waters Treaty and its travaux préparatoires. She will be followed by Professor Webb, who will address you on principles of treaty interpretation. Professor Webb will then be followed by Mr Stephen Fietta, who will make submissions on water 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 about 45 minutes: probably that will go up a little. But we are comfortable that we are in the framework of the scheme. The second point is just to anticipate something that will come to you perhaps around about the coffee break. In response to a question from Dr Blackmore yesterday, Dr Morris proposes to address a number of issues around sedimentation and the dams in the Himalayas, and is proposing to reference some publicly available information from a number of dams to illustrate the point. This is all publicly available. I think that there are two instances of additional exhibits that we would like to put on the record, and we will apply to do so, in response to Dr Blackmore's question. But that will come to you in writing during the course of the morning, in advance of Dr Morris's presentation. So I'm not proposing to anticipate the takeaway points that each of the advocates will be making during the course of today, but let me just briefly situate their submissions within the overall scheme of Pakistan's case, so that you have a sense of how it all fits together.

09:50 1	the Treaty has to be interpreted holistically. The	09:53 1	Her submissions will provide not only the legal
2	paragraph 8 mandatory design criteria must be construed	2	framework that applies to the interpretation of treaties
3	in the light of the let-flow and non-interference	3	but, importantly, she will also address the relationship
4	provisions of Article III. Article III must, in turn,	4	between, for interpretative purposes, the primary rule
5	be interpreted in the light of the Treaty bargain, in	5	and the exceptions to the rule. And that's the
6	which Pakistan was given unrestricted use of the waters	6	relationship between the headline provision in
7	of the Western Rivers, while India was given the	7	Article III let flow, unrestricted use,
8	unrestricted use of the waters of the Eastern Rivers.	8	non-interference and no storage and the exception for
9	That's the Treaty bargain. And then the Treaty bargain	9	hydroelectric power and pondage sufficient to provide
10	in turn has to be construed in the light of the broader	10	for firm power, which are found in Annexure D. So
11	settlement that was pursued and achieved by the Treaty,	11	there's the primary rule, Article III; then there are
12	the delimitation of the waters that flowed across the	12	the exceptions to the rule, which are essentially found,
13	partition land, and that's the peace bargain.	13	or detailed, in Annexure D.
14	These three interlocking bargains which I addressed	14	Professor Webb will also address you on the
15	yesterday the hydro bargain, Article III and	15	interpretative approach to terms that are given
16	Annexure D; the Treaty bargain, in shorthand, Article II	16	a special meaning. I anticipated a little bit of this
17	and Article III; and then the peace bargain, the	17	yesterday when I drew your attention to paragraph 2 of
18	settlement of the dispute, which is also reflected in	18	Annexure D, and that a number of the provisions for
19	Annexure A all interlock.	19	example, pondage, dead storage level and so on are
20	The circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty	20	given a bespoke meaning in the Treaty. And
21	and its preparatory works are the start of this	21	Professor Webb will address you on the interpretative
22	narrative, and this is what will be the subject of	22	approach to terms that are given a special meaning.
23	Ms Rees-Evans's submissions in just a moment. As	23	She will also address the issue of subsequent
24	Professor Webb, who will follow Ms Rees-Evans, will	24	agreements and subsequent practice that were the subject
25	subsequently explain, settled principles of treaty	25	of enquiry yesterday from you, Mr Chairman. She will
	Page 13		Page 15
09:51 1	interpretation provide that the circumstances of the	09:54 1	also pick up on a number of other themes from yesterday,
09:51 1 2	conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its	09:54 1 2	also pick up on a number of other themes from yesterday, including the relevance of the special character of the
	conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary	2 3	including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty.
2 3 4	conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation.	2 3 4	including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will
2 3 4 5	conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these	2 3 4 5	including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important
2 3 4 5 6	conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the	2 3 4 5 6	including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty.Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that
2 3 4 5 6 7	conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and	2 3 4 5 6 7	including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty.Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty.Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. His submissions will, of course, be given through
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday. If Ms Rees-Evans will begin the exercise of laying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. His submissions will, of course, be given through the lens and the voice of a lawyer, but they are not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday. If Ms Rees-Evans will begin the exercise of laying the bricks of the structure of Pakistan's case mine 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. His submissions will, of course, be given through the lens and the voice of a lawyer, but they are not principally submissions on legal issues, as he will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday. If Ms Rees-Evans will begin the exercise of laying the bricks of the structure of Pakistan's case mine is the design, we then move to the construction 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. His submissions will, of course, be given through the lens and the voice of a lawyer, but they are not principally submissions on legal issues, as he will explain the basis for the Treaty bargain division of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday. If Ms Rees-Evans will begin the exercise of laying the bricks of the structure of Pakistan's case mine is the design, we then move to the construction Professor Webb will provide you with the mortar that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. His submissions will, of course, be given through the lens and the voice of a lawyer, but they are not principally submissions on legal issues, as he will explain the basis for the Treaty bargain division of rights between the Eastern Rivers and the Western
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday. If Ms Rees-Evans will begin the exercise of laying the bricks of the structure of Pakistan's case mine is the design, we then move to the construction Professor Webb will provide you with the mortar that will be necessary to keep the bricks in place and ensure 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. His submissions will, of course, be given through the lens and the voice of a lawyer, but they are not principally submissions on legal issues, as he will explain the basis for the Treaty bargain division of rights between the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers. You will recall that I said yesterday that this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday. If Ms Rees-Evans will begin the exercise of laying the bricks of the structure of Pakistan's case mine is the design, we then move to the construction Professor Webb will provide you with the mortar that will be necessary to keep the bricks in place and ensure that the structure is secure. And she will address the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. His submissions will, of course, be given through the lens and the voice of a lawyer, but they are not principally submissions on legal issues, as he will explain the basis for the Treaty bargain division of rights between the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers. You will recall that I said yesterday that this division was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday. If Ms Rees-Evans will begin the exercise of laying the bricks of the structure of Pakistan's case mine is the design, we then move to the construction Professor Webb will provide you with the mortar that will be necessary to keep the bricks in place and ensure that the structure is secure. And she will address the bespoke and well-settled rules and principles of treaty 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. His submissions will, of course, be given through the lens and the voice of a lawyer, but they are not principally submissions on legal issues, as he will explain the basis for the Treaty bargain division of rights between the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers. You will recall that I said yesterday that this division was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby, but was actually based on foundation, on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday. If Ms Rees-Evans will begin the exercise of laying the bricks of the structure of Pakistan's case mine is the design, we then move to the construction Professor Webb will provide you with the mortar that will be necessary to keep the bricks in place and ensure that the structure is secure. And she will address the bespoke and well-settled rules and principles of treaty interpretation that will guide you in your task. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. His submissions will, of course, be given through the lens and the voice of a lawyer, but they are not principally submissions on legal issues, as he will explain the basis for the Treaty bargain division of rights between the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers. You will recall that I said yesterday that this division was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby, but was actually based on foundation, on the watershed, on the flow of the rivers, and he will
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday. If Ms Rees-Evans will begin the exercise of laying the bricks of the structure of Pakistan's case mine is the design, we then move to the construction Professor Webb will provide you with the mortar that will be necessary to keep the bricks in place and ensure that the structure is secure. And she will address the bespoke and well-settled rules and principles of treaty interpretation that will guide you in your task. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. His submissions will, of course, be given through the lens and the voice of a lawyer, but they are not principally submissions on legal issues, as he will explain the basis for the Treaty bargain division of rights between the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers. You will recall that I said yesterday that this division was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby, but was actually based on foundation, on the watershed, on the flow of the rivers, and he will address that.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday. If Ms Rees-Evans will begin the exercise of laying the bricks of the structure of Pakistan's case mine is the design, we then move to the construction Professor Webb will provide you with the mortar that will be necessary to keep the bricks in place and ensure that the structure is secure. And she will address the bespoke and well-settled rules and principles of treaty interpretation that will guide you in your task. And importantly, and I hope usefully for your purposes, she will root those general principles of 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. His submissions will, of course, be given through the lens and the voice of a lawyer, but they are not principally submissions on legal issues, as he will explain the basis for the Treaty bargain division of rights between the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers. You will recall that I said yesterday that this division was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby, but was actually based on foundation, on the watershed, on the flow of the rivers, and he will address that.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday. If Ms Rees-Evans will begin the exercise of laying the bricks of the structure of Pakistan's case mine is the design, we then move to the construction Professor Webb will provide you with the mortar that will be necessary to keep the bricks in place and ensure that the structure is secure. And she will address the bespoke and well-settled rules and principles of treaty interpretation that will guide you in your task. And importantly, and I hope usefully for your purposes, she will root those general principles of interpretation also in the practice of the Kishenganga 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. Mis submissions will, of course, be given through the lens and the voice of a lawyer, but they are not principally submissions on legal issues, as he will explain the basis for the Treaty bargain division of rights between the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers. You will recall that I said yesterday that this division was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby, but was actually based on foundation, on the watershed, on the flow of the rivers, and he will address that. He will also address the critical importance to Pakistan of the unrestricted flow of the waters of the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday. If Ms Rees-Evans will begin the exercise of laying the bricks of the structure of Pakistan's case mine is the design, we then move to the construction Professor Webb will provide you with the mortar that will be necessary to keep the bricks in place and ensure that the structure is secure. And she will address the bespoke and well-settled rules and principles of treaty interpretation that will guide you in your task. And importantly, and I hope usefully for your purposes, she will root those general principles of interpretation also in the practice of the Kishenganga Court. Because the Kishenganga Court, at various stages 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. His submissions will, of course, be given through the lens and the voice of a lawyer, but they are not principally submissions on legal issues, as he will explain the basis for the Treaty bargain division of rights between the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers. You will recall that I said yesterday that this division was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby, but was actually based on foundation, on the watershed, on the flow of the rivers, and he will address that. He will also address the critical importance to Pakistan of the unrestricted flow of the waters of the Western Rivers, and Pakistan's acute vulnerability to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday. If Ms Rees-Evans will begin the exercise of laying the bricks of the structure of Pakistan's case mine is the design, we then move to the construction Professor Webb will provide you with the mortar that will be necessary to keep the bricks in place and ensure that the structure is secure. And she will address the bespoke and well-settled rules and principles of treaty interpretation that will guide you in your task. And importantly, and I hope usefully for your purposes, she will root those general principles of interpretation also in the practice of the Kishenganga Court. Because the Kishenganga Court, at various stages in its various decisions and awards, referenced these 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. His submissions will, of course, be given through the lens and the voice of a lawyer, but they are not principally submissions on legal issues, as he will explain the basis for the Treaty bargain division of rights between the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers. You will recall that I said yesterday that this division was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby, but was actually based on foundation, on the watershed, on the flow of the rivers, and he will address that. He will also address the critical importance to Pakistan of the unrestricted flow of the waters of the Western Rivers, and Pakistan's acute vulnerability to the interference in the flow of those waters. So his
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 conclusion of a treaty and its preparatory works, its travaux préparatoires, can be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. Ms Rees-Evans will therefore take you through these preparatory works and the circumstances of the conclusion of the Treaty. She will be filling out and making solid the elements that I addressed yesterday when I laid out the three bargains embodied in the Treaty. And she will also be responding to a number of points that were raised in the submissions yesterday. If Ms Rees-Evans will begin the exercise of laying the bricks of the structure of Pakistan's case mine is the design, we then move to the construction Professor Webb will provide you with the mortar that will be necessary to keep the bricks in place and ensure that the structure is secure. And she will address the bespoke and well-settled rules and principles of treaty interpretation that will guide you in your task. And importantly, and I hope usefully for your purposes, she will root those general principles of interpretation also in the practice of the Kishenganga Court. Because the Kishenganga Court, at various stages 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 including the relevance of the special character of the Treaty. Mr Fietta, who will follow Professor Webb, will address you in some detail on the critically important issue of water usage and sustainability. I note that this is a very broadbrush headline, but it's a headline title that he will use to take you into the basis of the Treaty bargain that was struck in 1960 and the peace bargain framework for doing so. His submissions will, of course, be given through the lens and the voice of a lawyer, but they are not principally submissions on legal issues, as he will explain the basis for the Treaty bargain division of rights between the Eastern Rivers and the Western Rivers. You will recall that I said yesterday that this division was not a Solomonic exercise of simply cutting the baby, but was actually based on foundation, on the watershed, on the flow of the rivers, and he will address that. He will also address the critical importance to Pakistan of the unrestricted flow of the waters of the Western Rivers, and Pakistan's acute vulnerability to

09:56	1	policy and the hydrological underpinnings of the Treaty.	09:59 1	non-Pakistani dams also Pakistani dams, but a number
	2	And I use the word "hydrological" with a sense of	2	of other non-Pakistani dams to address Dr Blackmore's
	3	caution, because I'm not intending to label	3	enquiry.
	4	an engineering hydrological mantle for Mr Fietta, but	4	Dr Morris is also a veteran of the Kishenganga
	5	he's going to be talking about all of those issues.	5	arbitration, so he brings a measure of institutional
	6	Finally, we will come to Dr Morris's presentation,	6	memory from those proceedings.
	7	providing an opportunity for an authentic engineering	7	Mr Chairman, members of the Court, before I hand
	8	voice in the discussion. You heard in the Neelum-Jhelum	8	over to Ms Rees-Evans, which I will do in 60 seconds,
	9	site visit a lot of Pakistan's expert engineers	9	I have one concluding observation to make.
	10	obviously not talking about the Treaty, but giving you	10	As I addressed yesterday, while the origins of the
	11	an insight into the operation of run-of-river dams. And	11	present dispute are to be found in the Kishenganga
	12	this will be an opportunity for an authentic engineering	12	dispute, which was crystallised in 2006, with the first
	13	voice actually addressing the dispute and the Treaty.	13	correspondence identifying that it was a dispute for
	14	The Treaty, although it is a legal instrument and	14	purposes of Article IX, the roots of the parties'
	15	one of constitutional importance, was critically	15	systemic dispute, of which you are seised, go back much
	16	informed in its negotiation by engineers. As we have	16	deeper: to Pakistan's objection to India's Baglihar Dam
	17	addressed in our Memorial, the World Bank team that held	17	proposals in 1992. And I referenced the letter in which
	18	the ring in the negotiations of the Treaty was led,	18	Pakistan cited a number of the paragraph 8 subparagraphs
	19	amongst others, by Raymond Wheeler, the engineering	19	in 1992, in which it objected to India's Baglihar
í	20	advisor to the World Bank from 1949 to 1964.	20	proposal.
í	21	As formerly Lieutenant General Raymond Wheeler,	21	That objection particularised Pakistan's concerns
ź	22	Mr Wheeler had been the Chief of Engineers of the United	22	over India's interpretation of the paragraph 8 design
ź	23	States Army in the period before his appointment to the	23	criteria of run-of-river HEPs. That dispute has never
ź	24	World Bank, his retirement from the army. So he was	24	been resolved or gone away, other than with respect to
,	25	an expert engineer of longstanding experience, who was	25	the binding determination concerning the Baglihar plant
		Page 17		Page 19
		1 450 17		1 450 17
09:57	1	at the helm of the negotiations of the Treaty on the	10:00 1	alone, following the Neutral Expert's determination of
09:57	2	technical engineering side, from their inception to	2	February 2007. The contours of the systemic
09:57	2 3	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was]	2 3	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are
09:57	2 3 4	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964.	2 3 4	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There
09:57	2 3 4 5	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's	2 3 4 5	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some
09:57	2 3 4 5 6	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and	2 3 4 5 6	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same
09:57	2 3 4 5 6 7	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important	2 3 4 5 6 7	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute.
09:57	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured presentation but to provide an opportunity for the Court	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, India flushes its
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured presentation but to provide an opportunity for the Court to engage with Dr Morris on issues arising from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, India flushes its Western River HEPs, including without notification to
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured presentation but to provide an opportunity for the Court to engage with Dr Morris on issues arising from the Neelum-Jhelum site visit that you may have wanted to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, India flushes its Western River HEPs, including without notification to Pakistan, and India refuses to come to these
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured presentation but to provide an opportunity for the Court to engage with Dr Morris on issues arising from the Neelum-Jhelum site visit that you may have wanted to raise with him in the course of the site visit but,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, India flushes its Western River HEPs, including without notification to Pakistan, and India refuses to come to these proceedings. And as both Pakistan's Deputy Agent and
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured presentation but to provide an opportunity for the Court to engage with Dr Morris on issues arising from the Neelum-Jhelum site visit that you may have wanted to raise with him in the course of the site visit but, because of the Site Visit Protocol, were not able to do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, India flushes its Western River HEPs, including without notification to Pakistan, and India refuses to come to these proceedings. And as both Pakistan's Deputy Agent and I noted yesterday, India cannot, by its absence from
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured presentation but to provide an opportunity for the Court to engage with Dr Morris on issues arising from the Neelum-Jhelum site visit that you may have wanted to raise with him in the course of the site visit but, because of the Site Visit Protocol, were not able to do so.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, India flushes its Western River HEPs, including without notification to Pakistan, and India refuses to come to these proceedings. And as both Pakistan's Deputy Agent and I noted yesterday, India cannot, by its absence from these proceedings, strengthen a fundamentally flawed
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured presentation but to provide an opportunity for the Court to engage with Dr Morris on issues arising from the Neelum-Jhelum site visit that you may have wanted to raise with him in the course of the site visit but, because of the Site Visit Protocol, were not able to do so. You will know that Dr Morris is a leading authority 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, India flushes its Western River HEPs, including without notification to Pakistan, and India refuses to come to these proceedings. And as both Pakistan's Deputy Agent and I noted yesterday, India cannot, by its absence from these proceedings, strengthen a fundamentally flawed case by the device of simply not making it.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured presentation but to provide an opportunity for the Court to engage with Dr Morris on issues arising from the Neelum-Jhelum site visit that you may have wanted to raise with him in the course of the site visit but, because of the Site Visit Protocol, were not able to do so. You will know that Dr Morris is a leading authority on sediment management. Amongst his many other virtues, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, India flushes its Western River HEPs, including without notification to Pakistan, and India refuses to come to these proceedings. And as both Pakistan's Deputy Agent and I noted yesterday, India cannot, by its absence from these proceedings, strengthen a fundamentally flawed case by the device of simply not making it. Mr Chairman, with that, unless there's anything
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured presentation but to provide an opportunity for the Court to engage with Dr Morris on issues arising from the Neelum-Jhelum site visit that you may have wanted to raise with him in the course of the site visit but, because of the Site Visit Protocol, were not able to do so. You will know that Dr Morris is a leading authority on sediment management. Amongst his many other virtues, he also has a deep experience across the whole of the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, India flushes its Western River HEPs, including without notification to Pakistan, and India refuses to come to these proceedings. And as both Pakistan's Deputy Agent and I noted yesterday, India cannot, by its absence from these proceedings, strengthen a fundamentally flawed case by the device of simply not making it. Mr Chairman, with that, unless there's anything further with which I can help you, may I ask you to
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured presentation but to provide an opportunity for the Court to engage with Dr Morris on issues arising from the Neelum-Jhelum site visit that you may have wanted to raise with him in the course of the site visit but, because of the Site Visit Protocol, were not able to do so. You will know that Dr Morris is a leading authority on sediment management. Amongst his many other virtues, he also has a deep experience across the whole of the Himalayan region, being intimately familiar not only 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, India flushes its Western River HEPs, including without notification to Pakistan, and India refuses to come to these proceedings. And as both Pakistan's Deputy Agent and I noted yesterday, India cannot, by its absence from these proceedings, strengthen a fundamentally flawed case by the device of simply not making it. Mr Chairman, with that, unless there's anything further with which I can help you, may I ask you to invite Ms Rees-Evans to the podium to continue
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured presentation but to provide an opportunity for the Court to engage with Dr Morris on issues arising from the Neelum-Jhelum site visit that you may have wanted to raise with him in the course of the site visit but, because of the Site Visit Protocol, were not able to do so. You will know that Dr Morris is a leading authority on sediment management. Amongst his many other virtues, he also has a deep experience across the whole of the Himalayan region, being intimately familiar not only with Pakistani dams but also with other large dams 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, India flushes its Western River HEPs, including without notification to Pakistan, and India refuses to come to these proceedings. And as both Pakistan's Deputy Agent and I noted yesterday, India cannot, by its absence from these proceedings, strengthen a fundamentally flawed case by the device of simply not making it. Mr Chairman, with that, unless there's anything further with which I can help you, may I ask you to invite Ms Rees-Evans to the podium to continue Pakistan's submissions.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured presentation but to provide an opportunity for the Court to engage with Dr Morris on issues arising from the Neelum-Jhelum site visit that you may have wanted to raise with him in the course of the site visit but, because of the Site Visit Protocol, were not able to do so. You will know that Dr Morris is a leading authority on sediment management. Amongst his many other virtues, he also has a deep experience across the whole of the Himalayan region, being intimately familiar not only with Pakistani dams but also with other large dams across the Himalayas. And one of the responses that 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, India flushes its Western River HEPs, including without notification to Pakistan, and India refuses to come to these proceedings. And as both Pakistan's Deputy Agent and I noted yesterday, India cannot, by its absence from these proceedings, strengthen a fundamentally flawed case by the device of simply not making it. Mr Chairman, with that, unless there's anything further with which I can help you, may I ask you to invite Ms Rees-Evans to the podium to continue Pakistan's submissions. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I don't think there
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured presentation but to provide an opportunity for the Court to engage with Dr Morris on issues arising from the Neelum-Jhelum site visit that you may have wanted to raise with him in the course of the site visit but, because of the Site Visit Protocol, were not able to do so. You will know that Dr Morris is a leading authority on sediment management. Amongst his many other virtues, he also has a deep experience across the whole of the Himalayan region, being intimately familiar not only with Pakistani dams but also with other large dams across the Himalayas. And one of the responses that Dr Morris will give to the enquiry raised by 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, India flushes its Western River HEPs, including without notification to Pakistan, and India refuses to come to these proceedings. And as both Pakistan's Deputy Agent and I noted yesterday, India cannot, by its absence from these proceedings, strengthen a fundamentally flawed case by the device of simply not making it. Mr Chairman, with that, unless there's anything further with which I can help you, may I ask you to invite Ms Rees-Evans to the podium to continue Pakistan's submissions. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I don't think there are any questions we have for you at this time.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 technical engineering side, from their inception to their conclusion. His period at the World Bank [was] from 1949 all the way through to 1964. As you will also appreciate from Pakistan's Memorial, the US Army Corps of Engineers standards and guidance published over the years is a hugely important resource in this field. As I mentioned just a moment ago, Dr Morris has a structured presentation to give you. But the purpose of his submissions is not only to make the structured presentation but to provide an opportunity for the Court to engage with Dr Morris on issues arising from the Neelum-Jhelum site visit that you may have wanted to raise with him in the course of the site visit but, because of the Site Visit Protocol, were not able to do so. You will know that Dr Morris is a leading authority on sediment management. Amongst his many other virtues, he also has a deep experience across the whole of the Himalayan region, being intimately familiar not only with Pakistani dams but also with other large dams across the Himalayas. And one of the responses that 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 February 2007. The contours of the systemic interpretative dispute that are now before you are largely the same as they were going back to 1992. There has been some variation, there has been some circumstantial change, but it's largely the same dispute. The Kishenganga Court gave binding interpretations with systemic effect in respect of a number of matters, including the preclusion of drawdown flushing. India continues to contest this. And as we heard from Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, India flushes its Western River HEPs, including without notification to Pakistan, and India refuses to come to these proceedings. And as both Pakistan's Deputy Agent and I noted yesterday, India cannot, by its absence from these proceedings, strengthen a fundamentally flawed case by the device of simply not making it. Mr Chairman, with that, unless there's anything further with which I can help you, may I ask you to invite Ms Rees-Evans to the podium to continue Pakistan's submissions. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sir Daniel. I don't think there

		•	
10:02 1	Thank you very much.	10:05 1	circumstance where I wondered if Pakistan would provide
2	(10.02 am)	2	advance notice, since the early construction of
3	Submissions on Negotiating the Treaty	3	Neelum-Jhelum could have preempted or prevented the
4	MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the	4	construction of Kishenganga.
5	Court. It's an honour to appear before you again this	5	That was the thought that motivated my question.
6	morning to represent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.	6	I'm not looking for a particular answer on that at this
7	Today I will address you on aspects of the negotiating	7	point, but I just wanted to clarify why I asked that
8	history of the Indus Waters Treaty that are relevant to	8	question.
9	this phase of the proceedings.	9	MS REES-EVANS: Okay. That's helpful to know, thank you.
10	Before I do, I'd like to pick up on a point that	10	We will check whether there is any clarification we need
11	Mr Minear raised in a question to Mr Shah yesterday in	11	to make on that, and revert if there is.
12	his examination. This was in the transcript at Day 1,	12	MR MINEAR: Thank you.
13	page 167, lines 16 to 19. Mr Minear asked:	13	MS REES-EVANS: (Slide 2) So with that, I will turn now to
14	" under Article VII(2), does Pakistan, as	14	my presentation. The purpose of the presentation
15	a downstream riparian, ever have occasion or obligation	15	situated, as it is, at the beginning of Pakistan's
16	to notify India of its engineering works that might	16	submissions is to highlight for you the key features
17	materially affect India?"	17	of the historical context that lies behind the Treaty.
18	Mr Shah answered:	18	And it will take three parts.
19	"I don't think so."	19	First of all, I will look at the historical origins
20	We just wanted to pick up on this response by	20	and circumstances of conclusion of the Treaty. Then
21	reference to the terms of Article VII(2) of the Treaty.	21	I will go through the negotiation of the Treaty in the
22	Under Article VII(2), the information-sharing	22	critical period between 1954 and 1960. Then finally,
23	obligations apply to both parties. It provides that:	23	I will draw some conclusions in my third section on the
24	"If either party plans to construct any engineering	24	travaux and the interpretation of Article III
25	work which would cause interference with the waters of	25	Annexure D. And it's in this section that I will return
	Page 21		Page 23
			1 age 23
10:04 1	any of the Rivers and which in its opinion, would affect	10:07 1	to, Mr Minear, one of your questions on the travaux to
10:04 1 2	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other	10:07 1	Mr Shah yesterday afternoon.
	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating		
2	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the	2	Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics.
2 3	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude	2 3	Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by
2 3 4	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work."	2 3 4	Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation
2 3 4 5 6 7	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the	2 3 4 5 6 7	Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in which Pakistan would be capable of constructing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent states of Pakistan and India by an act of the British
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in which Pakistan would be capable of constructing engineering work which would cause interference with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent states of Pakistan and India by an act of the British Parliament in 1947. As he said yesterday and this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in which Pakistan would be capable of constructing engineering work which would cause interference with the waters and would affect India materially.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent states of Pakistan and India by an act of the British Parliament in 1947. As he said yesterday and this morning, the act divided the land, but failed to address
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in which Pakistan would be capable of constructing engineering work which would cause interference with the waters and would affect India materially. So it's this practical reality that was reflected in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent states of Pakistan and India by an act of the British Parliament in 1947. As he said yesterday and this morning, the act divided the land, but failed to address the allocation of waters. It left parts or all of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in which Pakistan would be capable of constructing engineering work which would cause interference with the waters and would affect India materially. So it's this practical reality that was reflected in Mr Shah's answer to you, but we wanted to ensure that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent states of Pakistan and India by an act of the British Parliament in 1947. As he said yesterday and this morning, the act divided the land, but failed to address the allocation of waters. It left parts or all of the upper reaches of the six main rivers of the Indus system
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in which Pakistan would be capable of constructing engineering work which would cause interference with the waters and would affect India materially. So it's this practical reality that was reflected in Mr Shah's answer to you, but we wanted to ensure that the legal position was clear on the record.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent states of Pakistan and India by an act of the British Parliament in 1947. As he said yesterday and this morning, the act divided the land, but failed to address the allocation of waters. It left parts or all of the upper reaches of the six main rivers of the Indus system in what is now Indian-controlled Kashmir, with their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in which Pakistan would be capable of constructing engineering work which would cause interference with the waters and would affect India materially. So it's this practical reality that was reflected in Mr Shah's answer to you, but we wanted to ensure that the legal position was clear on the record. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Ms Rees-Evans. (Pause) Sorry for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent states of Pakistan and India by an act of the British Parliament in 1947. As he said yesterday and this morning, the act divided the land, but failed to address the allocation of waters. It left parts or all of the upper reaches of the six main rivers of the Indus system in what is now Indian-controlled Kashmir, with their downstream stretches flowing through Pakistan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in which Pakistan would be capable of constructing engineering work which would cause interference with the waters and would affect India materially. So it's this practical reality that was reflected in Mr Shah's answer to you, but we wanted to ensure that the legal position was clear on the record. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Ms Rees-Evans. (Pause) Sorry for the delay in my question, Ms Rees-Evans. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent states of Pakistan and India by an act of the British Parliament in 1947. As he said yesterday and this morning, the act divided the land, but failed to address the allocation of waters. It left parts or all of the upper reaches of the six main rivers of the Indus system in what is now Indian-controlled Kashmir, with their downstream stretches flowing through Pakistan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in which Pakistan would be capable of constructing engineering work which would cause interference with the waters and would affect India materially. So it's this practical reality that was reflected in Mr Shah's answer to you, but we wanted to ensure that the legal position was clear on the record. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Ms Rees-Evans. The basis for my question, just so I'm clear on 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent states of Pakistan and India by an act of the British Parliament in 1947. As he said yesterday and this morning, the act divided the land, but failed to address the allocation of waters. It left parts or all of the upper reaches of the six main rivers of the Indus system in what is now Indian-controlled Kashmir, with their downstream stretches flowing through Pakistan. As the Deputy Agent said in his opening remarks yesterday:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in which Pakistan would be capable of constructing engineering work which would cause interference with the waters and would affect India materially. So it's this practical reality that was reflected in Mr Shah's answer to you, but we wanted to ensure that the legal position was clear on the record. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Ms Rees-Evans. The basis for my question, just so I'm clear on this, is the situation such as Pakistan's planned 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent states of Pakistan and India by an act of the British Parliament in 1947. As he said yesterday and this morning, the act divided the land, but failed to address the allocation of waters. It left parts or all of the upper reaches of the six main rivers of the Indus system in what is now Indian-controlled Kashmir, with their downstream stretches flowing through Pakistan. As the Deputy Agent said in his opening remarks yesterday:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in which Pakistan would be capable of constructing engineering work which would cause interference with the waters and would affect India materially. So it's this practical reality that was reflected in Mr Shah's answer to you, but we wanted to ensure that the legal position was clear on the record. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Ms Rees-Evans. (Pause) Sorry for the delay in my question, Ms Rees-Evans. The basis for my question, just so I'm clear on this, is the situation such as Pakistan's planned construction of the Neelum-Jhelum Dam and hydropower 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent states of Pakistan and India by an act of the British Parliament in 1947. As he said yesterday and this morning, the act divided the land, but failed to address the allocation of waters. It left parts or all of the upper reaches of the six main rivers of the Indus system in what is now Indian-controlled Kashmir, with their downstream stretches flowing through Pakistan. As the Deputy Agent said in his opening remarks yesterday: " since the independence of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan in 1947, Pakistan, being the lower riparian,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in which Pakistan would be capable of constructing engineering work which would cause interference with the waters and would affect India materially. So it's this practical reality that was reflected in Mr Shah's answer to you, but we wanted to ensure that the legal position was clear on the record. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Ms Rees-Evans. (Pause) Sorry for the delay in my question, Ms Rees-Evans. The basis for my question, just so I'm clear on this, is the situation such as Pakistan's planned construction of the Neelum-Jhelum Dam and hydropower plant. That construction could have affected India's 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent states of Pakistan and India by an act of the British Parliament in 1947. As he said yesterday and this morning, the act divided the land, but failed to address the allocation of waters. It left parts or all of the upper reaches of the six main rivers of the Indus system in what is now Indian-controlled Kashmir, with their downstream stretches flowing through Pakistan. As the Deputy Agent said in his opening remarks yesterday: " since the independence of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan in 1947, Pakistan, being the lower riparian, has lived in insecurity."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in which Pakistan would be capable of constructing engineering work which would cause interference with the waters and would affect India materially. So it's this practical reality that was reflected in Mr Shah's answer to you, but we wanted to ensure that the legal position was clear on the record. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Ms Rees-Evans. (Pause) Sorry for the delay in my question, Ms Rees-Evans. The basis for my question, just so I'm clear on this, is the situation such as Pakistan's planned construction of the Neelum-Jhelum Dam and hydropower 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent states of Pakistan and India by an act of the British Parliament in 1947. As he said yesterday and this morning, the act divided the land, but failed to address the allocation of waters. It left parts or all of the upper reaches of the six main rivers of the Indus system in what is now Indian-controlled Kashmir, with their downstream stretches flowing through Pakistan. As the Deputy Agent said in his opening remarks yesterday: " since the independence of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan in 1947, Pakistan, being the lower riparian, has lived in insecurity."
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 the other Party materially, it shall notify the other Party of its plans and shall supply such data relating to the work as may be available and as would enable the other Party to inform itself of the nature, magnitude and effect of the work." So it's mutual: both parties are under the obligation. Pakistan has the same obligation as India. But Pakistan hasn't had occasion in your words, Mr Minear to notify under Article VII(2). And the obligation is of more limited relevance, therefore, to Pakistan, because there are limited circumstances in which Pakistan would be capable of constructing engineering work which would cause interference with the waters and would affect India materially. So it's this practical reality that was reflected in Mr Shah's answer to you, but we wanted to ensure that the legal position was clear on the record. MR MINEAR: Thank you, Ms Rees-Evans. (Pause) Sorry for the delay in my question, Ms Rees-Evans. The basis for my question, just so I'm clear on this, is the situation such as Pakistan's planned construction of the Neelum-Jhelum Dam and hydropower plant. That construction could have affected India's 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 Mr Shah yesterday afternoon. (Slide 3) So turning to the first of these three topics. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, as you will by now know well, the events that led to the negotiation and conclusion of the Treaty are not just a point of historical interest. Appreciation of those events is essential to understanding the text of the Treaty and its operation in practice to this day. Sir Daniel referred you yesterday to the partition of British colonial India into what are now independent states of Pakistan and India by an act of the British Parliament in 1947. As he said yesterday and this morning, the act divided the land, but failed to address the allocation of waters. It left parts or all of the upper reaches of the six main rivers of the Indus system in what is now Indian-controlled Kashmir, with their downstream stretches flowing through Pakistan. As the Deputy Agent said in his opening remarks yesterday: " since the independence of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan in 1947, Pakistan, being the lower riparian, has lived in insecurity."

10.09 1	lines 4 to 6	10.10 1	could appear to the one that we just had (alide 4)
10:08 1	lines 4 to 6.	10:10 1	could go back to the one that we just had (slide 4).
2	You were referred yesterday to the events of	2	I'm still not clear how best to interpret what's
3	April 1948, the so-called "water dispute". This	3	being said here. As indicated yesterday, I think India,
4	incident left deep and long-lasting scars in the	4	in one of its memorials in the Kishenganga proceeding,
5	memories of the people of Pakistan, and Pakistan has	5	argued that the cut-off was not of all the water flowing
6	lived ever since in the shadow of the insecurity of the	6	from India into Pakistan, all six rivers, if you will;
7	1948 rupture.	7	instead, it was of two canals. And so when I read this
8	That shadow is well encapsulated in an article	8	kind of quote, where it says, "during negotiations
9	written by Mr David Lilienthal and published in	9	[regarding] allocation of water for irrigation, India
10	Collier's magazine just three years after the water	10	cut off most of the supply of water", is that to be
11	dispute, in 1951 (P-233). If you're familiar with	11	interpreted as two particular canals were cut off, or
12	Appendix A of Pakistan's Memorial, where we set out the	12	the entire water supply was cut off?
13	travaux in quite some extensive detail, you'll be	13	MS REES-EVANS: Well, we looked into this after your
14	familiar with Mr Lilienthal, whose name appears	14	question yesterday and I have deliberately not gone into
15	throughout it. He was the founding chairman of the	15	too much detail about this today because the reality is
16	Tennessee Valley Authority, a public corporation, whose	16	that what matters is [that] the impression that was left
17	purpose was, among other things, to supervise a vast	17	in Pakistan was this impression of extreme fear, and the
18	system of navigation, flood control and electricity	18	rupture stayed in the minds of the negotiators
19	generation in Tennessee and parts of several surrounding	19	thereafter, and in Pakistanis to this day. So the
20	US states.	20	feeling among Pakistanis caused by this incident was of
21	In 1951, the Governments of India and Pakistan	21	India being an extreme threat in terms of its control
22	invited him to visit India and Pakistan. His article	22	over the waters.
23	summarised the findings of his trip and made proposals	23	In terms of the specifics of what happened in the
24	for the resolution of the water dispute. He observed	24	incident, India has taken the position that you
25	with his own eyes a temporary reduction in the flow of	25	described yesterday in its counter-memorial. Pakistan
	Page 25		Page 27
10.00 1		10.12 1	
10:09 1	water from India, in a source of water that supplied	10:12 1	describes a different situation in I think it's
2	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the	2	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for
2 3	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He	2 3	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that
2 3 4	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute.	2 3 4	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350].
2 3 4 5	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4	2 3 4 5	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of
2 3 4 5 6	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the	2 3 4 5 6	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it
2 3 4 5 6 7	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future".	2 3 4 5 6 7	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from rivers or canals within India which would otherwise flow	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly what happened in 1948, we can certainly do that. But
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from rivers or canals within India which would otherwise flow on to Pakistan."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly what happened in 1948, we can certainly do that. But I think as Sir Daniel said yesterday, the main takeaway
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from rivers or canals within India which would otherwise flow on to Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-233 at page 8.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly what happened in 1948, we can certainly do that. But I think as Sir Daniel said yesterday, the main takeaway from it is the impact that it had in the minds of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from rivers or canals within India which would otherwise flow on to Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-233 at page 8. At the same time, India was proudly promoting its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly what happened in 1948, we can certainly do that. But I think as Sir Daniel said yesterday, the main takeaway from it is the impact that it had in the minds of Pakistanis and how it influenced their approach to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from rivers or canals within India which would otherwise flow on to Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-233 at page 8. At the same time, India was proudly promoting its extensive hydroelectric plants for its "vast resources	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly what happened in 1948, we can certainly do that. But I think as Sir Daniel said yesterday, the main takeaway from it is the impact that it had in the minds of Pakistanis and how it influenced their approach to the negotiations during this period from 1948 to 1960.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from rivers or canals within India which would otherwise flow on to Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-233 at page 8. At the same time, India was proudly promoting its extensive hydroelectric plants for its "vast resources of large rivers and high mountains". That's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly what happened in 1948, we can certainly do that. But I think as Sir Daniel said yesterday, the main takeaway from it is the impact that it had in the minds of Pakistanis and how it influenced their approach to the negotiations during this period from 1948 to 1960. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from rivers or canals within India which would otherwise flow on to Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-233 at page 8. At the same time, India was proudly promoting its extensive hydroelectric plants for its "vast resources of large rivers and high mountains". That's Exhibit P-409, page ii.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly what happened in 1948, we can certainly do that. But I think as Sir Daniel said yesterday, the main takeaway from it is the impact that it had in the minds of Pakistanis and how it influenced their approach to the negotiations during this period from 1948 to 1960. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: So Mr Lilienthal observed this is at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from rivers or canals within India which would otherwise flow on to Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-233 at page 8. At the same time, India was proudly promoting its extensive hydroelectric plants for its "vast resources of large rivers and high mountains". That's Exhibit P-409, page ii. This existential and ever-present threat of Indian	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly what happened in 1948, we can certainly do that. But I think as Sir Daniel said yesterday, the main takeaway from it is the impact that it had in the minds of Pakistanis and how it influenced their approach to the negotiations during this period from 1948 to 1960. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: So Mr Lilienthal observed this is at slide 5, and this is the description that Mr Lilienthal,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from rivers or canals within India which would otherwise flow on to Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-233 at page 8. At the same time, India was proudly promoting its extensive hydroelectric plants for its "vast resources of large rivers and high mountains". That's Exhibit P-409, page ii. This existential and ever-present threat of Indian interference with waters on which Pakistan was reliant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly what happened in 1948, we can certainly do that. But I think as Sir Daniel said yesterday, the main takeaway from it is the impact that it had in the minds of Pakistanis and how it influenced their approach to the negotiations during this period from 1948 to 1960. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: So Mr Lilienthal observed this is at slide 5, and this is the description that Mr Lilienthal, a third-party neutral observer, had of what was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from rivers or canals within India which would otherwise flow on to Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-233 at page 8. At the same time, India was proudly promoting its extensive hydroelectric plants for its "vast resources of large rivers and high mountains". That's Exhibit P-409, page ii. This existential and ever-present threat of Indian interference with waters on which Pakistan was reliant was, in his view, one of the most important elements of	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly what happened in 1948, we can certainly do that. But I think as Sir Daniel said yesterday, the main takeaway from it is the impact that it had in the minds of Pakistanis and how it influenced their approach to the negotiations during this period from 1948 to 1960. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: So Mr Lilienthal observed this is at slide 5, and this is the description that Mr Lilienthal, a third-party neutral observer, had of what was happening there at this time that:
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from rivers or canals within India which would otherwise flow on to Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-233 at page 8. At the same time, India was proudly promoting its extensive hydroelectric plants for its "vast resources of large rivers and high mountains". That's Exhibit P-409, page ii. This existential and ever-present threat of Indian interference with waters on which Pakistan was reliant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly what happened in 1948, we can certainly do that. But I think as Sir Daniel said yesterday, the main takeaway from it is the impact that it had in the minds of Pakistanis and how it influenced their approach to the negotiations during this period from 1948 to 1960. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: So Mr Lilienthal observed this is at slide 5, and this is the description that Mr Lilienthal, a third-party neutral observer, had of what was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from rivers or canals within India which would otherwise flow on to Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-233 at page 8. At the same time, India was proudly promoting its extensive hydroelectric plants for its "vast resources of large rivers and high mountains". That's Exhibit P-409, page ii. This existential and ever-present threat of Indian interference with waters on which Pakistan was reliant was, in his view, one of the most important elements of the dispute between the two countries.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly what happened in 1948, we can certainly do that. But I think as Sir Daniel said yesterday, the main takeaway from it is the impact that it had in the minds of Pakistanis and how it influenced their approach to the negotiations during this period from 1948 to 1960. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: So Mr Lilienthal observed this is at slide 5, and this is the description that Mr Lilienthal, a third-party neutral observer, had of what was happening there at this time that:
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from rivers or canals within India which would otherwise flow on to Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-233 at page 8. At the same time, India was proudly promoting its extensive hydroelectric plants for its "vast resources of large rivers and high mountains". That's Exhibit P-409, page ii. This existential and ever-present threat of Indian interference with waters on which Pakistan was reliant was, in his view, one of the most important elements of the dispute between the two countries. THE CHAIRMAN: Ms Rees-Evans, sorry to cut in relatively	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly what happened in 1948, we can certainly do that. But I think as Sir Daniel said yesterday, the main takeaway from it is the impact that it had in the minds of Pakistanis and how it influenced their approach to the negotiations during this period from 1948 to 1960. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: So Mr Lilienthal observed this is at slide 5, and this is the description that Mr Lilienthal, a third-party neutral observer, had of what was happening there at this time that: "No army, with bombs and shellfire, could devastate a land as thoroughly as Pakistan could be devastated by
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	Lahore and the surrounding farming country near the border. Pakistanis were, in his words, "furious". He put their visceral reaction down to the 1948 dispute. That dispute, as you can see in the quote on slide 4 now, at the very end, "makes Pakistan fearful of the future". As early as 1951, Mr Lilienthal saw firsthand India's expansive canal-building and irrigation programme. He commented that: "Most of this new withdrawal of water will come from rivers or canals within India which would otherwise flow on to Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-233 at page 8. At the same time, India was proudly promoting its extensive hydroelectric plants for its "vast resources of large rivers and high mountains". That's Exhibit P-409, page ii. This existential and ever-present threat of Indian interference with waters on which Pakistan was reliant was, in his view, one of the most important elements of the dispute between the two countries. THE CHAIRMAN: Ms Rees-Evans, sorry to cut in relatively early in your presentation, but since you have this	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 a publication of 1952. And I can find the reference for you: I think it might be P-150, but we can confirm that [P-350]. Pakistan sets out in that publication its version of events of the 1948 dispute in quite some detail, but it doesn't pick up on these two canals that India referred to in its submissions. It refers to a more general impact on a wide area within Pakistan. So if you would like us to return to that question and set out in any more detail the specifics of exactly what happened in 1948, we can certainly do that. But I think as Sir Daniel said yesterday, the main takeaway from it is the impact that it had in the minds of Pakistanis and how it influenced their approach to the negotiations during this period from 1948 to 1960. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: So Mr Lilienthal observed this is at slide 5, and this is the description that Mr Lilienthal, a third-party neutral observer, had of what was happening there at this time that: "No army, with bombs and shellfire, could devastate a land as thoroughly as Pakistan could be devastated by the simple expedient of India's permanently shutting off

10:14 1	of Pakistan alive."	10:16 1	an independent and separate supply, and this would help
2	This is Exhibit P-233, pages 7 to 8.	2	to "minimiz[e] friction between the two countries".
3	In other words, he is describing the power of India	3	Justifying this fundamental principle of
4	to weaponise the water. It was then, as it still is	4	independence, the Bank stated that it was "desirable",
5	now, a very real one. And the risk of weaponisation of	5	in its view:
6	water lay, both then and now, at the heart of the	6	" so far as practicable, to avoid control by
7	dispute between the parties.	7	India over waters on which Pakistan will be dependent,
8	He described then that "The starting point" of the	8	and to enable each country to control the works
9	settlement of the dispute this is at slide 6	9	supplying the water allocated to it and [to] determine
10	"should be to set to rest Pakistan's fears of	10	in its own interests the apportionment of waters within
11	deprivation and a return to desert". That should be the	11	its territories."
12	starting point of the solution to the Indus Waters	12	That's at paragraph 22 of the 1954 proposal.
13	problem.	13	Just as Mr Lilienthal had envisaged, this would help
14	Mr Lilienthal's article was the catalyst that	14	to allay Pakistan's fears of deprivation and, in his
15	prompted the World Bank's intervention. In 1951, having	15	words, "return to desert".
16	seen the article, the then President of the World Bank,	16	The 1954 proposal further explained that mutual
17	Mr Eugene Black, wrote to India and Pakistan. He	17	independence would be achieved by:
18	offered them the Bank's good offices to develop	18	" locati[ng] works serving each country on
19	an approach to the management of the Indus Waters	19	territories under its control, and [by the provision of]
20	resources. His letters are at P-354 and P-355.	20	assurances against interference by either country with
21	The proposal put forward was based on that set out	21	the supplies on which the other depends"
22	in Mr Lilienthal's article. It envisaged cooperative	22	These mechanisms, the Bank proposed, would "reduce
23	development of the water resources of the basin. The	23	the chances of disputes", and would "promote the
24	proposal itself is set out in Exhibits P-356 and P-357,	24	development of the entire basin". That's at P-130,
25	and again they are letters from Mr Black to the	25	paragraphs 41 and 42.
	Page 29		Page 31
10:15 1	Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India respectively.	10:18 1	The basic scheme of the 1954 proposal survived
10:15 1 2	Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India respectively. Two years of negotiations based on his proposal	10:18 1 2	The basic scheme of the 1954 proposal survived essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of
10:15 1 2 3	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal	10:18 1 2 3	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of
2	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of	2	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations.
2 3	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the	2 3	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of
2 3 4 5	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the	2 3 4	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed
2 3 4	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India	2 3 4 5	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the
2 3 4 5 6	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the	2 3 4 5 6	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise
2 3 4 5 6 7	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be	2 3 4 5 6 7	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal gained traction with the negotiating states, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal gained traction with the negotiating states, and ultimately it came to underpin the grand bargain	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers, in particular the generation of hydroelectric power, were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal gained traction with the negotiating states, and ultimately it came to underpin the grand bargain reflected in the Treaty.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers, in particular the generation of hydroelectric power, were fiercely contested. Because of that, ultimately they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal gained traction with the negotiating states, and ultimately it came to underpin the grand bargain reflected in the Treaty. Slide 7 has now got the 1954 proposal on it, and it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers, in particular the generation of hydroelectric power, were fiercely contested. Because of that, ultimately they were tightly constrained.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal gained traction with the negotiating states, and ultimately it came to underpin the grand bargain reflected in the Treaty. Slide 7 has now got the 1954 proposal on it, and it embodied two fundamental principles. The first was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers, in particular the generation of hydroelectric power, were fiercely contested. Because of that, ultimately they were tightly constrained. So I return just for a moment back to the basis of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal gained traction with the negotiating states, and ultimately it came to underpin the grand bargain reflected in the Treaty. Slide 7 has now got the 1954 proposal on it, and it embodied two fundamental principles. The first was that:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the waters of the Western Rivers, in particular the generation of hydroelectric power, were fiercely contested. Because of that, ultimately they were tightly constrained. So I return just for a moment back to the basis of the negotiations over this period, which is the 1954 proposal of the Bank. The key details of that proposal were set out in four simple paragraphs, shown on this
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal gained traction with the negotiating states, and ultimately it came to underpin the grand bargain reflected in the Treaty. Slide 7 has now got the 1954 proposal on it, and it embodied two fundamental principles. The first was that: " historic withdrawals [of waters] must be continued, [but] not necessarily from existing sources."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers, in particular the generation of hydroelectric power, were fiercely contested. Because of that, ultimately they were tightly constrained. So I return just for a moment back to the basis of the negotiations over this period, which is the 1954 proposal of the Bank. The key details of that proposal were set out in four simple paragraphs, shown on this and the next slide, slides 9 and 10.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal gained traction with the negotiating states, and ultimately it came to underpin the grand bargain reflected in the Treaty. Slide 7 has now got the 1954 proposal on it, and it embodied two fundamental principles. The first was that: " historic withdrawals [of waters] must be continued, [but] not necessarily from existing sources." The second was the principle of "mutual	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers, in particular the generation of hydroelectric power, were fiercely contested. Because of that, ultimately they were tightly constrained. So I return just for a moment back to the basis of the negotiations over this period, which is the 1954 proposal of the Bank. The key details of that proposal were set out in four simple paragraphs, shown on this and the next slide, slides 9 and 10. The first paragraph is the early progenitor of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal gained traction with the negotiating states, and ultimately it came to underpin the grand bargain reflected in the Treaty. Slide 7 has now got the 1954 proposal on it, and it embodied two fundamental principles. The first was that: " historic withdrawals [of waters] must be continued, [but] not necessarily from existing sources." The second was the principle of "mutual independence". It was to be achieved by dividing	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers, in particular the generation of hydroelectric power, were fiercely contested. Because of that, ultimately they were tightly constrained. So I return just for a moment back to the basis of the negotiations over this period, which is the 1954 proposal of the Bank. The key details of that proposal were set out in four simple paragraphs, shown on this and the next slide, slides 9 and 10. The first paragraph is the early progenitor of India's let-flow obligation. This is an obligation that
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal gained traction with the negotiating states, and ultimately it came to underpin the grand bargain reflected in the Treaty. Slide 7 has now got the 1954 proposal on it, and it embodied two fundamental principles. The first was that: " historic withdrawals [of waters] must be continued, [but] not necessarily from existing sources." The second was the principle of "mutual independence". It was to be achieved by dividing control of the waters: Western Rivers to Pakistan,	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers, in particular the generation of hydroelectric power, were fiercely contested. Because of that, ultimately they were tightly constrained. So I return just for a moment back to the basis of the negotiations over this period, which is the 1954 proposal of the Bank. The key details of that proposal were set out in four simple paragraphs, shown on this and the next slide, slides 9 and 10. The first paragraph is the early progenitor of India's let-flow obligation. This is an obligation that would ultimately be crystallised in Article III(1) of
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal gained traction with the negotiating states, and ultimately it came to underpin the grand bargain reflected in the Treaty. Slide 7 has now got the 1954 proposal on it, and it embodied two fundamental principles. The first was that: " historic withdrawals [of waters] must be continued, [but] not necessarily from existing sources." The second was the principle of "mutual independence". It was to be achieved by dividing control of the waters: Western Rivers to Pakistan, Eastern Rivers to India. The division of control of the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers, in particular the generation of hydroelectric power, were fiercely contested. Because of that, ultimately they were tightly constrained. So I return just for a moment back to the basis of the negotiations over this period, which is the 1954 proposal of the Bank. The key details of that proposal were set out in four simple paragraphs, shown on this and the next slide, slides 9 and 10. The first paragraph is the early progenitor of India's let-flow obligation. This is an obligation that would ultimately be crystallised in Article III(1) of the Treaty. It provided that:
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal gained traction with the negotiating states, and ultimately it came to underpin the grand bargain reflected in the Treaty. Slide 7 has now got the 1954 proposal on it, and it embodied two fundamental principles. The first was that: " historic withdrawals [of waters] must be continued, [but] not necessarily from existing sources." The second was the principle of "mutual independence". It was to be achieved by dividing control of the waters: Western Rivers to Pakistan,	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers, in particular the generation of hydroelectric power, were fiercely contested. Because of that, ultimately they were tightly constrained. So I return just for a moment back to the basis of the negotiations over this period, which is the 1954 proposal of the Bank. The key details of that proposal were set out in four simple paragraphs, shown on this and the next slide, slides 9 and 10. The first paragraph is the early progenitor of India's let-flow obligation. This is an obligation that would ultimately be crystallised in Article III(1) of
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal gained traction with the negotiating states, and ultimately it came to underpin the grand bargain reflected in the Treaty. Slide 7 has now got the 1954 proposal on it, and it embodied two fundamental principles. The first was that: " historic withdrawals [of waters] must be continued, [but] not necessarily from existing sources." The second was the principle of "mutual independence". It was to be achieved by dividing control of the waters: Western Rivers to Pakistan, Eastern Rivers to India. The division of control of the Western and Eastern Rivers would give each 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers, in particular the generation of hydroelectric power, were fiercely contested. Because of that, ultimately they were tightly constrained. So I return just for a moment back to the basis of the negotiations over this period, which is the 1954 proposal of the Bank. The key details of that proposal were set out in four simple paragraphs, shown on this and the next slide, slides 9 and 10. The first paragraph is the early progenitor of India's let-flow obligation. This is an obligation that would ultimately be crystallised in Article III(1) of the Treaty. It provided that: "The entire flow of the Western rivers (Indus,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	Two years of negotiations based on his proposal failed to yield any agreement. The poor prospects of a smooth-running joint administration were part of the problem. Another part of the problem was the fundamentally different approaches of Pakistan and India to how each side's existing uses of water should be serviced. It was this latter problem, the existing uses, that the Bank attempted to solve with its February 1954 proposal, and that's in Exhibit P-130. This proposal gained traction with the negotiating states, and ultimately it came to underpin the grand bargain reflected in the Treaty. Slide 7 has now got the 1954 proposal on it, and it embodied two fundamental principles. The first was that: " historic withdrawals [of waters] must be continued, [but] not necessarily from existing sources." The second was the principle of "mutual independence". It was to be achieved by dividing control of the waters: Western Rivers to Pakistan, Eastern Rivers to India. The division of control of the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	essentially unaltered in the subsequent years of negotiations. With that background context, I now turn to the second part of my presentation, which is a more detailed run-through of the critical negotiating period between 1954 and 1960. And there are two main themes that arise from this period: first, the pivotal importance to Pakistan of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers; second, that exceptions to the principle of India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers, in particular the generation of hydroelectric power, were fiercely contested. Because of that, ultimately they were tightly constrained. So I return just for a moment back to the basis of the negotiations over this period, which is the 1954 proposal of the Bank. The key details of that proposal were set out in four simple paragraphs, shown on this and the next slide, slides 9 and 10. The first paragraph is the early progenitor of India's let-flow obligation. This is an obligation that would ultimately be crystallised in Article III(1) of the Treaty. It provided that:

10.10 1	It always and Charach) moved has available for the evolution	10:22 1	automating into analy. April of a degree dynation and
10:19 1	Jhelum and Chenab) would be available for the exclusive		extending into early April of a degree, duration and
2	use and benefit of Pakistan, and for development by	2	frequency which the Bank Group could not regard as 'tolerable'."
3	Pakistan, except for the insignificant volume of Jhelum	3	
4	flow presently used in Kashmir."	4	That's in the 1956 aide-mémoire, Exhibit P-131,
5	India's share of the bargain, as it was envisaged in	5	paragraph 6(c)(iii). TAMS's findings led to
6	1954, was reflected in the second paragraph. It	6	an adjustment to the proposal, which was set out in the
7	provided that:	7	aide-mémoire from the Bank of May 1956.
8	"The entire flow of the Eastern rivers (Ravi, Beas	8	The aide-mémoire also recorded India's claim "that
9	and Sutlej) would be available for the exclusive use and	9	some part of the flow of the Jhelum and Chenab should be
10	benefit of India, and for development by India"	10	reserved for future development", involving "relatively
11	Except during a specified transition period.	11	insignificant consumptive uses", in the State of Jammu
12	(Slide 10) The third paragraph provided that the	12	and Kashmir. That's at paragraph 7(b) in Exhibit P-131.
13	transition period was to be calculated based on the time	13	That was an issue deferred for discussion until much
14	needed to effect the replacement of supplies for	14	further down the track, presumably on basis that given
15	Pakistan's historic withdrawals from the Eastern Rivers.	15	the "insignificance" to use the terms of the
16	The fourth paragraph addressed the construction and	16	aide-mémoire of such uses, it would not ultimately
17	cost of the works required to effect the replacement of	17	affect the fundamental balance set out in the 1954 Bank
18	supplies from India.	18	proposal.
19	The Bank argued that its 1954 proposal provided	19	The next major landmark in the negotiations came in
20	a "fair division" of the waters, and secured each state	20	May 1957. The Bank conveyed to India and Pakistan "some
21	mutual independence. India swiftly accepted the Bank's	21	suggestions" for a heads of agreement based on the 1954
22	proposal.	22	proposal, as adjusted by the 1956 aide-mémoire.
23	Pakistan was more cautious. It saw the Bank's	23	(Slide 11) The May 1957 head of agreement this is
24	proposal as involving, in its words, "great sacrifices".	24	at P-0362 built upon the division of the waters and
25	And that's in the letter from Foreign Minister Zafrullah	25	exclusivity advanced in the 1954 proposal. It recalled
	-		
	Page 33		Page 35
10:20 1	Khan to Mr Black of 28 July 1954, Exhibit P-383 at	10:23 1	again the central tenet of the 1954 proposal: the
	Khan to Mr Black of 28 July 1954, Exhibit P-383 at paragraph 3.	10:23 1	again the central tenet of the 1954 proposal: the division of the control of the "entire flow" of the
10:20 1 2 3	paragraph 3.		
2	-	2	division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India
2 3 4	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of	2 3	division of the control of the "entire flow" of the
2 3	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first	2 3 4	division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide.
2 3 4 5	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact	2 3 4 5	division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also
2 3 4 5 6 7	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses.	2 3 4 5 6 7	division of the control of the "entire flow" of theWestern and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and Indiarespectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown onthe slide.(Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement alsointroduced for the first time the concept of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut	2 3 4 5 6	division of the control of the "entire flow" of theWestern and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and Indiarespectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown onthe slide.(Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement alsointroduced for the first time the concept ofa Commission. The functions of the Commission would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: " construction of the works on the Indus or on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: " construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: " construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent. After some months of discussion, Pakistan accepted	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: " construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing of the natural flow into Pakistan of the waters of any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent. After some months of discussion, Pakistan accepted the 1954 proposal. Its acceptance was subject, among	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing of the natural flow into Pakistan of the waters of any of these Rivers."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent. After some months of discussion, Pakistan accepted the 1954 proposal. Its acceptance was subject, among other things, to the condition that it receive	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: " construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing of the natural flow into Pakistan of the waters of any of these Rivers." This is at point (h), now shown underlined on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent. After some months of discussion, Pakistan accepted the 1954 proposal. Its acceptance was subject, among other things, to the condition that it receive assurances that Pakistan's existing uses supplied by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: " construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing of the natural flow into Pakistan of the waters of any of these Rivers." This is at point (h), now shown underlined on the slide.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent. After some months of discussion, Pakistan accepted the 1954 proposal. Its acceptance was subject, among other things, to the condition that it receive assurances that Pakistan's existing uses supplied by the Eastern Rivers, and the planned requirements of Gudu and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: " construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing of the natural flow into Pakistan of the waters of any of these Rivers." This is at point (h), now shown underlined on the slide.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent. After some months of discussion, Pakistan accepted the 1954 proposal. Its acceptance was subject, among other things, to the condition that it receive assurances that Pakistan's existing uses supplied by the Eastern Rivers, and the planned requirements of Gudu and Sukkur, could be met from the flow of the Western	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing of the natural flow into Pakistan of the waters of any of these Rivers." This is at point (h), now shown underlined on the slide. This provision caused Pakistan concern. The fundamental basis of the 1954 proposal was "to avoid
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent. After some months of discussion, Pakistan accepted the 1954 proposal. Its acceptance was subject, among other things, to the condition that it receive assurances that Pakistan's existing uses supplied by the Eastern Rivers, and the planned requirements of Gudu and Sukkur, could be met from the flow of the Western Rivers. That's Exhibit P-383, paragraphs 2 to 3.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: " construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing of the natural flow into Pakistan of the waters of any of these Rivers." This is at point (h), now shown underlined on the slide. This provision caused Pakistan concern. The fundamental basis of the 1954 proposal was "to avoid control by India over waters on which Pakistan will be
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent. After some months of discussion, Pakistan accepted the 1954 proposal. Its acceptance was subject, among other things, to the condition that it receive assurances that Pakistan's existing uses supplied by the Eastern Rivers, and the planned requirements of Gudu and Sukkur, could be met from the flow of the Western Rivers. That's Exhibit P-383, paragraphs 2 to 3. Pakistan was right to hesitate. The Bank's	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: " construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing of the natural flow into Pakistan of the waters of any of these Rivers." This is at point (h), now shown underlined on the slide. This provision caused Pakistan concern. The fundamental basis of the 1954 proposal was "to avoid control by India over waters on which Pakistan will be dependent": that's in the 1954 proposal at P-130,
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent. After some months of discussion, Pakistan accepted the 1954 proposal. Its acceptance was subject, among other things, to the condition that it receive assurances that Pakistan's existing uses supplied by the Eastern Rivers, and the planned requirements of Gudu and Sukkur, could be met from the flow of the Western Rivers. That's Exhibit P-383, paragraphs 2 to 3. Pakistan was right to hesitate. The Bank's consultants, a firm called TAMS, subsequently concluded	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: " construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing of the natural flow into Pakistan of the waters of any of these Rivers." This is at point (h), now shown underlined on the slide. This provision caused Pakistan concern. The fundamental basis of the 1954 proposal was "to avoid control by India over waters on which Pakistan will be dependent": that's in the 1954 proposal at P-130, paragraph 22. And Pakistan would fiercely contest any
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent. After some months of discussion, Pakistan accepted the 1954 proposal. Its acceptance was subject, among other things, to the condition that it receive assurances that Pakistan's existing uses supplied by the Eastern Rivers, and the planned requirements of Gudu and Sukkur, could be met from the flow of the Western Rivers. That's Exhibit P-383, paragraphs 2 to 3. Pakistan was right to hesitate. The Bank's consultants, a firm called TAMS, subsequently concluded that the 1954 proposal would lead to:	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing of the natural flow into Pakistan of the waters of any of these Rivers." This is at point (h), now shown underlined on the slide. This provision caused Pakistan concern. The fundamental basis of the 1954 proposal at P-130, paragraph 22. And Pakistan would fiercely contest any attempt to encroach on this.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent. After some months of discussion, Pakistan accepted the 1954 proposal. Its acceptance was subject, among other things, to the condition that it receive assurances that Pakistan's existing uses supplied by the Eastern Rivers, and the planned requirements of Gudu and Sukkur, could be met from the flow of the Western Rivers. That's Exhibit P-383, paragraphs 2 to 3. Pakistan was right to hesitate. The Bank's consultants, a firm called TAMS, subsequently concluded that the 1954 proposal would lead to: " consistent shortages [of water] in Rabi"	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: " construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing of the natural flow into Pakistan of the waters of any of these Rivers." This is at point (h), now shown underlined on the slide. This provision caused Pakistan concern. The fundamental basis of the 1954 proposal at P-130, paragraph 22. And Pakistan would fiercely contest any attempt to encroach on this. (Slide 13) Pakistan raised its concerns on
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent. After some months of discussion, Pakistan accepted the 1954 proposal. Its acceptance was subject, among other things, to the condition that it receive assurances that Pakistan's existing uses supplied by the Eastern Rivers, and the planned requirements of Gudu and Sukkur, could be met from the flow of the Western Rivers. That's Exhibit P-383, paragraphs 2 to 3. Pakistan was right to hesitate. The Bank's consultants, a firm called TAMS, subsequently concluded that the 1954 proposal would lead to: " consistent shortages [of water] in Rabi" That is, winter crop season:	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: " construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing of the natural flow into Pakistan of the waters of any of these Rivers." This is at point (h), now shown underlined on the slide. This provision caused Pakistan concern. The fundamental basis of the 1954 proposal at P-130, paragraph 22. And Pakistan would fiercely contest any attempt to encroach on this. (Slide 13) Pakistan raised its concerns on paragraph 10(h) with the Bank. Pakistan said it assumed
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent. After some months of discussion, Pakistan accepted the 1954 proposal. Its acceptance was subject, among other things, to the condition that it receive assurances that Pakistan's existing uses supplied by the Eastern Rivers, and the planned requirements of Gudu and Sukkur, could be met from the flow of the Western Rivers. That's Exhibit P-383, paragraphs 2 to 3. Pakistan was right to hesitate. The Bank's consultants, a firm called TAMS, subsequently concluded that the 1954 proposal would lead to: " consistent shortages [of water] in Rabi"	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: " construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing of the natural flow into Pakistan of the waters of any of these Rivers." This is at point (h), now shown underlined on the slide. This provision caused Pakistan concern. The fundamental basis of the 1954 proposal at P-130, paragraph 22. And Pakistan would fiercely contest any attempt to encroach on this. (Slide 13) Pakistan raised its concerns on
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	paragraph 3. Pakistan had two principal concerns. They were set out in a letter from Prime Minister Ali to Mr Black of May 1954; that's Exhibit P-382. Pakistan's first concern was that the Bank proposal did not in fact guarantee supplies for Pakistan's existing uses. Second, Pakistan was concerned about the proposal to cut off the supplies which Pakistan has traditionally received from the Eastern Rivers, even if as a way to operationalise the goal of avoiding Indian control over supplies on which Pakistan would be dependent. After some months of discussion, Pakistan accepted the 1954 proposal. Its acceptance was subject, among other things, to the condition that it receive assurances that Pakistan's existing uses supplied by the Eastern Rivers, and the planned requirements of Gudu and Sukkur, could be met from the flow of the Western Rivers. That's Exhibit P-383, paragraphs 2 to 3. Pakistan was right to hesitate. The Bank's consultants, a firm called TAMS, subsequently concluded that the 1954 proposal would lead to: " consistent shortages [of water] in Rabi" That is, winter crop season:	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 division of the control of the "entire flow" of the Western and Eastern Rivers to Pakistan and India respectively. This is now in paragraph 1, now shown on the slide. (Slide 12) The May 1957 heads of agreement also introduced for the first time the concept of a Commission. The functions of the Commission would include overseeing proposals concerning: " construction of the works on the Indus or on the Jhelum or on the Chenab, outside the boundaries of Pakistan, which are likely to interfere with the timing of the natural flow into Pakistan of the waters of any of these Rivers." This is at point (h), now shown underlined on the slide. This provision caused Pakistan concern. The fundamental basis of the 1954 proposal at P-130, paragraph 22. And Pakistan would fiercely contest any attempt to encroach on this. (Slide 13) Pakistan raised its concerns on paragraph 10(h) with the Bank. Pakistan said it assumed

10:25 1	" not meant to increase Indian control over	10:27 1	"Works may not be constructed outside the boundary
10.25 1	the Western Rivers including their upstream	2	of Pakistan which might interfere or make it possible to
3	tributaries."	3	interfere with the natural flow into Pakistan of the
4	Pakistan noted that:	4	Western Rivers."
5	" any development on these rivers upstream of	5	This is at P-416, paragraphs 4.A and B, shown on the
6	Pakistan would have to have the consent of the	6	slide.
7	Government of Pakistan. It is not sufficient to have	7	Pakistan reiterated in subsequent correspondence its
8	the Commission ascertain that the proposed works are not	8	firm opposition to the construction of any works outside
9	likely to interfere with the timing or amount of the	9	the boundary of Pakistan that might interfere, or make
10	natural flow into Pakistan."	10	it possible to interfere, with the natural flow of the
11	That's Exhibit P-410, pages 2 to 3.	11	Western Rivers.
12	So it seems that paragraph 10(h) in the draft	12	In a letter to Mr Iliff of September 1957, shown now
13	May 1957 heads of terms was likely what provoked the	13	on slide 15, Pakistan's chief negotiator set out in
14	first discussions between the parties over India's plans	14	clear terms the motivations behind its position. In
15	to construct run-of-river HEPs on the Western Rivers.	15	short, it saw this as encroachment on the promises of
16	And this is what followed, in slide 14.	16	non-interference and mutual independent embodied in the
17	At a meeting at the Bank at the end of May 1957,	17	1954 proposal and 1956 aide-mémoire.
18	Mr Gulhati, the head of the Indian delegation, confirmed	18	Pakistan observed that, as the "lower riparian, [it]
19	that "India would wish to be free to construct	19	alone is vulnerable to interference by India". It saw
20	run-of-the-river plants". But he reassured the Bank	20	the introduction for the first time of an "unrestricted
21	that:	21	right to develop hydro-electric power" as India having
22	" India would certainly be prepared to undertake	22	its cake and eating it: securing exclusivity of control
23	not to construct live storage on any of those rivers or	23	over the Eastern Rivers, while at the same time denying
24	to interfere with the timing of the natural flow"	24	Pakistan its independence by attempting to secure rights
25	That's Exhibit P-411, page 1.	25	to interfere, or make it possible to interfere, with the
	Page 37		Page 39
	1 450 0 1		1 460 07
10:26 1	Pakistan remained firm. In discussions with the	10:29 1	natural flow of the waters of the Western Rivers.
2	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was	2	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general
2 3	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India	2 3	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3.
2 3 4	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412,	2 3 4	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused
2 3 4 5	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with	2 3 4 5	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the
2 3 4 5 6	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take	2 3 4 5 6	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even
2 3 4 5 6 7	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western	2 3 4 5 6 7	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6. Following these discussions, the Bank produced	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works: " because they often involved a continued
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6. Following these discussions, the Bank produced a revised set of heads of terms, the June 1957 heads of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works: " because they often involved a continued dependence upon it for Pakistan's water. This is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6. Following these discussions, the Bank produced a revised set of heads of terms, the June 1957 heads of terms. The following month Pakistan's chief negotiator,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works: " because they often involved a continued
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6. Following these discussions, the Bank produced a revised set of heads of terms, the June 1957 heads of terms. The following month Pakistan's chief negotiator, Mr Mueenudin, wrote to Mr Iliff. In his letter, he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works: " because they often involved a continued dependence upon it for Pakistan's water. This is something Pakistan was no longer willing, after
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6. Following these discussions, the Bank produced a revised set of heads of terms, the June 1957 heads of terms. The following month Pakistan's chief negotiator,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works: " because they often involved a continued dependence upon it for Pakistan's water. This is something Pakistan was no longer willing, after April 1948, to countenance."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6. Following these discussions, the Bank produced a revised set of heads of terms, the June 1957 heads of terms. The following month Pakistan's chief negotiator, Mr Mueenudin, wrote to Mr Iliff. In his letter, he identified eleven "principles" of the Bank's 1954	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works: " because they often involved a continued dependence upon it for Pakistan's water. This is something Pakistan was no longer willing, after April 1948, to countenance." That's Exhibit P-245 at page 143.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6. Following these discussions, the Bank produced a revised set of heads of terms, the June 1957 heads of terms. The following month Pakistan's chief negotiator, Mr Mueenudin, wrote to Mr Iliff. In his letter, he identified eleven "principles" of the Bank's 1954 proposal and the 1956 aide-mémoire.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works: " because they often involved a continued dependence upon it for Pakistan's water. This is something Pakistan was no longer willing, after April 1948, to countenance." That's Exhibit P-245 at page 143. Ten years later, the ghosts of that crisis still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6. Following these discussions, the Bank produced a revised set of heads of terms, the June 1957 heads of terms. The following month Pakistan's chief negotiator, Mr Mueenudin, wrote to Mr Iliff. In his letter, he identified eleven "principles" of the Bank's 1954 proposal and the 1956 aide-mémoire. The importance Pakistan placed on India's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works: " because they often involved a continued dependence upon it for Pakistan's water. This is something Pakistan was no longer willing, after April 1948, to countenance." That's Exhibit P-245 at page 143. Ten years later, the ghosts of that crisis still haunted Pakistan and the scars still ran deep in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6. Following these discussions, the Bank produced a revised set of heads of terms, the June 1957 heads of terms. The following month Pakistan's chief negotiator, Mr Mueenudin, wrote to Mr Iliff. In his letter, he identified eleven "principles" of the Bank's 1954 proposal and the 1956 aide-mémoire. The importance Pakistan placed on India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers is plain. Mr Mueenudin's letter emphasised that "the entire natural flow" of the Indus	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works: " because they often involved a continued dependence upon it for Pakistan's water. This is something Pakistan was no longer willing, after April 1948, to countenance." That's Exhibit P-245 at page 143. Ten years later, the ghosts of that crisis still haunted Pakistan and the scars still ran deep in the psyche of its negotiators. The only solution to effect the division of waters could therefore be one in which all the works necessary to divert from the Western
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6. Following these discussions, the Bank produced a revised set of heads of terms, the June 1957 heads of terms. The following month Pakistan's chief negotiator, Mr Mueenudin, wrote to Mr Iliff. In his letter, he identified eleven "principles" of the Bank's 1954 proposal and the 1956 aide-mémoire. The importance Pakistan placed on India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers is plain. Mr Mueenudin's letter	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works: " because they often involved a continued dependence upon it for Pakistan's water. This is something Pakistan was no longer willing, after April 1948, to countenance." That's Exhibit P-245 at page 143. Ten years later, the ghosts of that crisis still haunted Pakistan and the scars still ran deep in the psyche of its negotiators. The only solution to effect the division of waters could therefore be one in which all the works necessary to divert from the Western Rivers supplies to replace those that Pakistan had
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6. Following these discussions, the Bank produced a revised set of heads of terms, the June 1957 heads of terms. The following month Pakistan's chief negotiator, Mr Mueenudin, wrote to Mr Iliff. In his letter, he identified eleven "principles" of the Bank's 1954 proposal and the 1956 aide-mémoire. The importance Pakistan placed on India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers is plain. Mr Mueenudin's letter emphasised that "the entire natural flow" of the Indus system of rivers historically reaching Pakistan that is, aside from the Eastern Rivers was to be	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works: " because they often involved a continued dependence upon it for Pakistan's water. This is something Pakistan was no longer willing, after April 1948, to countenance." That's Exhibit P-245 at page 143. Ten years later, the ghosts of that crisis still haunted Pakistan and the scars still ran deep in the psyche of its negotiators. The only solution to effect the division of waters could therefore be one in which all the works necessary to divert from the Western Rivers supplies to replace those that Pakistan had historically enjoyed from the Eastern rivers were under
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6. Following these discussions, the Bank produced a revised set of heads of terms, the June 1957 heads of terms. The following month Pakistan's chief negotiator, Mr Mueenudin, wrote to Mr Iliff. In his letter, he identified eleven "principles" of the Bank's 1954 proposal and the 1956 aide-mémoire. The importance Pakistan placed on India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers is plain. Mr Mueenudin's letter emphasised that "the entire natural flow" of the Indus system of rivers historically reaching Pakistan that is, aside from the Eastern Rivers was to be "available for the exclusive use and benefit of	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works: " because they often involved a continued dependence upon it for Pakistan's water. This is something Pakistan was no longer willing, after April 1948, to countenance." That's Exhibit P-245 at page 143. Ten years later, the ghosts of that crisis still haunted Pakistan and the scars still ran deep in the psyche of its negotiators. The only solution to effect the division of waters could therefore be one in which all the works necessary to divert from the Western Rivers supplies to replace those that Pakistan had historically enjoyed from the Eastern rivers were under Pakistan's control. This was, therefore, necessarily
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6. Following these discussions, the Bank produced a revised set of heads of terms, the June 1957 heads of terms. The following month Pakistan's chief negotiator, Mr Mueenudin, wrote to Mr Iliff. In his letter, he identified eleven "principles" of the Bank's 1954 proposal and the 1956 aide-mémoire. The importance Pakistan placed on India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers is plain. Mr Mueenudin's letter emphasised that "the entire natural flow" of the Indus system of rivers historically reaching Pakistan that is, aside from the Eastern Rivers was to be	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works: " because they often involved a continued dependence upon it for Pakistan's water. This is something Pakistan was no longer willing, after April 1948, to countenance." That's Exhibit P-245 at page 143. Ten years later, the ghosts of that crisis still haunted Pakistan and the scars still ran deep in the psyche of its negotiators. The only solution to effect the division of waters could therefore be one in which all the works necessary to divert from the Western Rivers supplies to replace those that Pakistan had historically enjoyed from the Eastern rivers were under
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	Bank in mid-June 1957, Pakistan reaffirmed that it was "not prepared to acquiesce in any interference by India on the River Chenab". This is Exhibit P-412, paragraph 4(1). Its fears of Indian interference with or control over the waters also led Pakistan to take a firm line on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers. Pakistan informed the Bank that it "could not agree to the control by India of the Western Rivers even through works for the generation of Hydro-electricity". That's Exhibit P-363, paragraph 6. Following these discussions, the Bank produced a revised set of heads of terms, the June 1957 heads of terms. The following month Pakistan's chief negotiator, Mr Mueenudin, wrote to Mr Iliff. In his letter, he identified eleven "principles" of the Bank's 1954 proposal and the 1956 aide-mémoire. The importance Pakistan placed on India's non-interference with or control of the waters of the Western Rivers is plain. Mr Mueenudin's letter emphasised that "the entire natural flow" of the Indus system of rivers historically reaching Pakistan that is, aside from the Eastern Rivers was to be "available for the exclusive use and benefit of	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	That's Exhibit P-420, paragraph 3, and appendix, general head 1, paragraph 3. The subsequent negotiations up to March 1959 focused almost exclusively on the nature and financing of the works required to effect the division of waters. Even during this time, Pakistan's firmly held position on non-interference was a common theme. As Dr Alam observes in his PhD thesis on the Indus Waters Treaty: " Pakistan refuse[d] India's plans" That is, for replacement works: " because they often involved a continued dependence upon it for Pakistan's water. This is something Pakistan was no longer willing, after April 1948, to countenance." That's Exhibit P-245 at page 143. Ten years later, the ghosts of that crisis still haunted Pakistan and the scars still ran deep in the psyche of its negotiators. The only solution to effect the division of waters could therefore be one in which all the works necessary to divert from the Western Rivers supplies to replace those that Pakistan had historically enjoyed from the Eastern rivers were under Pakistan's control. This was, therefore, necessarily

10:30 1	out in its March 1959 settlement plan at Exhibit P-439.	10:33 1	treaty. India's use of the Western Rivers for the
2	Another linchpin of the settlement plan was	10.55 1	generation of hydroelectric power was a core part of
3	a ten-year transition period to carry out the	3	these discussions, which are recorded in very cursory
4	replacement works. Those works would be largely funded	4	detail, or high level, we can say, in the World Bank
5	by contributions from friendly governments. In talks	5	archives minutes from this period.
6	held in New Delhi and Karachi in the spring of 1959,	6	On 10 August 1959, Pakistan and India each put
7	Pakistan and India agreed to those foundational	0 7	forward their own draft heads of agreement. Both drafts
8	principles.	8	envisaged that India's hydroelectric uses of the Western
9	Despite the broad success of these talks in spring	8 9	Rivers would be a type of non-consumptive use. Pakistan
9 10	1959, the issue of India's use of the Western Rivers for	9 10	offered India its standing consent to India's use of the
10	hydroelectric purposes emerged as a significant issue of	10	Western Rivers for such purpose. However, it was
11	divergence. Pakistan maintained the position that India	11 12	subject to a proviso, that:
	should not be permitted to construct works for the	12	"Such use does not involve construction of any work
13	-		
14	generation of hydroelectric power on the Western Rivers in India. India insisted that its uses while in Indian	14	which can be operated to interfere with the rate,
15		15	quantity or quality of the natural flow of the river or
16	territory "must include" such "non-consumptive uses".	16	its tributaries."
17	That's Exhibit P-450.	17	Pakistan gave as an example of such a work "any
18	The Bank aligned with India. It informed Pakistan	18	structure which holds up the river flow temporarily or
19	that it could "not support" Pakistan's absolute	19	stores it for a certain period of time for use in
20	opposition "to build even 'run of the river'	20	subsequent periods". Pakistan's draft also provided for
21	hydro-electric works on any of the Western Rivers". It	21	"full details" of the scheme to be provided in advance
22	recognised in internal correspondence, however, that the	22	of construction of such works. That's in Exhibit P-133, 1 - 2(1)(1) - 1(1) - 2(1)(1)
23	negotiations were going to have what they called	23	paragraphs 3(b)(i) and (ii). Pakistan recognised from
24	"a tough passage" on that point. That's in	24	an early stage that information-sharing would be
25	Exhibit P-451.	25	critical.
	Page 41		Page 43
10:31 1	Pakistan was forced by the Bank to soften its	10:34 1	Over the subsequent days and weeks of the London
10:31 1 2	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers,	10:34 1 2	Over the subsequent days and weeks of the London negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and
	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be		
2	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers,	2	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric
2 3	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be	2 3	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the
2 3 4	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of	2 3 4	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric
2 3 4 5	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16.	2 3 4 5	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today.
2 3 4 5 6	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on	2 3 4 5 6	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period
2 3 4 5 6 7	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16.	2 3 4 5 6 7	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they would look for some protection on that point". That's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which [give] India the power to hurt us"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they would look for some protection on that point". That's Exhibit P-452 at paragraphs 8 and 10.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they would look for some protection on that point". That's Exhibit P-452 at paragraphs 8 and 10. (Slide 17) A message from Mr Mueenudin to Mr Iliff	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which [give] India the power to hurt us" That's Exhibit P-365. These sentiments were repeated in contemporaneous
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they would look for some protection on that point". That's Exhibit P-452 at paragraphs 8 and 10. (Slide 17) A message from Mr Mueenudin to Mr Iliff the following month conveyed the same sentiment in even 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which [give] India the power to hurt us" That's Exhibit P-365. These sentiments were repeated in contemporaneous internal Pakistan correspondence sent around the close
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they would look for some protection on that point". That's Exhibit P-452 at paragraphs 8 and 10. (Slide 17) A message from Mr Mueenudin to Mr Iliff the following month conveyed the same sentiment in even stronger terms: "India should not", he said, "have 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which [give] India the power to hurt us" That's Exhibit P-365. These sentiments were repeated in contemporaneous internal Pakistan correspondence sent around the close of the negotiations in September 1959, and these are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they would look for some protection on that point". That's Exhibit P-452 at paragraphs 8 and 10. (Slide 17) A message from Mr Mueenudin to Mr Iliff the following month conveyed the same sentiment in even stronger terms: "India should not", he said, "have a stranglehold on the Pak economy". That's 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which [give] India the power to hurt us" That's Exhibit P-365. These sentiments were repeated in contemporaneous internal Pakistan correspondence sent around the close of the negotiations in September 1959, and these are shown on slide 18 now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they would look for some protection on that point". That's Exhibit P-452 at paragraphs 8 and 10. (Slide 17) A message from Mr Mueenudin to Mr Iliff the following month conveyed the same sentiment in even stronger terms: "India should not", he said, "have a stranglehold on the Pak economy". That's Exhibit P-453. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which [give] India the power to hurt us" That's Exhibit P-365. These sentiments were repeated in contemporaneous internal Pakistan correspondence sent around the close of the negotiations in September 1959, and these are shown on slide 18 now. In a letter from Pakistan's chief negotiator to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they would look for some protection on that point". That's Exhibit P-452 at paragraphs 8 and 10. (Slide 17) A message from Mr Mueenudin to Mr Iliff the following month conveyed the same sentiment in even stronger terms: "India should not", he said, "have a stranglehold on the Pak economy". That's Exhibit P-453. (Slide 18) So I'm going to turn now to the last 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which [give] India the power to hurt us" That's Exhibit P-365. These sentiments were repeated in contemporaneous internal Pakistan correspondence sent around the close of the negotiations in September 1959, and these are shown on slide 18 now. In a letter from Pakistan's chief negotiator to Mr Sheikh, Secretary of the Ministry of Works,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they would look for some protection on that point". That's Exhibit P-452 at paragraphs 8 and 10. (Slide 17) A message from Mr Mueenudin to Mr Iliff the following month conveyed the same sentiment in even stronger terms: "India should not", he said, "have a stranglehold on the Pak economy". That's Exhibit P-453. (Slide 18) So I'm going to turn now to the last important phase of negotiations, which commenced in 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which [give] India the power to hurt us" That's Exhibit P-365. These sentiments were repeated in contemporaneous internal Pakistan correspondence sent around the close of the negotiations in September 1959, and these are shown on slide 18 now. In a letter from Pakistan's chief negotiator to Mr Sheikh, Secretary of the Ministry of Works, Irrigation and Power, Mr Mueenudin confirmed he had made
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they would look for some protection on that point". That's Exhibit P-452 at paragraphs 8 and 10. (Slide 17) A message from Mr Mueenudin to Mr Iliff the following month conveyed the same sentiment in even stronger terms: "India should not", he said, "have a stranglehold on the Pak economy". That's Exhibit P-453. (Slide 18) So I'm going to turn now to the last important phase of negotiations, which commenced in August 1959 and took place in London, when the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which [give] India the power to hurt us" That's Exhibit P-365. These sentiments were repeated in contemporaneous internal Pakistan correspondence sent around the close of the negotiations in September 1959, and these are shown on slide 18 now. In a letter from Pakistan's chief negotiator to Mr Sheikh, Secretary of the Ministry of Works, Irrigation and Power, Mr Mueenudin confirmed he had made it clear that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they would look for some protection on that point". That's Exhibit P-452 at paragraphs 8 and 10. (Slide 17) A message from Mr Mueenudin to Mr Iliff the following month conveyed the same sentiment in even stronger terms: "India should not", he said, "have a stranglehold on the Pak economy". That's Exhibit P-453. (Slide 18) So I'm going to turn now to the last important phase of negotiations, which commenced in August 1959 and took place in London, when the negotiating parties held the first detailed negotiations 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which [give] India the power to hurt us" That's Exhibit P-365. These sentiments were repeated in contemporaneous internal Pakistan correspondence sent around the close of the negotiations in September 1959, and these are shown on slide 18 now. In a letter from Pakistan's chief negotiator to Mr Sheikh, Secretary of the Ministry of Works, Irrigation and Power, Mr Mueenudin confirmed he had made it clear that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they would look for some protection on that point". That's Exhibit P-452 at paragraphs 8 and 10. (Slide 17) A message from Mr Mueenudin to Mr Iliff the following month conveyed the same sentiment in even stronger terms: "India should not", he said, "have a stranglehold on the Pak economy". That's Exhibit P-453. (Slide 18) So I'm going to turn now to the last important phase of negotiations, which commenced in August 1959 and took place in London, when the negotiating parties held the first detailed negotiations 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which [give] India the power to hurt us" That's Exhibit P-365. These sentiments were repeated in contemporaneous internal Pakistan correspondence sent around the close of the negotiations in September 1959, and these are shown on slide 18 now. In a letter from Pakistan's chief negotiator to Mr Sheikh, Secretary of the Ministry of Works, Irrigation and Power, Mr Mueenudin confirmed he had made it clear that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they would look for some protection on that point". That's Exhibit P-452 at paragraphs 8 and 10. (Slide 17) A message from Mr Mueenudin to Mr Iliff the following month conveyed the same sentiment in even stronger terms: "India should not", he said, "have a stranglehold on the Pak economy". That's Exhibit P-453. (Slide 18) So I'm going to turn now to the last important phase of negotiations, which commenced in August 1959 and took place in London, when the negotiating parties held the first detailed negotiations on the heads of agreement for an international water	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which [give] India the power to hurt us" That's Exhibit P-365. These sentiments were repeated in contemporaneous internal Pakistan correspondence sent around the close of the negotiations in September 1959, and these are shown on slide 18 now. In a letter from Pakistan's chief negotiator to Mr Sheikh, Secretary of the Ministry of Works, Irrigation and Power, Mr Mueenudin confirmed he had made it clear that: " our Government cannot possibly agree to storages which, if malevolently operated, would make
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 position on Indian HEP-building on the Western Rivers, but it remained clear that no such uses could be accepted if they were to interfere with the supplies of these rivers. Its concerns were summarised in a letter from Mr Iliff to Mr Gulhati of June 1959, shown on slide 16. While Pakistan "accept[ed] the general principle that India should be entitled to reserve on the Western Rivers Hydel Uses not involving consumptive use of water", it "expressed concern that the works that India constructed might interfere with the timely flow of water in the low-water season, and emphasised that they would look for some protection on that point". That's Exhibit P-452 at paragraphs 8 and 10. (Slide 17) A message from Mr Mueenudin to Mr Iliff the following month conveyed the same sentiment in even stronger terms: "India should not", he said, "have a stranglehold on the Pak economy". That's Exhibit P-453. (Slide 18) So I'm going to turn now to the last important phase of negotiations, which commenced in August 1959 and took place in London, when the negotiating parties held the first detailed negotiations 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 negotiations, the parties continued to discuss and exchange proposals surrounding India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. The detailed history is set out in paragraphs 121 to 134 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial, so I can spare you that today. At the heart of Pakistan's position in this period were its concerns over Indian interference with the natural flow of the waters on which Pakistan would be reliant. As Pakistan's chief negotiator explained at the time: " we do not want any works to be built which [give] India the power to hurt us" That's Exhibit P-365. These sentiments were repeated in contemporaneous internal Pakistan correspondence sent around the close of the negotiations in September 1959, and these are shown on slide 18 now. In a letter from Pakistan's chief negotiator to Mr Sheikh, Secretary of the Ministry of Works, Irrigation and Power, Mr Mueenudin confirmed he had made it clear that:

10:35 1	an appreciable difference to our economy."	10:38 1	language was used, and disappointed to find that there
10.55 1	And that:	10.38 1	was not much in the way of answer there.
2		2	MR MINEAR: Thank you.
4	" Pakistan would not agree to giving India a stranglehold over her economy."	3 4	MS REES-EVANS: So as I said, the archives contain
		45	a reasonable collection of the various drafts that came
5	That's Exhibit P-475, paragraph 5.		
6	In a subsequent letter, Mr Mueenudin confirmed again	6	after the 1959 heads of agreement, but the context
7	that he had made it clear that Pakistan:	7	around them, and certainly why they changed over time,
8	" would not, under any circumstances, agree to	8	is completely lacking in the archives. So I'll take you
9	the construction of works which would give India the	9	through the drafts and explain some of this lack of
10	*	10	context as I go through.
11	That's Exhibit P-134, paragraph 6.	11	(Slide 20) The first draft of the Treaty presented
12	-	12	to the governments was that of 9 December 1959, in Exhibit P-139. Draft Article III set out in detail
13	· ·	13	
14	*	14 15	India's obligation to "let flow" the Western Rivers.
15	0	15	The provision was significant for a number of reasons.
16	C	10	First, it articulated the "let flow" obligation in clear terms and matched it with a prohibition on
17	-		*
18	· ·	18 19	"interference" by India with the waters of the Western Rivers.
19 20		19 20	Second, it marked a shift in the language regarding
20 21	Annex B of the heads of agreement encapsulated the	20 21	India's use of the Western Rivers for the generation of
		21	hydroelectric power. The language of India's
22	-		"entitlement" to such use, as it was under Annex B of
23 24	parties in the London negotiations as to the use of the Wastern Pivers for the generation of hydroelectric	23	
24 25	Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power. It provided a definition of "run-of-river"	24 25	the heads of agreement 1959, became a statement of obligation subject to a defined exception in the 1959
23	power. It provided a definition of Tun-of-fiver	23	obligation subject to a defined exception in the 1959
	Page 45		Page 47
10:37 1	plants. It also set out detailed design and operational	10:40 1	draft.
2	constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed	2	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the
2 3	constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the	2 3	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers
2 3 4	constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and	2 3 4	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the
2 3 4 5	constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them.	2 3 4 5	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage,
2 3 4 5 6	constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let	2 3 4 5 6	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E.
2 3 4 5 6 7	constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them.MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do	2 3 4 5 6 7	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them.MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them.MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source?MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't discussed in those terms in a way that comes out of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140. Notwithstanding this apparent progress, by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't discussed in those terms in a way that comes out of the minutes of the August 1959 minutes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140. Notwithstanding this apparent progress, by March 1960 the parties were still unable to reach
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't discussed in those terms in a way that comes out of the minutes of the August 1959 minutes. So the answer, as with much of the questions that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140. Notwithstanding this apparent progress, by March 1960 the parties were still unable to reach agreement on Western Rivers uses, including storage,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't discussed in those terms in a way that comes out of the minutes of the August 1959 minutes. So the answer, as with much of the questions that we have about the travaux, is unclear. It doesn't come 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140. Notwithstanding this apparent progress, by March 1960 the parties were still unable to reach agreement on Western Rivers uses, including storage, among other issues. Progress in the negotiations was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't discussed in those terms in a way that comes out of the minutes of the August 1959 minutes. So the answer, as with much of the questions that we have about the travaux, is unclear. It doesn't come out of the documents. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140. Notwithstanding this apparent progress, by March 1960 the parties were still unable to reach agreement on Western Rivers uses, including storage, among other issues. Progress in the negotiations was stymied by India's ever-increasing demands for use of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't discussed in those terms in a way that comes out of the minutes of the August 1959 minutes. So the answer, as with much of the questions that we have about the travaux, is unclear. It doesn't come out of the documents. MR MINEAR: As I recall from your Memorial, it's quite 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140. Notwithstanding this apparent progress, by March 1960 the parties were still unable to reach agreement on Western Rivers uses, including storage, among other issues. Progress in the negotiations was stymied by India's ever-increasing demands for use of the Western Rivers. The parties' exchanges over this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't discussed in those terms in a way that comes out of the minutes of the August 1959 minutes. So the answer, as with much of the questions that we have about the travaux, is unclear. It doesn't come out of the documents. MR MINEAR: As I recall from your Memorial, it's quite distinctive language. Is that correct? It doesn't 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140. Notwithstanding this apparent progress, by March 1960 the parties were still unable to reach agreement on Western Rivers uses, including storage, among other issues. Progress in the negotiations was stymied by India's ever-increasing demands for use of the Western Rivers. The parties' exchanges over this period are set out in paragraphs 159 to 168 of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't discussed in those terms in a way that comes out of the minutes of the August 1959 minutes. So the answer, as with much of the questions that we have about the travaux, is unclear. It doesn't come out of the documents. MR MINEAR: As I recall from your Memorial, it's quite distinctive language. Is that correct? It doesn't appear in other similar treaties involving water rights? 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140. Notwithstanding this apparent progress, by March 1960 the parties were still unable to reach agreement on Western Rivers uses, including storage, among other issues. Progress in the negotiations was stymied by India's ever-increasing demands for use of the Western Rivers. The parties' exchanges over this period are set out in paragraphs 159 to 168 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't discussed in those terms in a way that comes out of the minutes of the August 1959 minutes. So the answer, as with much of the questions that we have about the travaux, is unclear. It doesn't come out of the documents. MR MINEAR: As I recall from your Memorial, it's quite distinctive language. Is that correct? It doesn't appear in other similar treaties involving water rights? MS REES-EVANS: I think that's right. I don't think 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140. Notwithstanding this apparent progress, by March 1960 the parties were still unable to reach agreement on Western Rivers uses, including storage, among other issues. Progress in the negotiations was stymied by India's ever-increasing demands for use of the Western Rivers. The parties' exchanges over this period are set out in paragraphs 159 to 168 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial. The common and by now, recurring thread of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't discussed in those terms in a way that comes out of the minutes of the August 1959 minutes. So the answer, as with much of the questions that we have about the travaux, is unclear. It doesn't come out of the documents. MR MINEAR: As I recall from your Memorial, it's quite distinctive language. Is that correct? It doesn't appear in other similar treaties involving water rights? MS REES-EVANS: I think that's right. I don't think we found comparable language in other international 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140. Notwithstanding this apparent progress, by March 1960 the parties were still unable to reach agreement on Western Rivers uses, including storage, among other issues. Progress in the negotiations was stymied by India's ever-increasing demands for use of the Western Rivers. The parties' exchanges over this period are set out in paragraphs 159 to 168 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial. The common and by now, recurring thread of this period was, on the one hand, India's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't discussed in those terms in a way that comes out of the minutes of the August 1959 minutes. So the answer, as with much of the questions that we have about the travaux, is unclear. It doesn't come out of the documents. MR MINEAR: As I recall from your Memorial, it's quite distinctive language. Is that correct? It doesn't appear in other similar treaties involving water rights? MS REES-EVANS: I think that's right. I don't think we found comparable language in other international treaties. It's one of the things that obviously, when 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140. Notwithstanding this apparent progress, by March 1960 the parties were still unable to reach agreement on Western Rivers uses, including storage, among other issues. Progress in the negotiations was stymied by India's ever-increasing demands for use of the Western Rivers. The parties' exchanges over this period are set out in paragraphs 159 to 168 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial. The common and by now, recurring thread of this period was, on the one hand, India's ever-increasing demands over the Western Rivers and, on
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't discussed in those terms in a way that comes out of the minutes of the August 1959 minutes. So the answer, as with much of the questions that we have about the travaux, is unclear. It doesn't come out of the documents. MR MINEAR: As I recall from your Memorial, it's quite distinctive language. Is that correct? It doesn't appear in other similar treaties involving water rights? MS REES-EVANS: I think that's right. I don't think we found comparable language in other international treaties. It's one of the things that obviously, when we looked through the travaux, we were very keen to see 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140. Notwithstanding this apparent progress, by March 1960 the parties were still unable to reach agreement on Western Rivers uses, including storage, among other issues. Progress in the negotiations was stymied by India's ever-increasing demands for use of the Western Rivers. The parties' exchanges over this period are set out in paragraphs 159 to 168 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial. The common and by now, recurring thread of this period was, on the one hand, India's ever-increasing demands over the Western Rivers and, on the other, Pakistan's imperative to "avoid control by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't discussed in those terms in a way that comes out of the minutes of the August 1959 minutes. So the answer, as with much of the questions that we have about the travaux, is unclear. It doesn't come out of the documents. MR MINEAR: As I recall from your Memorial, it's quite distinctive language. Is that correct? It doesn't appear in other similar treaties involving water rights? MS REES-EVANS: I think that's right. I don't think we found comparable language in other international treaties. It's one of the things that obviously, when 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140. Notwithstanding this apparent progress, by March 1960 the parties were still unable to reach agreement on Western Rivers uses, including storage, among other issues. Progress in the negotiations was stymied by India's ever-increasing demands for use of the Western Rivers. The parties' exchanges over this period are set out in paragraphs 159 to 168 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial. The common and by now, recurring thread of this period was, on the one hand, India's ever-increasing demands over the Western Rivers and, on
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 constraints in respect of run-of-river HEPs constructed by India on the Western Rivers. Annex B is the forerunner of what became Annexure D to the Treaty and there are close parallels between them. MR MINEAR: Excuse me, Ms Rees-Evans. The language "let flow", was the origin of that language the Bank's, or do we know if it came from some other source? MS REES-EVANS: Thank you, Mr Minear, for the question. I don't think we know where that came from, because I think it was introduced for the first time in the December 1959 heads of agreement, but it wasn't discussed in those terms in a way that comes out of the minutes of the August 1959 minutes. So the answer, as with much of the questions that we have about the travaux, is unclear. It doesn't come out of the documents. MR MINEAR: As I recall from your Memorial, it's quite distinctive language. Is that correct? It doesn't appear in other similar treaties involving water rights? MS REES-EVANS: I think that's right. I don't think we found comparable language in other international treaties. It's one of the things that obviously, when we looked through the travaux, we were very keen to see 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	Third, the only exception it envisaged to the prohibition on storage for India on the Western Rivers was that specifically envisaged in Annexure E of the Treaty. HEPs could not, therefore, incorporate storage, save as permitted by Annexure E. The December 1959 draft therefore clearly emphasised the primacy of the let-flow obligation, and the limited character of any exceptions to that obligation. And Pakistan's chief negotiator reported to his government that "by and large", the December 1959 draft "safeguards Pakistan's interests". That's Exhibit P-140. Notwithstanding this apparent progress, by March 1960 the parties were still unable to reach agreement on Western Rivers uses, including storage, among other issues. Progress in the negotiations was stymied by India's ever-increasing demands for use of the Western Rivers. The parties' exchanges over this period are set out in paragraphs 159 to 168 of Appendix A to Pakistan's Memorial. The common and by now, recurring thread of this period was, on the one hand, India's ever-increasing demands over the Western Rivers and, on the other, Pakistan's imperative to "avoid control by

10:41 1	As Pakistan's Ambassador to the US recalled in his	10:44 1	constraining India's use of the Western Rivers for
2	memorandum to the President of the Bank in April 1960,	2	hydroelectric power, in Mr Iliff's words after the
3	Pakistan had:	3	conclusion of the Treaty, he said, "tie India up very
4	" agreed to permit[] India as much power	4	tightly". That's at Exhibit P-515.
5	development as it desires from run-of-the-river plants	5	I'm now going to turn to the third part of my
6	[and also to] 0.5 MAF of storage for irrigation	6	presentation; unless, Mr Minear, you wanted to jump in
7	[which could also] be used for hydro-electric power as	7	with a question?
8	well."	8	MR MINEAR: I apologise, I do have a question here with
9	He emphasised that any proposals the Bank should put	9	respect to Exhibit P-483.
10	forward to Pakistan for further Indian storage should:	10	There is the statement here that:
11	" keep in view that it is politically	11	" [Pakistan] has agreed to meet these needs by
12	essential for Pakistan's irrigation system to be as	12	permitting India as much power development as it desires
13	independent as possible and works that could cause	13	from run-of-the-river plants."
14	interference should be minimal"	14	Is that statement, do you think, reflective of
15	This is P-483, enclosure pages 5 to 6, on slide 21.	15	Pakistan's policy with regard to power generation, that
16	In a further conversation, the Ambassador warned	16	there were no limits on the amount of power that India
17	Mr Iliff that Pakistan would be very reluctant to ignore	17	might produce, as long as it came from a run-of-river
18	the basic assumptions of the Bank's 1954 proposal	18	plant?
19	regarding mutual independence and Western uses. This is	19	MS REES-EVANS: I think what Pakistan had in mind here was
20	at Exhibit P-484, paragraph 6.	20	that there was no limit, as you say. In some ways, it
21	These exchanges were directed primarily at	21	was quite a broad consent to India to develop the
22	negotiations surrounding what became Annexures C and E.,	22	Western Rivers for power development. But at the same
23	so they're not directly relevant to D. But they do	23	time, it had in mind very much run-of-river plants with
24	provide important context to Pakistan's position on	24	no storage other than this 0.5 MAF of storage that could
25	exceptions to India's let-flow obligation, including on	25	use be used for hydropower.
	Page 49		Page 51
	6		
10:42 1	hydroelectric power generation.	10:45 1	But I think it's clear from the correspondence at
10:42 1 2	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in	10:45 1 2	this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that
	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of		this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the
2	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and	2 3 4	this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water.
2 3	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context	2 3	this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the
2 3 4 5 6	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as	2 3 4 5 6	this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure
2 3 4 5 6 7	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives	2 3 4 5 6 7	this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960. It is clear from this negotiating history of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it couldn't be interfered with, Pakistan came to accept
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960. It is clear from this negotiating history of the Treaty that the final balance struck was hard-fought.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it couldn't be interfered with, Pakistan came to accept that India could develop the Western Rivers for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960. It is clear from this negotiating history of the Treaty that the final balance struck was hard-fought. The constant that remained from the Bank's 1954 proposal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it couldn't be interfered with, Pakistan came to accept that India could develop the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power at that time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960. It is clear from this negotiating history of the Treaty that the final balance struck was hard-fought. The constant that remained from the Bank's 1954 proposal was the division of control over the Western and Eastern	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it couldn't be interfered with, Pakistan came to accept that India could develop the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power at that time. MR MINEAR: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960. It is clear from this negotiating history of the Treaty that the final balance struck was hard-fought. The constant that remained from the Bank's 1954 proposal was the division of control over the Western and Eastern Rivers, and the mutual independence that that assured.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it couldn't be interfered with, Pakistan came to accept that India could develop the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power at that time. MR MINEAR: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: (Slide 22) Turning to the final part of my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960. It is clear from this negotiating history of the Treaty that the final balance struck was hard-fought. The constant that remained from the Bank's 1954 proposal was the division of control over the Western and Eastern Rivers, and the mutual independence that that assured. It was not a perfect solution for Pakistan.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it couldn't be interfered with, Pakistan came to accept that India could develop the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power at that time. MR MINEAR: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: (Slide 22) Turning to the final part of my presentation. In this part of my submission I'm going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960. It is clear from this negotiating history of the Treaty that the final balance struck was hard-fought. The constant that remained from the Bank's 1954 proposal was the division of control over the Western and Eastern Rivers, and the mutual independence that that assured. It was not a perfect solution for Pakistan. As Pakistan's Foreign Minister said in 1954, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it couldn't be interfered with, Pakistan came to accept that India could develop the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power at that time. MR MINEAR: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: (Slide 22) Turning to the final part of my presentation. In this part of my submission I'm going to highlight four specific conclusions from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960. It is clear from this negotiating history of the Treaty that the final balance struck was hard-fought. The constant that remained from the Bank's 1954 proposal was the division of control over the Western and Eastern Rivers, and the mutual independence that that assured. It was not a perfect solution for Pakistan. As Pakistan's Foreign Minister said in 1954, the original proposal on which it was based involved "great	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it couldn't be interfered with, Pakistan came to accept that India could develop the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power at that time. MR MINEAR: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: (Slide 22) Turning to the final part of my presentation. In this part of my submission I'm going to highlight four specific conclusions from the travaux préparatoires regarding the evolution of the key
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960. It is clear from this negotiating history of the Treaty that the final balance struck was hard-fought. The constant that remained from the Bank's 1954 proposal was the division of control over the Western and Eastern Rivers, and the mutual independence that that assured. It was not a perfect solution for Pakistan. As Pakistan's Foreign Minister said in 1954, the original proposal on which it was based involved "great sacrifices" for Pakistan. That's P-383, paragraph 3.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it couldn't be interfered with, Pakistan came to accept that India could develop the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power at that time. MR MINEAR: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: (Slide 22) Turning to the final part of my presentation. In this part of my submission I'm going to highlight four specific conclusions from the travaux préparatoires regarding the evolution of the key provisions at issue in this proceeding, namely of
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960. It is clear from this negotiating history of the Treaty that the final balance struck was hard-fought. The constant that remained from the Bank's 1954 proposal was the division of control over the Western and Eastern Rivers, and the mutual independence that that assured. It was not a perfect solution for Pakistan. As Pakistan's Foreign Minister said in 1954, the original proposal on which it was based involved "great sacrifices" for Pakistan. That's P-383, paragraph 3. But it was acceptable on the basis and indeed, on the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it couldn't be interfered with, Pakistan came to accept that India could develop the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power at that time. MR MINEAR: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: (Slide 22) Turning to the final part of my presentation. In this part of my submission I'm going to highlight four specific conclusions from the travaux préparatoires regarding the evolution of the key provisions at issue in this proceeding, namely of Article III and various paragraphs of Annexure D.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960. It is clear from this negotiating history of the Treaty that the final balance struck was hard-fought. The constant that remained from the Bank's 1954 proposal was the division of control over the Western and Eastern Rivers, and the mutual independence that that assured. It was not a perfect solution for Pakistan. As Pakistan's Foreign Minister said in 1954, the original proposal on which it was based involved "great sacrifices" for Pakistan. That's P-383, paragraph 3. But it was acceptable on the basis and indeed, on the condition, as Pakistan repeatedly emphasised during the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it couldn't be interfered with, Pakistan came to accept that India could develop the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power at that time. MR MINEAR: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: (Slide 22) Turning to the final part of my presentation. In this part of my submission I'm going to highlight four specific conclusions from the travaux préparatoires regarding the evolution of the key provisions at issue in this proceeding, namely of Article III and various paragraphs of Annexure D.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960. It is clear from this negotiating history of the Treaty that the final balance struck was hard-fought. The constant that remained from the Bank's 1954 proposal was the division of control over the Western and Eastern Rivers, and the mutual independence that that assured. It was not a perfect solution for Pakistan. As Pakistan's Foreign Minister said in 1954, the original proposal on which it was based involved "great sacrifices" for Pakistan. That's P-383, paragraph 3. But it was acceptable on the basis and indeed, on the condition, as Pakistan repeatedly emphasised during the negotiations that it would protect Pakistan against	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it couldn't be interfered with, Pakistan came to accept that India could develop the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power at that time. MR MINEAR: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: (Slide 22) Turning to the final part of my presentation. In this part of my submission I'm going to highlight four specific conclusions from the travaux préparatoires regarding the evolution of the key provisions at issue in this proceeding, namely of Article III and various paragraphs of Annexure D. As Professor Webb will go on to explain, the travaux can, in certain circumstances, be an important factor in
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960. It is clear from this negotiating history of the Treaty that the final balance struck was hard-fought. The constant that remained from the Bank's 1954 proposal was the division of control over the Western and Eastern Rivers, and the mutual independence that that assured. It was not a perfect solution for Pakistan. As Pakistan's Foreign Minister said in 1954, the original proposal on which it was based involved "great sacrifices" for Pakistan. That's P-383, paragraph 3. But it was acceptable on the basis and indeed, on the condition, as Pakistan repeatedly emphasised during the negotiations that it would protect Pakistan against control over waters on which it would be reliant. It is	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it couldn't be interfered with, Pakistan came to accept that India could develop the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power at that time. MR MINEAR: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: (Slide 22) Turning to the final part of my presentation. In this part of my submission I'm going to highlight four specific conclusions from the travaux préparatoires regarding the evolution of the key provisions at issue in this proceeding, namely of Article III and various paragraphs of Annexure D. As Professor Webb will go on to explain, the travaux can, in certain circumstances, be an important factor in the interpretation of the Treaty pursuant to the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	The Bank produced a revised draft of the Treaty in April 1960 that's at P-476 together with a set of draft annexures, including D, that's Exhibit P-476, and E, at Exhibit P-489. The archives provide no context over any of the changes made in the April 1960 draft as against the December 1959 draft. Nor do the archives provide any transparency regarding the process leading up to the June 1960 draft and its annexures. The final text of the Indus Waters Treaty was ultimately agreed on 6 September 1960. It is clear from this negotiating history of the Treaty that the final balance struck was hard-fought. The constant that remained from the Bank's 1954 proposal was the division of control over the Western and Eastern Rivers, and the mutual independence that that assured. It was not a perfect solution for Pakistan. As Pakistan's Foreign Minister said in 1954, the original proposal on which it was based involved "great sacrifices" for Pakistan. That's P-383, paragraph 3. But it was acceptable on the basis and indeed, on the condition, as Pakistan repeatedly emphasised during the negotiations that it would protect Pakistan against	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 this time that Pakistan envisaged very much plants that involved no consumptive use of water, didn't affect the timing or quantity of the natural flow of the water. And what subsequently came through, obviously, in the detailed provisions of Annexure D, was how to ensure that Pakistan's concerns over the timing no interference with the timing and quantity of the natural flow of the water could be regulated and ensured. So provided that those two things could be ensured, that the timing of the water and the quantity of it couldn't be interfered with, Pakistan came to accept that India could develop the Western Rivers for hydroelectric power at that time. MR MINEAR: Thank you. MS REES-EVANS: (Slide 22) Turning to the final part of my presentation. In this part of my submission I'm going to highlight four specific conclusions from the travaux préparatoires regarding the evolution of the key provisions at issue in this proceeding, namely of Article III and various paragraphs of Annexure D. As Professor Webb will go on to explain, the travaux can, in certain circumstances, be an important factor in the interpretation of the Treaty pursuant to the

10:47	1	Article 32 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of	10:50 1	that it would not object to India's use of the Western
	2	Treaties.	2	Rivers for the non-consumptive generation of
	3	(Slide 23) The first conclusion is that the let-flow	3	hydroelectric power. That's at P-133.
	4	principle was deliberately fortified over time to its	4	(Slide 27) The 1959 agreement was couched instead in
	5	final incarnation as an obligation on India to let flow	5	permissive language, providing at Article IV(2) that:
	6	all the waters of the Western Rivers. This reflected	6	"India shall be entitled to generate hydro-electric
	7	Pakistan's firmly held and oft-expressed concerns	7	power on the Western Rivers in accordance with the
	8	regarding any threat of Indian control over the waters	8	provisions of Annex 'B'."
	9	on which it was due to be reliant.	9	That's the precursor to Annexure D.
	10	Articles II and III of the Treaty are the	10	(Slide 28) The permissiveness of the 1959 heads of
	11	operationalisation of the 1954 proposal's foundational	11	agreement was then corrected in the first full draft
	12	principle of the division of the waters. The language	12	provided to the Governments of India and Pakistan as the
	13	it uses, of the entire flow of each of the Western and	13	December 1959 draft. It provided that India "shall not
	14	Eastern Rivers being "available for" the exclusive use	14	permit any interference with the waters" of the Western
	15	of Pakistan and India, respectively, was mirrored in the	15	Rivers except for the defined list of uses, which
	16	1957 heads of agreement. This is P-362 and P-413.	16	included the generation of hydroelectric power. This
	17	From the summer of 1959, the language moved towards	17	shift in language is significant. It points to the
	18	that of obligation. The heads of agreement of 1959	18	primacy of the pivotal let-flow obligation and, by
	19	provided that "India shall let flow the water[s] of the	19	implication, the limiting character of the exception.
	20	Western Rivers free from any interference", save for	20	Further reinforcing this conclusion is the
	21	certain exceptions. That's in Article IV at	21	introduction as from the December 1959 draft of the
	22	Exhibit P-136, shown now on slide 23.	22	Treaty of the clear prohibition, subject to the
	23	The December 1959 draft went further still. This is	23	exceptions set out in Annexures D and E, on India's
	24	on slide 24 now. It spelt out explicitly India's	24	storage of any water or construction of any storage
	25	"obligation to let flow all the waters of the Western	25	works on the Western Rivers. This is at Article III(4)
		Page 53		Page 55
10.40			10.51 1	
10:48	1	Rivers". This is at Article III(2).	10:51 1	of the final Treaty. This provision remained largely
10:48	2	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and	2	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the
10:48	2 3	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to	2 3	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty.
10:48	2 3 4	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's	2 3 4	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the
10:48	2 3 4 5	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers	2 3 4 5	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty.It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations
10:48	2 3 4 5 6	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That	2 3 4 5 6	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty.It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated
10:48	2 3 4 5 6 7	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be	2 3 4 5 6 7	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty.It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the
10:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25. (Slide 26) The second conclusion is that India's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information about its run-of-river HEP plants was a constant feature
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25. (Slide 26) The second conclusion is that India's ability to utilise the Western Rivers for the generation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information about its run-of-river HEP plants was a constant feature of the drafts. I think Mr Shah yesterday referred to
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25. (Slide 26) The second conclusion is that India's ability to utilise the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power was deliberately couched as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information about its run-of-river HEP plants was a constant feature of the drafts. I think Mr Shah yesterday referred to "the wisdom of the framers of the Treaty" in this
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25. (Slide 26) The second conclusion is that India's ability to utilise the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power was deliberately couched as an exception to India's positive and binding obligation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information about its run-of-river HEP plants was a constant feature of the drafts. I think Mr Shah yesterday referred to "the wisdom of the framers of the Treaty" in this respect (Day 1, page 163, line 9).
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25. (Slide 26) The second conclusion is that India's ability to utilise the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power was deliberately couched as an exception to India's positive and binding obligation to let flow. This in itself represented a concession by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information about its run-of-river HEP plants was a constant feature of the drafts. I think Mr Shah yesterday referred to "the wisdom of the framers of the Treaty" in this respect (Day 1, page 163, line 9). As early as the May 1957 heads of terms in P-362,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25. (Slide 26) The second conclusion is that India's ability to utilise the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power was deliberately couched as an exception to India's positive and binding obligation to let flow. This in itself represented a concession by Pakistan.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information about its run-of-river HEP plants was a constant feature of the drafts. I think Mr Shah yesterday referred to "the wisdom of the framers of the Treaty" in this respect (Day 1, page 163, line 9). As early as the May 1957 heads of terms in P-362, now shown on slide 29, the parties recognised that
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25. (Slide 26) The second conclusion is that India's ability to utilise the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power was deliberately couched as an exception to India's positive and binding obligation to let flow. This in itself represented a concession by Pakistan. Pakistan's opening position, reflected in its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information about its run-of-river HEP plants was a constant feature of the drafts. I think Mr Shah yesterday referred to "the wisdom of the framers of the Treaty" in this respect (Day 1, page 163, line 9). As early as the May 1957 heads of terms in P-362, now shown on slide 29, the parties recognised that information-sharing was absolutely vital to the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25. (Slide 26) The second conclusion is that India's ability to utilise the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power was deliberately couched as an exception to India's positive and binding obligation to let flow. This in itself represented a concession by Pakistan. Pakistan's opening position, reflected in its comments to the May 1957 heads of agreement, was that:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information about its run-of-river HEP plants was a constant feature of the drafts. I think Mr Shah yesterday referred to "the wisdom of the framers of the Treaty" in this respect (Day 1, page 163, line 9). As early as the May 1957 heads of terms in P-362, now shown on slide 29, the parties recognised that information-sharing was absolutely vital to the permission that the Treaty was to give to India.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25. (Slide 26) The second conclusion is that India's ability to utilise the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power was deliberately couched as an exception to India's positive and binding obligation to let flow. This in itself represented a concession by Pakistan. Pakistan's opening position, reflected in its comments to the May 1957 heads of agreement, was that: " any development on [the Western] rivers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information about its run-of-river HEP plants was a constant feature of the drafts. I think Mr Shah yesterday referred to "the wisdom of the framers of the Treaty" in this respect (Day 1, page 163, line 9). As early as the May 1957 heads of terms in P-362, now shown on slide 29, the parties recognised that information-sharing was absolutely vital to the permission that the Treaty was to give to India. (Slide 30) The fourth conclusion from the travaux is
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25. (Slide 26) The second conclusion is that India's ability to utilise the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power was deliberately couched as an exception to India's positive and binding obligation to let flow. This in itself represented a concession by Pakistan. Pakistan's opening position, reflected in its comments to the May 1957 heads of agreement, was that: " any development on [the Western] rivers upstream of Pakistan would have to have the consent of	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information about its run-of-river HEP plants was a constant feature of the drafts. I think Mr Shah yesterday referred to "the wisdom of the framers of the Treaty" in this respect (Day 1, page 163, line 9). As early as the May 1957 heads of terms in P-362, now shown on slide 29, the parties recognised that information-sharing was absolutely vital to the permission that the Treaty was to give to India. (Slide 30) The fourth conclusion from the travaux is that unfortunately, as I've said before, they provide
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25. (Slide 26) The second conclusion is that India's ability to utilise the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power was deliberately couched as an exception to India's positive and binding obligation to let flow. This in itself represented a concession by Pakistan. Pakistan's opening position, reflected in its comments to the May 1957 heads of agreement, was that: " any development on [the Western] rivers upstream of Pakistan would have to have the consent of the Government of Pakistan."	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information about its run-of-river HEP plants was a constant feature of the drafts. I think Mr Shah yesterday referred to "the wisdom of the framers of the Treaty" in this respect (Day 1, page 163, line 9). As early as the May 1957 heads of terms in P-362, now shown on slide 29, the parties recognised that information-sharing was absolutely vital to the permission that the Treaty was to give to India. (Slide 30) The fourth conclusion from the travaux is that unfortunately, as I've said before, they provide little assistance in providing context to certain
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \end{array}$	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25. (Slide 26) The second conclusion is that India's ability to utilise the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power was deliberately couched as an exception to India's positive and binding obligation to let flow. This in itself represented a concession by Pakistan. Pakistan's opening position, reflected in its comments to the May 1957 heads of agreement, was that: " any development on [the Western] rivers upstream of Pakistan would have to have the consent of the Government of Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-410.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information about its run-of-river HEP plants was a constant feature of the drafts. I think Mr Shah yesterday referred to "the wisdom of the framers of the Treaty" in this respect (Day 1, page 163, line 9). As early as the May 1957 heads of terms in P-362, now shown on slide 29, the parties recognised that information-sharing was absolutely vital to the permission that the Treaty was to give to India. (Slide 30) The fourth conclusion from the travaux is that unfortunately, as I've said before, they provide little assistance in providing context to certain aspects of the Treaty. And most notably, I think that's
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \end{array}$	 (Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25. (Slide 26) The second conclusion is that India's ability to utilise the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power was deliberately couched as an exception to India's positive and binding obligation to let flow. This in itself represented a concession by Pakistan. Pakistan's opening position, reflected in its comments to the May 1957 heads of agreement, was that: " any development on [the Western] rivers upstream of Pakistan would have to have the consent of the Government of Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-410. Under pressure from India and the Bank, Pakistan 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information about its run-of-river HEP plants was a constant feature of the drafts. I think Mr Shah yesterday referred to "the wisdom of the framers of the Treaty" in this respect (Day 1, page 163, line 9). As early as the May 1957 heads of terms in P-362, now shown on slide 29, the parties recognised that information-sharing was absolutely vital to the permission that the Treaty was to give to India. (Slide 30) The fourth conclusion from the travaux is that unfortunately, as I've said before, they provide little assistance in providing context to certain aspects of the Treaty. And most notably, I think that's around some of the key provisions at Annexure D.
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \end{array}$	(Slide 25) Then between the December 1959 draft and the final Treaty, the main substantive change to Article III of the Treaty was to strengthen Pakistan's rights to receive all those waters of the Western Rivers which India is under an obligation to let flow. That change was effected through the removal of the words "be entitled to" in the June 1959 draft. In the June 1959 draft [as] in the final version, the Treaty simply provides that Pakistan "shall receive" those waters. This is visible in the red-line shown now on slide 25. (Slide 26) The second conclusion is that India's ability to utilise the Western Rivers for the generation of hydroelectric power was deliberately couched as an exception to India's positive and binding obligation to let flow. This in itself represented a concession by Pakistan. Pakistan's opening position, reflected in its comments to the May 1957 heads of agreement, was that: " any development on [the Western] rivers upstream of Pakistan would have to have the consent of the Government of Pakistan." That's Exhibit P-410.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	constant from December 1959 to the final version of the Treaty. It is evident from the intense exchanges between the negotiating parties in the final months of negotiations that India's attempts to expand on the storage allocated to it was fiercely fought. For that reason, the negotiating history supports a narrow construction of these exceptions to India's let-flow obligation. (Slide 29) The third conclusion is that the requirement that India provide Pakistan with information about its run-of-river HEP plants was a constant feature of the drafts. I think Mr Shah yesterday referred to "the wisdom of the framers of the Treaty" in this respect (Day 1, page 163, line 9). As early as the May 1957 heads of terms in P-362, now shown on slide 29, the parties recognised that information-sharing was absolutely vital to the permission that the Treaty was to give to India. (Slide 30) The fourth conclusion from the travaux is that unfortunately, as I've said before, they provide little assistance in providing context to certain aspects of the Treaty. And most notably, I think that's

		1	
10:53 1	have taken place in the London mastings in August 1050	10:55 1	proposal Paragraph 2(h) set out a design oritorion
	have taken place in the London meetings in August 1959,		proposal. Paragraph 3(b) set out a design criterion which required that the "volume between the maximum and
2	but they don't give much detail in the minutes of those	2	-
3	meetings. And there are then likely to have been	3	minimum levels of the operating pool shall not exceed
4	further detailed negotiations in the run-up to the $\Delta = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1}{2}$	4	that required to meet the daily or weekly load
5	April 1960 draft of Annexure D. But again, there's no	5	fluctuations as the case may be".
6	detail of the negotiations at all in the archives in	6	So we think that Pakistan clearly intended, with its
7	that period.	7	proposed addition, to establish a limit on India's
8	Pakistan has summarised the evolution of aspects of	8	allowable pondage. So at that stage they were working
9	the relevant provisions of Annexure D in paragraphs 50	9	out how to establish that limit.
10	to 52 of Appendix A of its Memorial. I intend to focus	10	This isn't the end of the story, because then we
11	my remarks on that which can be gleaned about the term	11	have the, essentially, gaping hole in the negotiating
12	"pondage" and related terms, in response to the question	12	records. We know next to nothing about why the draft of
13	that you asked, Mr Minear, of Mr Shah yesterday.	13	the Treaty evolved as it did between the heads of
14	Mr Minear observed and this is the Day 1	14	agreement 1959 and the April 1960 draft of Annexure D.
15	transcript, page 215, lines 10 to 14 that:	15	All that we know is from the subsequent drafts
16	" Pakistan initially suggested a pondage	16	themselves.
17	determination based on a minimum load factor, and	17	(Slide 32) So if we look at the April 1960 draft, we
18	I would be interested in knowing what relevance that	18	see that it introduces a formal definition of "pondage",
19	might have to the position that was ultimately	19	which is largely consistent with the description in the
20	formulated in the Treaty."	20	heads of agreement of 1959. It provides that:
21	It is helpful, in answering this question, to go	21	"'Pondage' means storage of only sufficient
22	through, with your indulgence and this will be the	22	magnitude to meet fluctuations in the discharge of the
23	end of my presentation the chronology of the drafts	23	turbines arising from variations in the daily and weekly
24	on this particular point.	24	load of the plant."
25	It appears that the term "pondage" was first	25	This is P-476, draft paragraph 5(c).
	Page 57		Page 59
	- "6" "		
10:54 1	introduced by Pakistan in a draft of 15 August 1959.	10:57 1	But the equivalent of paragraph 3(b) of Annex B of
2	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b).	2	the heads of agreement so this is the design
2 3	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's	2 3	the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load".
2 3 4	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b).	2 3 4	the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at
2 3 4 5	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term	2 3 4 5	the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that:
2 3 4 5 6	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that	2 3 4 5 6	the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not
2 3 4 5 6 7	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of	2 3 4 5 6 7	the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on the main stem of the Chenab River)."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants. We can only speculate about why this was, because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on the main stem of the Chenab River)." At this stage, a pondage determination based on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants. We can only speculate about why this was, because again, as I said, we don't have the records of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on the main stem of the Chenab River)." At this stage, a pondage determination based on a load factor was put forward as a design criterion.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants. We can only speculate about why this was, because again, as I said, we don't have the records of the negotiations. But if we were to speculate, we might say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on the main stem of the Chenab River)." At this stage, a pondage determination based on a load factor was put forward as a design criterion. So then the next time it appears is in the heads of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants. We can only speculate about why this was, because again, as I said, we don't have the records of the negotiations. But if we were to speculate, we might say that it's a reflection that the parties didn't want the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on the main stem of the Chenab River)." At this stage, a pondage determination based on a load factor was put forward as a design criterion. So then the next time it appears is in the heads of agreement of 1959 (P-136). There, it is described in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants. We can only speculate about why this was, because again, as I said, we don't have the records of the negotiations. But if we were to speculate, we might say that it's a reflection that the parties didn't want the design criterion to be linked to something as subjective
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on the main stem of the Chenab River)." At this stage, a pondage determination based on a load factor was put forward as a design criterion. So then the next time it appears is in the heads of agreement of 1959 (P-136). There, it is described in paragraph 2 on slide 31 now as:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants. We can only speculate about why this was, because again, as I said, we don't have the records of the negotiations. But if we were to speculate, we might say that it's a reflection that the parties didn't want the design criterion to be linked to something as subjective as load or demand, so how much power the operator wants
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on the main stem of the Chenab River)." At this stage, a pondage determination based on a load factor was put forward as a design criterion. So then the next time it appears is in the heads of agreement of 1959 (P-136). There, it is described in paragraph 2 on slide 31 now as: " the [live] storage in the operating pool	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants. We can only speculate about why this was, because again, as I said, we don't have the records of the negotiations. But if we were to speculate, we might say that it's a reflection that the parties didn't want the design criterion to be linked to something as subjective as load or demand, so how much power the operator wants to generate from the plant. But the travaux don't
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on the main stem of the Chenab River)." At this stage, a pondage determination based on a load factor was put forward as a design criterion. So then the next time it appears is in the heads of agreement of 1959 (P-136). There, it is described in paragraph 2 on slide 31 now as: " the [live] storage in the operating pool 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants. We can only speculate about why this was, because again, as I said, we don't have the records of the negotiations. But if we were to speculate, we might say that it's a reflection that the parties didn't want the design criterion to be linked to something as subjective as load or demand, so how much power the operator wants to generate from the plant. But the travaux don't confirm either way.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on the main stem of the Chenab River)." At this stage, a pondage determination based on a load factor was put forward as a design criterion. So then the next time it appears is in the heads of agreement of 1959 (P-136). There, it is described in paragraph 2 on slide 31 now as: " the [live] storage in the operating pool 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants. We can only speculate about why this was, because again, as I said, we don't have the records of the negotiations. But if we were to speculate, we might say that it's a reflection that the parties didn't want the design criterion to be linked to something as subjective as load or demand, so how much power the operator wants to generate from the plant. But the travaux don't confirm either way.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on the main stem of the Chenab River)." At this stage, a pondage determination based on a load factor was put forward as a design criterion. So then the next time it appears is in the heads of agreement of 1959 (P-136). There, it is described in paragraph 2 on slide 31 now as: " the [live] storage in the operating pool 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants. We can only speculate about why this was, because again, as I said, we don't have the records of the negotiations. But if we were to speculate, we might say that it's a reflection that the parties didn't want the design criterion to be linked to something as subjective as load or demand, so how much power the operator wants to generate from the plant. But the travaux don't confirm either way. What we do know, however, is that from this point on, the parties clearly recognised the significance of
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on the main stem of the Chenab River)." At this stage, a pondage determination based on a load factor was put forward as a design criterion. So then the next time it appears is in the heads of agreement of 1959 (P-136). There, it is described in paragraph 2 on slide 31 now as: " the [live] storage in the operating pool required to meet fluctuations in the discharge of the turbines arising from variations in the daily or weekly load of the power plant." 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants. We can only speculate about why this was, because again, as I said, we don't have the records of the negotiations. But if we were to speculate, we might say that it's a reflection that the parties didn't want the design criterion to be linked to something as subjective as load or demand, so how much power the operator wants to generate from the plant. But the travaux don't confirm either way. What we do know, however, is that from this point on, the parties clearly recognised the significance of the term "firm power". So while the definition of the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on the main stem of the Chenab River)." At this stage, a pondage determination based on a load factor was put forward as a design criterion. So then the next time it appears is in the heads of agreement of 1959 (P-136). There, it is described in paragraph 2 on slide 31 now as: " the [live] storage in the operating pool required to meet fluctuations in the discharge of the turbines arising from variations in the daily or weekly load of the power plant." 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants. We can only speculate about why this was, because again, as I said, we don't have the records of the negotiations. But if we were to speculate, we might say that it's a reflection that the parties didn't want the design criterion to be linked to something as subjective as load or demand, so how much power the operator wants to generate from the plant. But the travaux don't confirm either way. What we do know, however, is that from this point on, the parties clearly recognised the significance of the term "firm power". So while the definition of the term "pondage" stayed almost entirely constant in the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on the main stem of the Chenab River)." At this stage, a pondage determination based on a load factor was put forward as a design criterion. So then the next time it appears is in the heads of agreement of 1959 (P-136). There, it is described in paragraph 2 on slide 31 now as: " the [live] storage in the operating pool required to meet fluctuations in the discharge of the turbines arising from variations in the daily or weekly load of the power plant." 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants. We can only speculate about why this was, because again, as I said, we don't have the records of the negotiations. But if we were to speculate, we might say that it's a reflection that the parties didn't want the design criterion to be linked to something as subjective as load or demand, so how much power the operator wants to generate from the plant. But the travaux don't confirm either way. What we do know, however, is that from this point on, the parties clearly recognised the significance of the term "firm power". So while the definition of the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 That's Exhibit P-365, enclosure 2, at paragraph 2(b). I've set out the provision on the slide and it's highlighted in 2(b). In Pakistan's August 1959 draft, it used the term "pondage" in one of a number of considerations that "shall govern the design, construction and operation" of hydroelectric power plant works. And it stipulated that the pondage shall be that which is: " adequate only to cater for the weekly load factor of the power plant (daily load factor in the case of a power house involving the construction of a dam on the main stem of the Chenab River)." At this stage, a pondage determination based on a load factor was put forward as a design criterion. So then the next time it appears is in the heads of agreement of 1959 (P-136). There, it is described in paragraph 2 on slide 31 now as: " the [live] storage in the operating pool required to meet fluctuations in the discharge of the turbines arising from variations in the daily or weekly load of the power plant." 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 the heads of agreement so this is the design criterion no longer refers to the concept of "load". Instead it is linked to "firm power". This is at paragraph 7(c). It provided that: "The maximum Pondage in the Operating Pool shall not exceed twice the Pondage required for Firm Power." So at this point the concept of "load" is confined solely to the definition and the concept of "firm power" is introduced. The concept of "load" is removed completely from the design criterion for new run-of-river plants. We can only speculate about why this was, because again, as I said, we don't have the records of the negotiations. But if we were to speculate, we might say that it's a reflection that the parties didn't want the design criterion to be linked to something as subjective as load or demand, so how much power the operator wants to generate from the plant. But the travaux don't confirm either way. What we do know, however, is that from this point on, the parties clearly recognised the significance of the term "firm power". So while the definition of the term "pondage" stayed almost entirely constant in the

10:58 1	the definition of "firm power" evolved. So that's what	11:01 1	your presentation, but I just wanted to flag this
10.58 1	-	2	question for one of your future presenters.
3		3	MS REES-EVANS: Sorry, could you give me the paragraph
4			reference?
		4	
5		5	MR MINEAR: Yes: it's paragraph 21 of Annexure E.
6	1	6	MS REES-EVANS: Paragraph 21, okay.
7	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	7	MR MINEAR: I can read it to you if you'd like.
8	· · ·	8	MS REES-EVANS: No, I have that, thank you.
9		9	I think we'll come back to that then, yes. Thank
10		10	-
11		11	
12	6	12	•
13		13	
14		14	
15		15	
16		16	travaux préparatoires, with references to statements
17	6 6	17	made by Professor Crawford and Professor Lowe in the
18	time, so I accept all of that. I was just wondering,	18	Kishenganga proceeding. That discussion seemed to be
19		19	suggesting that it was important to discern what
20	emerging technologies that might impact on the	20	constitutes a part of the travaux and what does not.
21	agreement, that haven't been canvassed by the agreement	21	But then at paragraph 31, Pakistan says that even
22	but could still have an impact? I'll leave global	22	non-travaux materials fall within the scope of VCLT
23	warming out, as a sort of generic issue. But would	23	Article 32.
24	something like cloud seeding, for example, be deemed	24	Can you clarify why it's important to determine what
25	an engineering work? That's a question.	25	is and what is not travaux?
	D		5 (2)
	Page 61		Page 63
11:00 1	MS REES-EVANS: I think I might leave that to be taken up by	11:03 1	MS REES-EVANS: Well, yes, I think certainly the discussion
11:00 1	5 1 7	11:03 1 2	MS REES-EVANS: Well, yes, I think certainly the discussion of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing
	one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It		
2	one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the	2	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate
2	one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that	2 3	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about
2 3 4 5	one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in	2 3 4 5	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux;
2 3 4	one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is	2 3 4 5 6	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in
2 3 4 5 6 7	one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960.	2 3 4 5 6 7	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga,
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be addressed in subsequent submissions. But as I say, the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material from the record can be taken into account under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be addressed in subsequent submissions. But as I say, the travaux just don't provide very much guidance on how the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material from the record can be taken into account under Article 32.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be addressed in subsequent submissions. But as I say, the travaux just don't provide very much guidance on how the Treaty will be responsive to future developments in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material from the record can be taken into account under Article 32. So I think where the Court came out, after having
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be addressed in subsequent submissions. But as I say, the travaux just don't provide very much guidance on how the Treaty will be responsive to future developments in technologies. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material from the record can be taken into account under Article 32. So I think where the Court came out, after having this discussion during the course of the I believe it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be addressed in subsequent submissions. But as I say, the travaux just don't provide very much guidance on how the Treaty will be responsive to future developments in technologies. MR MINEAR: I just would like to flag an enquiry that might 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material from the record can be taken into account under Article 32. So I think where the Court came out, after having this discussion during the course of the I believe it was the hearing on the merits yes, in the hearing on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be addressed in subsequent submissions. But as I say, the travaux just don't provide very much guidance on how the Treaty will be responsive to future developments in technologies. MR MINEAR: I just would like to flag an enquiry that might arise later. I don't think it falls within your 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material from the record can be taken into account under Article 32. So I think where the Court came out, after having this discussion during the course of the I believe it was the hearing on the merits yes, in the hearing on the merits I think where the Court came out was that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be addressed in subsequent submissions. But as I say, the travaux just don't provide very much guidance on how the Treaty will be responsive to future developments in technologies. MR MINEAR: I just would like to flag an enquiry that might arise later. I don't think it falls within your presentation, but it seems an appropriate point to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material from the record can be taken into account under Article 32. So I think where the Court came out, after having this discussion during the course of the I believe it was the hearing on the merits yes, in the hearing on the merits I think where the Court came out was that it didn't need to pay too strict attention necessarily
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be addressed in subsequent submissions. But as I say, the travaux just don't provide very much guidance on how the Treaty will be responsive to future developments in technologies. MR MINEAR: I just would like to flag an enquiry that might arise later. I don't think it falls within your presentation, but it seems an appropriate point to make it. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material from the record can be taken into account under Article 32. So I think where the Court came out, after having this discussion during the course of the I believe it was the hearing on the merits yes, in the hearing on the merits I think where the Court came out was that it didn't need to pay too strict attention necessarily to the distinction, because actually it could take into
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 21\\ 21\\ 21\\ 21\\ 21\\ 21\\ 21\\ 21\\ 21$	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be addressed in subsequent submissions. But as I say, the travaux just don't provide very much guidance on how the Treaty will be responsive to future developments in technologies. MR MINEAR: I just would like to flag an enquiry that might arise later. I don't think it falls within your presentation, but it seems an appropriate point to make it. In Annexure E, paragraph 21(a), there's a reference 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material from the record can be taken into account under Article 32. So I think where the Court came out, after having this discussion during the course of the I believe it was the hearing on the merits yes, in the hearing on the merits I think where the Court came out was that it didn't need to pay too strict attention necessarily to the distinction, because actually it could take into account materials under Article 32 even if they weren't
$ \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 22$	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be addressed in subsequent submissions. But as I say, the travaux just don't provide very much guidance on how the Treaty will be responsive to future developments in technologies. MR MINEAR: I just would like to flag an enquiry that might arise later. I don't think it falls within your presentation, but it seems an appropriate point to make it. In Annexure E, paragraph 21(a), there's a reference to "firm power" there as well, and I would be curious if 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material from the record can be taken into account under Article 32. So I think where the Court came out, after having this discussion during the course of the I believe it was the hearing on the merits yes, in the hearing on the merits I think where the Court came out was that it didn't need to pay too strict attention necessarily to the distinction, because actually it could take into account materials under Article 32 even if they weren't strictly defined as travaux.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 23 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24$	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be addressed in subsequent submissions. But as I say, the travaux just don't provide very much guidance on how the Treaty will be responsive to future developments in technologies. MR MINEAR: I just would like to flag an enquiry that might arise later. I don't think it falls within your presentation, but it seems an appropriate point to make it. In Annexure E, paragraph 21(a), there's a reference to "firm power" there as well, and I would be curious if that definition of "firm power" is the same as used in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material from the record can be taken into account under Article 32. So I think where the Court came out, after having this discussion during the course of the I believe it was the hearing on the merits yes, in the hearing on the merits I think where the Court came out was that it didn't need to pay too strict attention necessarily to the distinction, because actually it could take into account materials under Article 32 even if they weren't strictly defined as travaux. But I suspect that part of the reason it reached
$ \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24$	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be addressed in subsequent submissions. But as I say, the travaux just don't provide very much guidance on how the Treaty will be responsive to future developments in technologies. MR MINEAR: I just would like to flag an enquiry that might arise later. I don't think it falls within your presentation, but it seems an appropriate point to make it. In Annexure E, paragraph 21(a), there's a reference to "firm power" there as well, and I would be curious if that definition of "firm power" is the same as used in Annexure D. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material from the record can be taken into account under Article 32. So I think where the Court came out, after having this discussion during the course of the I believe it was the hearing on the merits yes, in the hearing on the merits I think where the Court came out was that it didn't need to pay too strict attention necessarily to the distinction, because actually it could take into account materials under Article 32 even if they weren't strictly defined as travaux. But I suspect that part of the reason it reached that conclusion was because it wasn't necessary in that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be addressed in subsequent submissions. But as I say, the travaux just don't provide very much guidance on how the Treaty will be responsive to future developments in technologies. MR MINEAR: I just would like to flag an enquiry that might arise later. I don't think it falls within your presentation, but it seems an appropriate point to make it. In Annexure E, paragraph 21(a), there's a reference to "firm power" there as well, and I would be curious if that definition of "firm power" is the same as used in Annexure D. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material from the record can be taken into account under Article 32. So I think where the Court came out, after having this discussion during the course of the I believe it was the hearing on the merits yes, in the hearing on the merits I think where the Court came out was that it didn't need to pay too strict attention necessarily to the distinction, because actually it could take into account materials under Article 32 even if they weren't strictly defined as travaux. But I suspect that part of the reason it reached that conclusion was because it wasn't necessary in that
$ \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24$	 one of the subsequent presentations, if I may. It certainly isn't addressed in what I've seen of the travaux. I haven't seen anything in the travaux that pays very close attention to how developments in technology will be addressed by the text that is currently under negotiation as at 1959/1960. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. I just wanted to see whether there was somewhere a cubbyhole that had an ability to start a conversation about those things. But apparently not. So thank you. MS REES-EVANS: It's certainly something that will be addressed in subsequent submissions. But as I say, the travaux just don't provide very much guidance on how the Treaty will be responsive to future developments in technologies. MR MINEAR: I just would like to flag an enquiry that might arise later. I don't think it falls within your presentation, but it seems an appropriate point to make it. In Annexure E, paragraph 21(a), there's a reference to "firm power" there as well, and I would be curious if that definition of "firm power" is the same as used in Annexure D. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of this in Kishenganga is a little bit confusing because, as you say, it seems to take two separate tacks: on the one hand, there's a discussion about whether something is formally characterised as travaux; and on the other hand, there's this acceptance that in any case it can be taken into account under Article 32. I think the reference that you cited in paragraph 31 is to a footnote in the partial award where the Court effectively is saying, we, the Court in Kishenganga, don't think that the distinction is actually all that important because either way we think that this material from the record can be taken into account under Article 32. So I think where the Court came out, after having this discussion during the course of the I believe it was the hearing on the merits yes, in the hearing on the merits I think where the Court came out was that it didn't need to pay too strict attention necessarily to the distinction, because actually it could take into account materials under Article 32 even if they weren't strictly defined as travaux. But I suspect that part of the reason it reached that conclusion was because it wasn't necessary in that

11:05 1	because it actually didn't rely on the travaux	11:07 1	of the parties was aware of the particular document that
11.05 1	particularly extensively in its award. There's a couple	2	was generated.
3	of aspects where they do rely on the travaux, but in	3	So I think that the overarching point here was that
4	general they don't form a huge part of the Court's	4	the Bank had been very good in its approach to the
4 5	award. So I suspect that's why the Court, in its	5	parties and very transparent with both parties. So as
6	partial award, didn't end up entertaining this	5	
0 7	distinction too much in its analysis.	7	a general approach, you could say you can take the
8	But it may be also worth saying that if something		documents produced by the Bank as travaux for that
	can be characterised as "travaux", I think for a Court	8	reason, because they were transparent with both sides.
9	it is easier to give that weight than something that	9	But I can't think of a particular example. But if
10		10	there is an example where really this is a record of
11	doesn't strictly fall within the concept of "travaux".	11	a conversation with one party, which at the time the
12	And so it's a question of really the weight which you	12	other party was completely unaware of, for instance,
13	give the materials that you're looking at. And you	13	I think it is more questionable whether you could
14	would give something that formally constitutes travaux	14	characterise that as part of the travaux.
15	more weight than something that doesn't, obviously as	15	THE CHAIRMAN: So let's take as an example an issue that
16	a reflection of the negotiating positions of the	16	you've raised in the Memorial and also today, which is
17	parties.	17	the idea of the let-flow principle operating. And in
18	THE CHAIRMAN: So there's a range of materials that we could	18	Appendix A at page 8, subparagraph (a), you say:
19	take into account as a part of a supplemental means of	19	" throughout the negotiations, the pivotal 'let
20	interpretation, but perhaps the travaux préparatoires	20	flow' principle remained relatively constant."
21	defined, perhaps, as the materials that form a part of	21	And you have that also at paragraph 41, I think.
22	the negotiating record of the Treaty might be given	22	And today you've reiterated that, and I think I heard
23	more weight than those other materials because they	23	you say it was fortified over time as part of the
24	speak more to the intent of the parties; is that the way	24	negotiating history.
25	you understand it?	25	It seems clear that Pakistan took that type of
	Page 65		Page 67
11:06 1	MS REES-EVANS: Yes, I think that's right, although just	11:09 1	approach throughout the negotiations. It seems
2	a slight clarification on one of the points that you	2	relatively clear to me that India did not take that
2 3	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at	2 3	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began
2 3 4	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by	2 3 4	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be
2 3 4 5	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by	2 3 4 5	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved
2 3 4 5 6	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties.	2 3 4 5 6	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be
2 3 4 5 6 7	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in	2 3 4 5 6 7	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents generated by third parties so in this case the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the Western Rivers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents generated by third parties so in this case the Bank to determine whether those materials should	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the Western Rivers. So when I look at that, I see one party perhaps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents generated by third parties so in this case the Bank to determine whether those materials should properly be described as reflecting the parties' views,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the Western Rivers. So when I look at that, I see one party perhaps channelling a let-flow concept, even if those words
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents generated by third parties so in this case the Bank to determine whether those materials should properly be described as reflecting the parties' views, and therefore whether they constitute travaux.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the Western Rivers. So when I look at that, I see one party perhaps channelling a let-flow concept, even if those words themselves weren't used at the outset, but the other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents generated by third parties so in this case the Bank to determine whether those materials should properly be described as reflecting the parties' views, and therefore whether they constitute travaux. THE CHAIRMAN: So in this instance, would you view the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the Western Rivers. So when I look at that, I see one party perhaps channelling a let-flow concept, even if those words themselves weren't used at the outset, but the other party not so much accepting that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents generated by third parties so in this case the Bank to determine whether those materials should properly be described as reflecting the parties' views, and therefore whether they constitute travaux. THE CHAIRMAN: So in this instance, would you view the materials generated by the World Bank as a part of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the Western Rivers. So when I look at that, I see one party perhaps channelling a let-flow concept, even if those words themselves weren't used at the outset, but the other party not so much accepting that. So if we then go to the World Bank's statements and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents generated by third parties so in this case the Bank to determine whether those materials should properly be described as reflecting the parties' views, and therefore whether they constitute travaux. THE CHAIRMAN: So in this instance, would you view the materials generated by the World Bank as a part of the travaux, or would you say that it's not actually part of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the Western Rivers. So when I look at that, I see one party perhaps channelling a let-flow concept, even if those words themselves weren't used at the outset, but the other party not so much accepting that. So if we then go to the World Bank's statements and perhaps give them some weight, it doesn't appear to be
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	 a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents generated by third parties so in this case the Bank to determine whether those materials should properly be described as reflecting the parties' views, and therefore whether they constitute travaux. THE CHAIRMAN: So in this instance, would you view the materials generated by the World Bank as a part of the travaux, or would you say that it's not actually part of the travaux because it's not the parties expressing 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the Western Rivers. So when I look at that, I see one party perhaps channelling a let-flow concept, even if those words themselves weren't used at the outset, but the other party not so much accepting that. So if we then go to the World Bank's statements and perhaps give them some weight, it doesn't appear to be the case that in the World Bank's statements there's
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents generated by third parties so in this case the Bank to determine whether those materials should properly be described as reflecting the parties' views, and therefore whether they constitute travaux. THE CHAIRMAN: So in this instance, would you view the materials generated by the World Bank as a part of the travaux, or would you say that it's not actually part of the travaux because it's not the parties expressing their own views? 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the Western Rivers. So when I look at that, I see one party perhaps channelling a let-flow concept, even if those words themselves weren't used at the outset, but the other party not so much accepting that. So if we then go to the World Bank's statements and perhaps give them some weight, it doesn't appear to be the case that in the World Bank's statements there's an indication that the purpose in this Treaty was to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents generated by third parties so in this case the Bank to determine whether those materials should properly be described as reflecting the parties' views, and therefore whether they constitute travaux. THE CHAIRMAN: So in this instance, would you view the materials generated by the World Bank as a part of the travaux, or would you say that it's not actually part of the travaux because it's not the parties expressing their own views? MS REES-EVANS: I don't think it's possible to give 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the Western Rivers. So when I look at that, I see one party perhaps channelling a let-flow concept, even if those words themselves weren't used at the outset, but the other party not so much accepting that. So if we then go to the World Bank's statements and perhaps give them some weight, it doesn't appear to be the case that in the World Bank's statements there's an indication that the purpose in this Treaty was to ensure that there would be an absolute let-flow of the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents generated by third parties so in this case the Bank to determine whether those materials should properly be described as reflecting the parties' views, and therefore whether they constitute travaux. THE CHAIRMAN: So in this instance, would you view the materials generated by the World Bank as a part of the travaux, or would you say that it's not actually part of the travaux because it's not the parties expressing their own views? MS REES-EVANS: I don't think it's possible to give a general answer to that; I think it depends on the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the Western Rivers. So when I look at that, I see one party perhaps channelling a let-flow concept, even if those words themselves weren't used at the outset, but the other party not so much accepting that. So if we then go to the World Bank's statements and perhaps give them some weight, it doesn't appear to be the case that in the World Bank's statements there's an indication that the purpose in this Treaty was to ensure that there would be an absolute let-flow of the rivers. There's references throughout the materials to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents generated by third parties so in this case the Bank to determine whether those materials should properly be described as reflecting the parties' views, and therefore whether they constitute travaux. THE CHAIRMAN: So in this instance, would you view the materials generated by the World Bank as a part of the travaux, or would you say that it's not actually part of the travaux because it's not the parties expressing their own views? MS REES-EVANS: I don't think it's possible to give a general answer to that; I think it depends on the specific document. Because as we set out, I think, in 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the Western Rivers. So when I look at that, I see one party perhaps channelling a let-flow concept, even if those words themselves weren't used at the outset, but the other party not so much accepting that. So if we then go to the World Bank's statements and perhaps give them some weight, it doesn't appear to be the case that in the World Bank's statements there's an indication that the purpose in this Treaty was to ensure that there would be an absolute let-flow of the rivers. There's references throughout the materials to at least some uses of the upper part of the rivers by
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents generated by third parties so in this case the Bank to determine whether those materials should properly be described as reflecting the parties' views, and therefore whether they constitute travaux. THE CHAIRMAN: So in this instance, would you view the materials generated by the World Bank as a part of the travaux, or would you say that it's not actually part of the travaux because it's not the parties expressing their own views? MS REES-EVANS: I don't think it's possible to give a general answer to that; I think it depends on the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the Western Rivers. So when I look at that, I see one party perhaps channelling a let-flow concept, even if those words themselves weren't used at the outset, but the other party not so much accepting that. So if we then go to the World Bank's statements and perhaps give them some weight, it doesn't appear to be the case that in the World Bank's statements there's an indication that the purpose in this Treaty was to ensure that there would be an absolute let-flow of the rivers. There's references throughout the materials to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 a slight clarification on one of the points that you made, because in this case we're obviously looking at a negotiating record that wasn't entirely generated by the parties, and in fact largely it was not generated by the parties. So formally speaking, I think as we've set out in these paragraphs here, you're not giving such weight to materials that were produced by a third party. So the materials that were produced by the negotiating parties are formally the travaux, and then you've got to look at the specific circumstances surrounding documents generated by third parties so in this case the Bank to determine whether those materials should properly be described as reflecting the parties' views, and therefore whether they constitute travaux. THE CHAIRMAN: So in this instance, would you view the materials generated by the World Bank as a part of the travaux, or would you say that it's not actually part of the travaux because it's not the parties expressing their own views? MS REES-EVANS: I don't think it's possible to give a general answer to that; I think it depends on the specific document. Because as we set out, I think, in 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	relatively clear to me that India did not take that approach throughout the negotiations; that they began with an idea of existing uses within India need to be preserved and maintained, and then over time they moved towards an approach of: non-consumptive uses should be permissible, and then eventually we get the exception that we currently have in the Treaty. And I think you've recognised in Appendix A and in your statement today that Pakistan was, as you put it, forced to accept ultimately this idea that there would be uses of the waters that in some sense impede the flow of the Western Rivers. So when I look at that, I see one party perhaps channelling a let-flow concept, even if those words themselves weren't used at the outset, but the other party not so much accepting that. So if we then go to the World Bank's statements and perhaps give them some weight, it doesn't appear to be the case that in the World Bank's statements there's an indication that the purpose in this Treaty was to ensure that there would be an absolute let-flow of the rivers. There's references throughout the materials to at least some uses of the upper part of the rivers by

11:11 1	September 1951 or November 1951, I see principles being	11:14 1	beyond just that period between August 1959 and the
2	articulated there, but I don't see the let-flow	2	final Treaty, I think it would be useful for us to come
3	principle. And when I look at the subsequent	3	back to you on that.
4	correspondence of the Bank with the two Prime Ministers,	4	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, certainly feel free to do that.
5	I don't see a let-flow principle being articulated.	5	I suppose I was pressing you a bit on this idea that
6	And when I look at that 1954 proposal that you	6	throughout the negotiations the let-flow principle was
7	pointed out to us, which, as you indicated to us,	7	pivotal, because that latter bit doesn't speak to the
8	Pakistan resisted initially, there's certainly language	8	broader story of the negotiations. But even on that
9	about avoiding control by India over waters on which	9	latter bit, the shift from the 1959 heads of agreement
10	Pakistan is dependent. That's not quite the same thing	10	to the 1959 draft, it looks somewhat as though there is
11	as a let-flow principle. Instead it seems like there is	11	a fortification of a let-flow concept, a right for this
12	the introduction there of the concept of an "entire	12	to happen, but also a fortification, a drilling-down on
13	flow", but with exceptions. In that instance, there's	13	what are the exceptions going to be what rights, if
14	reference to "insignificant use", I think. But still,	14	you will, India has with respect to hydroelectric
15	it's not an absolute let-flow. Likewise, in the [1956]	15	plants and thus a hardening, if you will, on both
16	aide-mémoire, I don't see that principle being	16	sides of the equation.
17	articulated.	17	MS REES-EVANS: Yes, I can see your point, and I think
18	All that to just say: it feels like we're getting to	18	we will address it sort of in longer time.
19	a point where, rather than a fortification of a let-flow	19	But in relation to the first point, I suppose one
20	principle, we have an increasing, perhaps, fortification	20	thing that certainly comes out from, as you say, the
21	of a Pakistan position of wanting relatively	21	Pakistan materials is that Pakistan simply wouldn't have
22	unrestricted, if not completely unrestricted, flows, and	22	entered into this Treaty but for the kind of overarching
23	an Indian position that there do need to be exceptions,	23	obligation of India to let the waters of the Western
24	and eventually an acceptance that there would be	24	Rivers through to Pakistan. That was really the
25	exceptions, in the form of hydroelectric power and	25	fundamental premise. That was really the fundamental
	Page 69		Page 71
11.13 1	certain other uses on the upper parts of the river	11.16 1	premise of Pakistan's agreement to the bargain as
11:13 1	certain other uses on the upper parts of the river. So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell	11:16 1 2	premise of Pakistan's agreement to the bargain as a whole.
11:13 1 2 3	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell	2	a whole.
2	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the		· · · ·
2 3	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell	2 3	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh.
2 3 4	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct.	2 3 4	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
2 3 4 5	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to	2 3 4 5	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as
2 3 4 5 6	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away	2 3 4 5 6	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had
2 3 4 5 6 7	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically	2 3 4 5 6 7	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of the I can find the slides but some of the slides	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further information.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of the I can find the slides but some of the slides I set out today, which is essentially the movement in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further information. The other thing that I wanted to say is: the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of the I can find the slides but some of the slides I set out today, which is essentially the movement in the language as between the 1959 heads of agreement to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further information. The other thing that I wanted to say is: the question of the travaux préparatoires, this is a very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of the I can find the slides but some of the slides I set out today, which is essentially the movement in the language as between the 1959 heads of agreement to the final terms of the Treaty, and the recognition	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further information. The other thing that I wanted to say is: the question of the travaux préparatoires, this is a very old debate. I remember the first time I was in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of the I can find the slides but some of the slides I set out today, which is essentially the movement in the language as between the 1959 heads of agreement to the final terms of the Treaty, and the recognition during that evolution in the language of India of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further information. The other thing that I wanted to say is: the question of the travaux préparatoires, this is a very old debate. I remember the first time I was in the Sixth Committee, there was a debate as to what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of the I can find the slides but some of the slides I set out today, which is essentially the movement in the language as between the 1959 heads of agreement to the final terms of the Treaty, and the recognition during that evolution in the language of India of the way that the terms are couched. So initially I think we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further information. The other thing that I wanted to say is: the question of the travaux préparatoires, this is a very old debate. I remember the first time I was in the Sixth Committee, there was a debate as to what constitutes travaux préparatoires, and there was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of the I can find the slides but some of the slides I set out today, which is essentially the movement in the language as between the 1959 heads of agreement to the final terms of the Treaty, and the recognition during that evolution in the language of India of the way that the terms are couched. So initially I think we have a description of the waters being "available for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further information. The other thing that I wanted to say is: the question of the travaux préparatoires, this is a very old debate. I remember the first time I was in the Sixth Committee, there was a debate as to what constitutes travaux préparatoires, and there was a statement by the late Shabtai Rosenne that I still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of the I can find the slides but some of the slides I set out today, which is essentially the movement in the language as between the 1959 heads of agreement to the final terms of the Treaty, and the recognition during that evolution in the language of India of the way that the terms are couched. So initially I think we have a description of the waters being "available for the use", and then we have India "shall make the waters	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further information. The other thing that I wanted to say is: the question of the travaux préparatoires, this is a very old debate. I remember the first time I was in the Sixth Committee, there was a debate as to what constitutes travaux préparatoires, and there was a statement by the late Shabtai Rosenne that I still remember. So I don't think we can really settle it
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of the I can find the slides but some of the slides I set out today, which is essentially the movement in the language as between the 1959 heads of agreement to the final terms of the Treaty, and the recognition during that evolution in the language of India of the way that the terms are couched. So initially I think we have a description of the waters being "available for the use", and then we have India "shall make the waters available", and then we have India is "under	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further information. The other thing that I wanted to say is: the question of the travaux préparatoires, this is a very old debate. I remember the first time I was in the Sixth Committee, there was a debate as to what constitutes travaux préparatoires, and there was a statement by the late Shabtai Rosenne that I still remember. So I don't think we can really settle it here. Anyway, the Neutral Expert thought that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of the I can find the slides but some of the slides I set out today, which is essentially the movement in the language as between the 1959 heads of agreement to the final terms of the Treaty, and the recognition during that evolution in the language of India of the way that the terms are couched. So initially I think we have a description of the waters being "available for the use", and then we have India "shall make the waters available", and then we have India is "under an obligation to". So there is that evolution, which,	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further information. The other thing that I wanted to say is: the question of the travaux préparatoires, this is a very old debate. I remember the first time I was in the Sixth Committee, there was a debate as to what constitutes travaux préparatoires, and there was a statement by the late Shabtai Rosenne that I still remember. So I don't think we can really settle it here. Anyway, the Neutral Expert thought that everything was clear and there was no need for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of the I can find the slides but some of the slides I set out today, which is essentially the movement in the language as between the 1959 heads of agreement to the final terms of the Treaty, and the recognition during that evolution in the language of India of the way that the terms are couched. So initially I think we have a description of the waters being "available for the use", and then we have India is "under an obligation to". So there is that evolution, which, over time, incrementally fortifies, we say, the let-flow	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further information. The other thing that I wanted to say is: the question of the travaux préparatoires, this is a very old debate. I remember the first time I was in the Sixth Committee, there was a debate as to what constitutes travaux préparatoires, and there was a statement by the late Shabtai Rosenne that I still remember. So I don't think we can really settle it here. Anyway, the Neutral Expert thought that everything was clear and there was no need for supplementary means of interpretation.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of the I can find the slides but some of the slides I set out today, which is essentially the movement in the language as between the 1959 heads of agreement to the final terms of the Treaty, and the recognition during that evolution in the language of India of the way that the terms are couched. So initially I think we have a description of the waters being "available for the use", and then we have India "shall make the waters available", and then we have India is "under an obligation to". So there is that evolution, which, over time, incrementally fortifies, we say, the let-flow obligation.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further information. The other thing that I wanted to say is: the question of the travaux préparatoires, this is a very old debate. I remember the first time I was in the Sixth Committee, there was a debate as to what constitutes travaux préparatoires, and there was a statement by the late Shabtai Rosenne that I still remember. So I don't think we can really settle it here. Anyway, the Neutral Expert thought that everything was clear and there was no need for supplementary means of interpretation. So this is what I thought. But I don't have a very
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of the language as between the 1959 heads of agreement to the final terms of the Treaty, and the recognition during that evolution in the language of India of the way that the terms are couched. So initially I think we have a description of the waters being "available for the use", and then we have India is "under an obligation to". So there is that evolution, which, over time, incrementally fortifies, we say, the let-flow obligation. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further information. The other thing that I wanted to say is: the question of the travaux préparatoires, this is a very old debate. I remember the first time I was in the Sixth Committee, there was a debate as to what constitutes travaux préparatoires, and there was a statement by the late Shabtai Rosenne that I still remember. So I don't think we can really settle it here. Anyway, the Neutral Expert thought that everything was clear and there was no need for supplementary means of interpretation.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	So I just advance all of that to invite you to tell me where perhaps that recounting of what happened in the negotiating history may not be entirely correct. MS REES-EVANS: I think just in a sort of brief answer to that but I think it would be useful for us to go away and look at some of the documents you specifically referred to and come back maybe with a longer answer with more time. But just as a sort of high-level response to that. I suppose the fortification, as we say, of the let-flow obligation is as I set out, I think, in some of the I can find the slides but some of the slides I set out today, which is essentially the movement in the language as between the 1959 heads of agreement to the final terms of the Treaty, and the recognition during that evolution in the language of India of the way that the terms are couched. So initially I think we have a description of the waters being "available for the use", and then we have India "shall make the waters available", and then we have India is "under an obligation to". So there is that evolution, which, over time, incrementally fortifies, we say, the let-flow obligation.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	a whole. THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh. JUDGE AL-KHASAWNEH: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I don't really see the "let flow" expression as anything more than a shorthand for a principle that had already existed. And we can probably trace the beginning to one of the earlier drafts, where there was talk of allowing historic withdrawals to continue, for example. So it's not a new principle; it's just one way of expressing the thing. That's how I look at it. Of course I would be very happy to look at further information. The other thing that I wanted to say is: the question of the travaux préparatoires, this is a very old debate. I remember the first time I was in the Sixth Committee, there was a debate as to what constitutes travaux préparatoires, and there was a statement by the late Shabtai Rosenne that I still remember. So I don't think we can really settle it here. Anyway, the Neutral Expert thought that everything was clear and there was no need for supplementary means of interpretation. So this is what I thought. But I don't have a very

Jay 2 11	icaring on the Merns, I list I hase		Tuesday, 7 July 202
11.10.1		11.40.1	
11:18 1	and to look at any further information. Thank you.	11:49 1	This was provided for and cited in paragraph 29 of
2	THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Al-Khasawneh just prompts one further	2	Annexure G of the Treaty. I'm going to come back to
3	question and I think we'll let you go.	3	this in detail.
4	Is it the case that from the outset of the	4	(Slide 3) So I will proceed in four parts. I'm
5	negotiations on through to the end, there was	5	going to set out the key principles, engage with the
6	an acceptance on both sides that historical use should	6	issued raised in the discussion so far, and lay the
7	be preserved; that is, that there were uses by India	7	groundwork for Pakistan's analysis of the Treaty in the
8	upstream for certain purposes, Pakistan downstream for	8	coming days.
9	certain purposes I'm talking of the Western Rivers	9	So first I'm going to look at what's called the
10	and that these should be preserved as we move along in	10	"general rule" of treaty interpretation, Article 31.
11	the negotiations? Is that correct?	11	And I'm going to develop some of the points that
12	MS REES-EVANS: I think that's right. I think it's referred	12	Sir Daniel has highlighted: the special meaning given to
13	to as "existing uses" in both cases, the term "existing	13	terms, the principle that an exception to a rule is to
14	uses" is used. Certainly that was one of Pakistan's	14	be interpreted restrictively, and I will address the
15	concerns about the 1954 proposal, whether existing uses	15	issue of subsequent agreements and practice.
16	were in fact protected by that proposal. But	16	Second, I'll look at supplementary means under
17	I believe and we will double-check that but	17	Article 32 of the Vienna Convention, building on what
18	I believe that that was a concept that applied equally	18	Ms Rees-Evans has set out on the travaux préparatoires.
19	to both sides.	19	Third, I will come to paragraph 29 of Annexure G,
20	THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Well, thank you very much,	20	and I will show that recourse by the Court to relevant
21	Ms Rees-Evans. That was very helpful.	21	rules of international law is possible, but only when
22	So I think we will now take our coffee break, and	22	necessary for the interpretation or application of the
23	why don't we plan to come back at 11.45.	23	Treaty. And in this context I will address, among other
24	MS REES-EVANS: Thank you.	24	things, the question of climate change and the Treaty.
25	(11.19 am)	25	Fourth, I will look at the interpretation of peace
	D 72		· ·
	Page 73		Page 75
11:19 1	(A short break)	11:50 1	and boundary treaties. And in response to the
11:19 1 2		11:50 1 2	and boundary treaties. And in response to the discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by
	(11.48 am)		
2	(11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours.	2	discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by
2 3	(11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours.	2 3	discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from
2 3 4	(11.48 am)THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty InterpretationPROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my	2 3 4	discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international
2 3 4 5	(11.48 am)THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty InterpretationPROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you.	2 3 4 5	discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set
2 3 4 5 6	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to 	2 3 4 5 6	discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in
2 3 4 5 6 7	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be 	2 3 4 5 6 7	discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this will be very familiar, almost instinctual; but for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going through it in sequence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this will be very familiar, almost instinctual; but for others it is relevant because these are well-established 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going through it in sequence. (Slide 5) I'm going to be spending most of my time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this will be very familiar, almost instinctual; but for others it is relevant because these are well-established rules and they differ from the interpretation of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going through it in sequence. (Slide 5) I'm going to be spending most of my time on that first paragraph, Article 31(1). And it has four
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this will be very familiar, almost instinctual; but for others it is relevant because these are well-established rules and they differ from the interpretation of domestic law or contracts. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going through it in sequence. (Slide 5) I'm going to be spending most of my time on that first paragraph, Article 31(1). And it has four elements: ordinary meaning, context, object and purpose,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this will be very familiar, almost instinctual; but for others it is relevant because these are well-established rules and they differ from the interpretation of domestic law or contracts. I'm also going to address questions that arose 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going through it in sequence. (Slide 5) I'm going to be spending most of my time on that first paragraph, Article 31(1). And it has four elements: ordinary meaning, context, object and purpose, and good faith. The Vienna Convention does not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this will be very familiar, almost instinctual; but for others it is relevant because these are well-established rules and they differ from the interpretation of domestic law or contracts. I'm also going to address questions that arose yesterday and this morning, in the course of where they 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going through it in sequence. (Slide 5) I'm going to be spending most of my time on that first paragraph, Article 31(1). And it has four elements: ordinary meaning, context, object and purpose, and good faith. The Vienna Convention does not establish an order of priority among these criteria, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this will be very familiar, almost instinctual; but for others it is relevant because these are well-established rules and they differ from the interpretation of domestic law or contracts. I'm also going to address questions that arose yesterday and this morning, in the course of where they arise during my presentation. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going through it in sequence. (Slide 5) I'm going to be spending most of my time on that first paragraph, Article 31(1). And it has four elements: ordinary meaning, context, object and purpose, and good faith. The Vienna Convention does not establish an order of priority among these criteria, and the consistent case law has been that they are to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this will be very familiar, almost instinctual; but for others it is relevant because these are well-established rules and they differ from the interpretation of domestic law or contracts. I'm also going to address questions that arose yesterday and this morning, in the course of where they arise during my presentation. (Slide 2) The starting point is the Indus Waters 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going through it in sequence. (Slide 5) I'm going to be spending most of my time on that first paragraph, Article 31(1). And it has four elements: ordinary meaning, context, object and purpose, and good faith. The Vienna Convention does not establish an order of priority among these criteria, and the consistent case law has been that they are to be considered as a whole.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this will be very familiar, almost instinctual; but for others it is relevant because these are well-established rules and they differ from the interpretation of domestic law or contracts. I'm also going to address questions that arose yesterday and this morning, in the course of where they arise during my presentation. (Slide 2) The starting point is the Indus Waters Treaty itself. As the Court observed in its Competence 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going through it in sequence. (Slide 5) I'm going to be spending most of my time on that first paragraph, Article 31(1). And it has four elements: ordinary meaning, context, object and purpose, and good faith. The Vienna Convention does not establish an order of priority among these criteria, and the consistent case law has been that they are to be considered as a whole. (Slide 6) So turning first to "ordinary meaning",
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this will be very familiar, almost instinctual; but for others it is relevant because these are well-established rules and they differ from the interpretation of domestic law or contracts. I'm also going to address questions that arose yesterday and this morning, in the course of where they arise during my presentation. (Slide 2) The starting point is the Indus Waters Treaty itself. As the Court observed in its Competence Award, the primary source for this Court to interpret 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going through it in sequence. (Slide 5) I'm going to be spending most of my time on that first paragraph, Article 31(1). And it has four elements: ordinary meaning, context, object and purpose, and good faith. The Vienna Convention does not establish an order of priority among these criteria, and the consistent case law has been that they are to be considered as a whole. (Slide 6) So turning first to "ordinary meaning", Article 31(1) provides that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this will be very familiar, almost instinctual; but for others it is relevant because these are well-established rules and they differ from the interpretation of domestic law or contracts. I'm also going to address questions that arose yesterday and this morning, in the course of where they arise during my presentation. (Slide 2) The starting point is the Indus Waters Treaty itself. As the Court observed in its Competence Award, the primary source for this Court to interpret and apply is the Treaty. Whenever necessary for the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going through it in sequence. (Slide 5) I'm going to be spending most of my time on that first paragraph, Article 31(1). And it has four elements: ordinary meaning, context, object and purpose, and good faith. The Vienna Convention does not establish an order of priority among these criteria, and the consistent case law has been that they are to be considered as a whole. (Slide 6) So turning first to "ordinary meaning", Article 31(1) provides that: "A treaty shall be interpreted in accordance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this will be very familiar, almost instinctual; but for others it is relevant because these are well-established rules and they differ from the interpretation of domestic law or contracts. I'm also going to address questions that arose yesterday and this morning, in the course of where they arise during my presentation. (Slide 2) The starting point is the Indus Waters Treaty itself. As the Court observed in its Competence Award, the primary source for this Court to interpret and apply is the Treaty. Whenever necessary for the Treaty's interpretation and application, however, the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going through it in sequence. (Slide 5) I'm going to be spending most of my time on that first paragraph, Article 31(1). And it has four elements: ordinary meaning, context, object and purpose, and good faith. The Vienna Convention does not establish an order of priority among these criteria, and the consistent case law has been that they are to be considered as a whole. (Slide 6) So turning first to "ordinary meaning", Article 31(1) provides that: "A treaty shall be interpreted in accordance with the ordinary meaning to be given to the terms"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this will be very familiar, almost instinctual; but for others it is relevant because these are well-established rules and they differ from the interpretation of domestic law or contracts. I'm also going to address questions that arose yesterday and this morning, in the course of where they arise during my presentation. (Slide 2) The starting point is the Indus Waters Treaty itself. As the Court observed in its Competence Award, the primary source for this Court to interpret and apply is the Treaty. Whenever necessary for the Treaty's interpretation and application, however, the Court may apply international conventions and customary 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going through it in sequence. (Slide 5) I'm going to be spending most of my time on that first paragraph, Article 31(1). And it has four elements: ordinary meaning, context, object and purpose, and good faith. The Vienna Convention does not establish an order of priority among these criteria, and the consistent case law has been that they are to be considered as a whole. (Slide 6) So turning first to "ordinary meaning", Article 31(1) provides that: "A treaty shall be interpreted in accordance with the ordinary meaning to be given to the terms"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 (11.48 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, the floor is yours. Submissions on Principles of Treaty Interpretation PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you very much. And if my presentation could be shown. Thank you. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, it's an honour to appear before you on behalf of Pakistan. I will be addressing you three times during this first round, and today I will covering the principles of treaty interpretation. For some members of the Court, this will be very familiar, almost instinctual; but for others it is relevant because these are well-established rules and they differ from the interpretation of domestic law or contracts. I'm also going to address questions that arose yesterday and this morning, in the course of where they arise during my presentation. (Slide 2) The starting point is the Indus Waters Treaty itself. As the Court observed in its Competence Award, the primary source for this Court to interpret and apply is the Treaty. Whenever necessary for the Treaty's interpretation and application, however, the Court may apply international conventions and customary 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 discussion yesterday, I will develop the points made by Sir Daniel, and distinguish the Indus Waters Treaty from treaties that have been determined by international courts to be living instruments. And I will also set out how these arguments were addressed and dealt with in the Baglihar and Kishenganga proceedings. (Slide 4) So turning first to the general rule. This is laid out in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention. I'm not going to read out the text, but I will be going through it in sequence. (Slide 5) I'm going to be spending most of my time on that first paragraph, Article 31(1). And it has four elements: ordinary meaning, context, object and purpose, and good faith. The Vienna Convention does not establish an order of priority among these criteria, and the consistent case law has been that they are to be considered as a whole. (Slide 6) So turning first to "ordinary meaning", Article 31(1) provides that: "A treaty shall be interpreted in accordance with the ordinary meaning to be given to the terms" The ICJ has dealt with this a number of times recently in the preliminary objections judgment in

11:52 1	based, above all, upon the text of the treaty.	11:55 1	Vienna Convention in paragraph 4.
2	The Kishenganga Court followed this approach by	2	At the time the Treaty was negotiated and we've
3	commencing its interpretation of paragraph 15(iii) of	3	heard about the sequence in the previous presentation
4	Annexure D with the statement (PLA-3, paragraph 402):		the drafters of the Treaty, and in particular the expert
		4	
5	" the text of Paragraph 15, and specifically with	5	engineers on both sides and for the World Bank, were
6	the ordinary meaning of the terms there used."	6	well aware of contemporary usage of the terms that they
7	(Slide 7) There's an important temporal point to	7	were including in the text, including the contemporary
8	highlight here: the "ordinary meaning" is generally the	8	publication, for example, of Creager & Justin in 1950.
9	meaning attributed to the terms at the time the Treaty	9	Yet, as Sir Daniel mentioned and as Pakistan's
10	is concluded. This is the principle of contemporaneity.	10	Memorial sets out, some of the Treaty's terms depart
11	Sir Gerald Fitzmaurice, who was a special rapporteur for	11	from their conventional contemporaneous usage and they
12	the ILC's work on treaties, defined that principle as	12	have a distinct and unique meaning. We will be
13	follows (PLA-63):	13	addressing these in context when we go through the
14	"The terms of a treaty must be interpreted according	14	paragraph 8 criteria. But I just wanted to give
15	to the meaning which they possessed, or which would have	15	an example, and it goes to a question that Mr Minear
16	been attributed to them, and in the light of current	16	asked before the break.
17	linguistic usage, at the time when the treaty was	17	(Slide 10) So this is the meaning of "Firm Power".
18	originally concluded."	18	And here I'm talking about it in the context of
19	(Slide 8) The International Law Commission said this	19	Annexure D, where the ordinary meaning would be: power
20	requirement is one of both common sense and good faith.	20	calculated by reference to demand, plotted on a load
21	And the principle has been confirmed by the ICJ and	21	curve; power intended to have assured availability to
22	other international courts and tribunals, and I will	22	the customer to meet their agreed needs and
22	just illustrate this with two examples.	23	requirements.
23	The first is the case of the Rights of Nationals of	23	However, the Treaty defines it with a special
24	the United States of America in Morocco, a dispute	24	meaning, in paragraph 2(i) of Annexure D, as:
23	the Onned States of America in Morocco, a dispute	23	meaning, in paragraph 2(1) of Annexure D, as.
	Page 77		Page 79
11:53 1	between France and the United States. And the word	11:56 1	" the hydro-electric power corresponding to the
11:53 1 2	between France and the United States. And the word there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that	11:56 1 2	" the hydro-electric power corresponding to the minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant"
2	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that	2	minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant"
2 3	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And	2 3	minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the
2 3 4	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189):	2 3 4	minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river.
2 3 4 5	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two	2 3 4 5	minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm
2 3 4 5 6	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded."	2 3 4 5 6 7	minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant"So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river.Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it was used in a treaty of 1881, with an 1893 protocol	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in that provision.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it was used in a treaty of 1881, with an 1893 protocol concerning the boundary dispute between them. As you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in that provision. MR MINEAR: Professor, sorry to interrupt you so early in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it was used in a treaty of 1881, with an 1893 protocol concerning the boundary dispute between them. As you can see, the tribunal concluded (PLA-67, paragraph 130)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in that provision. MR MINEAR: Professor, sorry to interrupt you so early in your presentation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it was used in a treaty of 1881, with an 1893 protocol concerning the boundary dispute between them. As you can see, the tribunal concluded (PLA-67, paragraph 130) that:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in that provision. MR MINEAR: Professor, sorry to interrupt you so early in your presentation. PROFESSOR WEBB: Not at all.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it was used in a treaty of 1881, with an 1893 protocol concerning the boundary dispute between them. As you can see, the tribunal concluded (PLA-67, paragraph 130) that: " the concept of 'water-parting' is not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in that provision. MR MINEAR: Professor, sorry to interrupt you so early in your presentation. PROFESSOR WEBB: Not at all. MR MINEAR: I do have a question though that goes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it was used in a treaty of 1881, with an 1893 protocol concerning the boundary dispute between them. As you can see, the tribunal concluded (PLA-67, paragraph 130) that: " the concept of 'water-parting' is not susceptible of subsequent change through usage, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in that provision. MR MINEAR: Professor, sorry to interrupt you so early in your presentation. PROFESSOR WEBB: Not at all. MR MINEAR: I do have a question though that goes specifically to this question of special meanings. My
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it was used in a treaty of 1881, with an 1893 protocol concerning the boundary dispute between them. As you can see, the tribunal concluded (PLA-67, paragraph 130) that: " the concept of 'water-parting' is not susceptible of subsequent change through usage, evolution of the language, or acts or decisions of one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in that provision. MR MINEAR: Professor, sorry to interrupt you so early in your presentation. PROFESSOR WEBB: Not at all. MR MINEAR: I do have a question though that goes specifically to this question of special meanings. My question is whether there is an analogue to a domestic
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	 there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it was used in a treaty of 1881, with an 1893 protocol concerning the boundary dispute between them. As you can see, the tribunal concluded (PLA-67, paragraph 130) that: " the concept of 'water-parting' is not susceptible of subsequent change through usage, evolution of the language, or acts or decisions of one of the Parties to the dispute." 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in that provision. MR MINEAR: Professor, sorry to interrupt you so early in your presentation. PROFESSOR WEBB: Not at all. MR MINEAR: I do have a question though that goes specifically to this question of special meanings. My question is whether there is an analogue to a domestic rule that's followed in the interpretation of statutes
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it was used in a treaty of 1881, with an 1893 protocol concerning the boundary dispute between them. As you can see, the tribunal concluded (PLA-67, paragraph 130) that: " the concept of 'water-parting' is not susceptible of subsequent change through usage, evolution of the language, or acts or decisions of one of the Parties to the dispute." (Slide 9) So the terms of the Indus Waters Treaty 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in that provision. MR MINEAR: Professor, sorry to interrupt you so early in your presentation. PROFESSOR WEBB: Not at all. MR MINEAR: I do have a question though that goes specifically to this question of special meanings. My question is whether there is an analogue to a domestic rule that's followed in the interpretation of statutes in the United States, and that is I'll quote the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it was used in a treaty of 1881, with an 1893 protocol concerning the boundary dispute between them. As you can see, the tribunal concluded (PLA-67, paragraph 130) that: " the concept of 'water-parting' is not susceptible of subsequent change through usage, evolution of the language, or acts or decisions of one of the Parties to the dispute." (Slide 9) So the terms of the Indus Waters Treaty must be given their ordinary and natural meaning, 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in that provision. MR MINEAR: Professor, sorry to interrupt you so early in your presentation. PROFESSOR WEBB: Not at all. MR MINEAR: I do have a question though that goes specifically to this question of special meanings. My question is whether there is an analogue to a domestic rule that's followed in the interpretation of statutes in the United States, and that is I'll quote the statement:
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it was used in a treaty of 1881, with an 1893 protocol concerning the boundary dispute between them. As you can see, the tribunal concluded (PLA-67, paragraph 130) that: " the concept of 'water-parting' is not susceptible of subsequent change through usage, evolution of the language, or acts or decisions of one of the Parties to the dispute." (Slide 9) So the terms of the Indus Waters Treaty must be given their ordinary and natural meaning, understood at the time of the conclusion of the Treaty. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in that provision. MR MINEAR: Professor, sorry to interrupt you so early in your presentation. PROFESSOR WEBB: Not at all. MR MINEAR: I do have a question though that goes specifically to this question of special meanings. My question is whether there is an analogue to a domestic rule that's followed in the interpretation of statutes in the United States, and that is I'll quote the statement:
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it was used in a treaty of 1881, with an 1893 protocol concerning the boundary dispute between them. As you can see, the tribunal concluded (PLA-67, paragraph 130) that: " the concept of 'water-parting' is not susceptible of subsequent change through usage, evolution of the language, or acts or decisions of one of the Parties to the dispute." (Slide 9) So the terms of the Indus Waters Treaty must be given their ordinary and natural meaning, understood at the time of the conclusion of the Treaty. The exception to that is if a special meaning is 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in that provision. MR MINEAR: Professor, sorry to interrupt you so early in your presentation. PROFESSOR WEBB: Not at all. MR MINEAR: I do have a question though that goes specifically to this question of special meanings. My question is whether there is an analogue to a domestic rule that's followed in the interpretation of statutes in the United States, and that is I'll quote the statement: "In settling on a fair reading of a statute, it is not unusual to consider the ordinary meaning of
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it was used in a treaty of 1881, with an 1893 protocol concerning the boundary dispute between them. As you can see, the tribunal concluded (PLA-67, paragraph 130) that: " the concept of 'water-parting' is not susceptible of subsequent change through usage, evolution of the language, or acts or decisions of one of the Parties to the dispute." (Slide 9) So the terms of the Indus Waters Treaty must be given their ordinary and natural meaning, understood at the time of the conclusion of the Treaty. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in that provision. MR MINEAR: Professor, sorry to interrupt you so early in your presentation. PROFESSOR WEBB: Not at all. MR MINEAR: I do have a question though that goes specifically to this question of special meanings. My question is whether there is an analogue to a domestic rule that's followed in the interpretation of statutes in the United States, and that is I'll quote the statement:
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 there that was being interpreted was "dispute", that appeared in treaties concluded in 1787 and 1836. And the court said (PLA-64, page 189): "It [was] necessary to take into account the meaning of the word 'dispute' at [those] times when the two treaties [were] concluded." And the result of that is that they found that "dispute" covered both civil and criminal proceedings. The second case is an arbitration between Argentina and Chile concerning the frontier line at a certain point. And here the word was "water-parting", and it was used in a treaty of 1881, with an 1893 protocol concerning the boundary dispute between them. As you can see, the tribunal concluded (PLA-67, paragraph 130) that: " the concept of 'water-parting' is not susceptible of subsequent change through usage, evolution of the language, or acts or decisions of one of the Parties to the dispute." (Slide 9) So the terms of the Indus Waters Treaty must be given their ordinary and natural meaning, understood at the time of the conclusion of the Treaty. The exception to that is if a special meaning is 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 minimum mean discharge at the site of a plant" So it is calculated by reference to the flow of the river. Now, Mr Minear asked whether the reference to "firm power" in paragraph 21(a) of Annexure E has the same meaning. And we say that it does not, and that is in a very lawyerly way: because it doesn't have capital letters. It is clear from that provision in 21(a) that "Pondage" is intended to have the special meaning: it is capitalised, it is cross-referenced to Annexure D. But "firm power" is used in the ordinary meaning, we say, in that provision. MR MINEAR: Professor, sorry to interrupt you so early in your presentation. PROFESSOR WEBB: Not at all. MR MINEAR: I do have a question though that goes specifically to this question of special meanings. My question is whether there is an analogue to a domestic rule that's followed in the interpretation of statutes in the United States, and that is I'll quote the statement: "In settling on a fair reading of a statute, it is not unusual to consider the ordinary meaning of

11:58 1	between that ordinary meaning and the reach of the	12:00 1	MR MINEAR: Thank you.
2	definition."	2	THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Webb, before we let you continue,
3	This comes from a case called Bond v United States,	3	you've set up this idea that Article 31 of the Vienna
4	which was interpreting a statute that implemented the	4	Convention, in paragraph 1, when it speaks of "ordinary
5	Chemical Weapons Convention. And the point that was	5	meaning", is essentially speaking of a static
6	made in this case was: "chemical weapons" had	6	interpretation of terms. Of course, Article 31,
7	a meaning the Treaty meaning and the statutory	7	paragraph 1 itself doesn't say that. And it does seem
8	meaning was very, very broad, but it could be read more	8	to be the case that separate from Article 31,
9	restrictively based on the general sense of "chemical	9	paragraph 4, there is the possibility of an evolutive
10	weapons".	10	interpretation of terms within a treaty, and there are
11	The same principle was applied in another case	11	cases, of course, that would support that: the Aegean
12	called Sackett v EPA, and in that case the term	12	Sea case, the Navigational Rights case and so on.
13	"navigable waters" was defined as "waters of the United	13	So I'm wondering if you accept that there is not
14	States".	14	necessarily a static approach in Article 31,
15	PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes.	15	paragraph 1; and if so, whether your argument is going
16	MR MINEAR: And the question was: does "navigability" still	16	to be that a treaty as a whole is either static or
17	provide some insight into that definition?	17	evolutive, or whether you would accept that terms within
18	Now, in both of those cases, the ordinary meaning	18	any given treaty might be viewed as having been intended
19	was used to restrict what was a very broad defined	19	to have either a static or an evolutive interpretation.
20	meaning.	20	PROFESSOR WEBB: I'm going to be coming to those exact cases
21	PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes.	21	in the fourth part of my presentation. So I'll answer
22	MR MINEAR: My question is simply this: is there a similar	22	now, but I will come back to more detail on why the
23	principle in international treaty interpretation? This	23	treaties in those cases can be distinguished.
24	might be something peculiar to the United States law,	24	But in answer to your question now, it is true that
25	and I just wonder if this is present in treaty	25	"ordinary meaning" as defined in paragraph 1 is not
	2		D 00
	Page 81		Page 83
11:59 1	interpretation, in your experience.	12:02 1	a static meaning. But the starting point, going back to
	interpretation, in your experience. PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain	12:02 1 2	a static meaning. But the starting point, going back to Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that
11:59 1 2 3	PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain	12:02 1 2 3	Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that
2	PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined	2	
2 3	PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain	2 3	Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the
2 3 4	PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly	2 3 4	Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of
2 3 4 5	PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation	2 3 4 5 6	Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the
2 3 4 5 6	PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now.But I think the two cases that you cite, and the	2 3 4 5	Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the
2 3 4 5 6 7	PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in terms of the holistic analysis that I mentioned at the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention. And then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in terms of the holistic analysis that I mentioned at the beginning. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in terms of the holistic analysis that I mentioned at the beginning. So it sounds like and not being familiar with the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention. And then THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if I could just respond on that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in terms of the holistic analysis that I mentioned at the beginning. So it sounds like and not being familiar with the cases, but from your summary of them it sounds like 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention. And then THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if I could just respond on that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: Fitzmaurice was not the final rapporteur in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in terms of the holistic analysis that I mentioned at the beginning. So it sounds like and not being familiar with the cases, but from your summary of them it sounds like the principle of effectiveness played a role there, that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention. And then THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if I could just respond on that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: Fitzmaurice was not the final rapporteur in the project and it's a question as to whether his views
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in terms of the holistic analysis that I mentioned at the beginning. So it sounds like and not being familiar with the cases, but from your summary of them it sounds like the principle of effectiveness played a role there, that that narrowed the meaning, or perhaps the context or the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention. And then THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if I could just respond on that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: Fitzmaurice was not the final rapporteur in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in terms of the holistic analysis that I mentioned at the beginning. So it sounds like and not being familiar with the cases, but from your summary of them it sounds like the principle of effectiveness played a role there, that that narrowed the meaning, or perhaps the context or the object and purpose, all of which are familiar concepts 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention. And then THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if I could just respond on that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: Fitzmaurice was not the final rapporteur in the project and it's a question as to whether his views worked their way into what became the Vienna Convention, including the ILC's commentary. So it may be worth
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in terms of the holistic analysis that I mentioned at the beginning. So it sounds like and not being familiar with the cases, but from your summary of them it sounds like the principle of effectiveness played a role there, that that narrowed the meaning, or perhaps the context or the object and purpose, all of which are familiar concepts in international law and could have led to a similar 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention. And then THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if I could just respond on that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: Fitzmaurice was not the final rapporteur in the project and it's a question as to whether his views worked their way into what became the Vienna Convention,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in terms of the holistic analysis that I mentioned at the beginning. So it sounds like and not being familiar with the cases, but from your summary of them it sounds like the principle of effectiveness played a role there, that that narrowed the meaning, or perhaps the context or the object and purpose, all of which are familiar concepts in international law and could have led to a similar 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention. And then THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if I could just respond on that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: Fitzmaurice was not the final rapporteur in the project and it's a question as to whether his views worked their way into what became the Vienna Convention, including the ILC's commentary. So it may be worth looking at that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in terms of the holistic analysis that I mentioned at the beginning. So it sounds like and not being familiar with the cases, but from your summary of them it sounds like the principle of effectiveness played a role there, that that narrowed the meaning, or perhaps the context or the object and purpose, all of which are familiar concepts in international law and could have led to a similar outcome, but not just through this contrast between ordinary and special meaning. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	 Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention. And then THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if I could just respond on that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: Fitzmaurice was not the final rapporteur in the project and it's a question as to whether his views worked their way into what became the Vienna Convention, including the ILC's commentary. So it may be worth looking at that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But the reason why I did raise this now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in terms of the holistic analysis that I mentioned at the beginning. So it sounds like and not being familiar with the cases, but from your summary of them it sounds like the principle of effectiveness played a role there, that that narrowed the meaning, or perhaps the context or the object and purpose, all of which are familiar concepts in international law and could have led to a similar outcome, but not just through this contrast between ordinary and special meaning. MR MINEAR: Thank you. I just want to make sure I'm not 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention. And then THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if I could just respond on that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: Fitzmaurice was not the final rapporteur in the project and it's a question as to whether his views worked their way into what became the Vienna Convention, including the ILC's commentary. So it may be worth looking at that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But the reason why I did raise this now I realise you're going to, in your final part of your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in terms of the holistic analysis that I mentioned at the beginning. So it sounds like and not being familiar with the cases, but from your summary of them it sounds like the principle of effectiveness played a role there, that that narrowed the meaning, or perhaps the context or the object and purpose, all of which are familiar concepts in international law and could have led to a similar outcome, but not just through this contrast between ordinary and special meaning. MR MINEAR: Thank you. I just want to make sure I'm not importing principles that I'm familiar with into the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention. And then THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if I could just respond on that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: Fitzmaurice was not the final rapporteur in the project and it's a question as to whether his views worked their way into what became the Vienna Convention, including the ILC's commentary. So it may be worth looking at that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But the reason why I did raise this now I realise you're going to, in your final part of your presentation, address this. But it seemed to me that in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in terms of the holistic analysis that I mentioned at the beginning. So it sounds like and not being familiar with the cases, but from your summary of them it sounds like the principle of effectiveness played a role there, that that narrowed the meaning, or perhaps the context or the object and purpose, all of which are familiar concepts in international law and could have led to a similar outcome, but not just through this contrast between ordinary and special meaning. MR MINEAR: Thank you. I just want to make sure I'm not importing principles that I'm familiar with into the international context. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention. And then THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if I could just respond on that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: Fitzmaurice was not the final rapporteur in the project and it's a question as to whether his views worked their way into what became the Vienna Convention, including the ILC's commentary. So it may be worth looking at that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But the reason why I did raise this now I realise you're going to, in your final part of your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 PROFESSOR WEBB: So the particular way in which we explain that the ordinary meaning has restricted the defined meaning is not a core principle of treaty interpretation in international law, and I would say it would be fairly unusual. I can't think of examples now. But I think the two cases that you cite, and the process that's gone through, we do see a broad analogue with the process of treaty interpretation under the Vienna Convention, but not restricted to ordinary meaning and special meaning, that binary choice, but in terms of the holistic analysis that I mentioned at the beginning. So it sounds like and not being familiar with the cases, but from your summary of them it sounds like the principle of effectiveness played a role there, that that narrowed the meaning, or perhaps the context or the object and purpose, all of which are familiar concepts in international law and could have led to a similar outcome, but not just through this contrast between ordinary and special meaning. MR MINEAR: Thank you. I just want to make sure I'm not importing principles that I'm familiar with into the international context. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 Fitzmaurice and the drafting of this treaty, is that "ordinary meaning" is associated with its meaning at the time. Now, that may be displaced by other factors of treaty interpretation, object and purpose, or the express intention of the drafters as expressed in the treaty, the character of the treaty itself: that can displace that starting point. But what I'm saying is that that is the starting point based on the drafting of the Vienna Convention. And then THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if I could just respond on that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: Fitzmaurice was not the final rapporteur in the project and it's a question as to whether his views worked their way into what became the Vienna Convention, including the ILC's commentary. So it may be worth looking at that. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: But the reason why I did raise this now I realise you're going to, in your final part of your presentation, address this. But it seemed to me that in the Memorial, there was this approach to static

		r	
12:03 1	point in time, let's acknowledge that there's evolutive,	12:06 1	interpretation. The first is the role as an "immediate
2	but that's to be limited to very specific kinds of	2	qualifier" of the ordinary meaning of the terms used in
3	treaties.	3	the Treaty. The Kishenganga Court used this type of
4	PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes.	4	context in interpreting paragraph 15 of Annexure D, and
5	THE CHAIRMAN: I think Sir Daniel yesterday referred to the	5	it observed (PLA-3, paragraph 407) that:
6	living instrument-type treaty.	6	"A review of the context of Paragraph 15 makes clear
7	I'm just curious whether you would accept that it is	7	that the provision is placed within a continuum of
8	a part of a possibility of an Article 31, paragraph 1	8	design, construction and operation that cannot properly
9		8 9	be separated into watertight compartments."
10		10	And given that context, the Court went on to say
11		11	(PLA-3, paragraph 409) that:
12	5 1	12	" the various paragraphs contained in
13		13	Annexure D must be interpreted in a mutually reinforcing
14		14	manner"
15		15	(Slide 12) I'm not going to read it out, but I'm
16		16	just going to bring to your attention the paragraph of
17	6 6	17	the partial award (PLA-3, paragraph 407) where the Court
18	• •	18	applied that contextual interpretation, and also brought
19		19	in this idea of not "render[ing] ineffective" certain
20	5	20	provisions.
21		21	So that's the first aspect: an immediate qualifier.
22		22	(Slide 13) The second aspect is looking at the
23	1 I	23	structure of the treaty as its context, so looking at
24	1	24	the preamble and the annexes and any agreements
25	Treaty that perhaps are more generic in nature "sound	25	concluded in connection with the conclusion of the
	Page 85		Page 87
			6
12:04 1	and economical design" or "customary practice", whatever	12:07 1	treaty. And the Kishenganga Court also looked at that
2	the term is	2	second type of context in its Treaty interpretation,
	the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice".	2 3	second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion
2 3 4	the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as	2 3 4	second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the
2 3	the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not?	2 3 4 5	second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole.
2 3 4 5 6	the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that.	2 3 4 5 6	second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if
2 3 4 5 6 7	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and 	2 3 4 5 6 7	second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is a completely generic term in the way that "commerce" was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to tomorrow are crucial to the identification of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is a completely generic term in the way that "commerce" was in Navigational Rights, because it is still impacted by 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to tomorrow are crucial to the identification of the object and purpose.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is a completely generic term in the way that "commerce" was in Navigational Rights, because it is still impacted by paragraph 29(g), by the object and purpose of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to tomorrow are crucial to the identification of the object and purpose. So the reference to "object and purpose" has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is a completely generic term in the way that "commerce" was in Navigational Rights, because it is still impacted by paragraph 29(g), by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the travaux préparatoires, by the three 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to tomorrow are crucial to the identification of the object and purpose. So the reference to "object and purpose" has two related implications. First, it brings into the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is a completely generic term in the way that "commerce" was in Navigational Rights, because it is still impacted by paragraph 29(g), by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the travaux préparatoires, by the three bargains underpinning the Treaty, and all of that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to tomorrow are crucial to the identification of the object and purpose. So the reference to "object and purpose" has two related implications. First, it brings into the interpretation process the principle of effectiveness
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is a completely generic term in the way that "commerce" was in Navigational Rights, because it is still impacted by paragraph 29(g), by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the travaux préparatoires, by the three bargains underpinning the Treaty, and all of that restricts what you can do in terms of defining what 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to tomorrow are crucial to the identification of the object and purpose. So the reference to "object and purpose" has two related implications. First, it brings into the interpretation process the principle of effectiveness that I already mentioned in response to Mr Minear. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is a completely generic term in the way that "commerce" was in Navigational Rights, because it is still impacted by paragraph 29(g), by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the travaux préparatoires, by the three bargains underpinning the Treaty, and all of that restricts what you can do in terms of defining what "commerce" in 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to tomorrow are crucial to the identification of the object and purpose. So the reference to "object and purpose" has two related implications. First, it brings into the interpretation process the principle of effectiveness that I already mentioned in response to Mr Minear. So this is the idea that you do not pursue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is a completely generic term in the way that "commerce" was in Navigational Rights, because it is still impacted by paragraph 29(g), by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the travaux préparatoires, by the three bargains underpinning the Treaty, and all of that restricts what you can do in terms of defining what "sound and economical" is, in a way that "commerce" in Navigational Rights was not so restricted.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to tomorrow are crucial to the identification of the object and purpose. So the reference to "object and purpose" has two related implications. First, it brings into the interpretation process the principle of effectiveness that I already mentioned in response to Mr Minear. So this is the idea that you do not pursue an interpretation that would render parts of the treaty
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is a completely generic term in the way that "commerce" was in Navigational Rights, because it is still impacted by paragraph 29(g), by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the travaux préparatoires, by the three bargains underpinning the Treaty, and all of that restricts what you can do in terms of defining what "sound and economical" is, in a way that "commerce" in Navigational Rights was not so restricted. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to tomorrow are crucial to the identification of the object and purpose. So the reference to "object and purpose" has two related implications. First, it brings into the interpretation process the principle of effectiveness that I already mentioned in response to Mr Minear. So this is the idea that you do not pursue an interpretation that would render parts of the treaty superfluous or diminish its practical effect.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is a completely generic term in the way that "commerce" was in Navigational Rights, because it is still impacted by paragraph 29(g), by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the travaux préparatoires, by the three bargains underpinning the Treaty, and all of that restricts what you can do in terms of defining what "sound and economical" is, in a way that "commerce" in Navigational Rights was not so restricted. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 11) So now coming to the next aspect 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to tomorrow are crucial to the identification of the object and purpose. So the reference to "object and purpose" has two related implications. First, it brings into the interpretation process the principle of effectiveness that I already mentioned in response to Mr Minear. So this is the idea that you do not pursue an interpretation that would render parts of the treaty superfluous or diminish its practical effect.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is a completely generic term in the way that "commerce" was in Navigational Rights, because it is still impacted by paragraph 29(g), by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the travaux préparatoires, by the three bargains underpinning the Treaty, and all of that restricts what you can do in terms of defining what "sound and economical" is, in a way that "commerce" in Navigational Rights was not so restricted. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 11) So now coming to the next aspect of Article 31(1), which is looking at the terms of the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to tomorrow are crucial to the identification of the object and purpose. So the reference to "object and purpose" has two related implications. First, it brings into the interpretation process the principle of effectiveness that I already mentioned in response to Mr Minear. So this is the idea that you do not pursue an interpretation that would render parts of the treaty superfluous or diminish its practical effect.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is a completely generic term in the way that "commerce" was in Navigational Rights, because it is still impacted by paragraph 29(g), by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the travaux préparatoires, by the three bargains underpinning the Treaty, and all of that restricts what you can do in terms of defining what "sound and economical" is, in a way that "commerce" in Navigational Rights was not so restricted. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 11) So now coming to the next aspect of Article 31(1), which is looking at the terms of the Treaty in their context. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to tomorrow are crucial to the identification of the object and purpose. So the reference to "object and purpose" has two related implications. First, it brings into the interpretation process the principle of effectiveness that I already mentioned in response to Mr Minear. So this is the idea that you do not pursue an interpretation that would render parts of the treaty superfluous or diminish its practical effect. And the second aspect is that object and purpose requires that account be taken not only of the rights and obligations created by the treaty, but also of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is a completely generic term in the way that "commerce" was in Navigational Rights, because it is still impacted by paragraph 29(g), by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the travaux préparatoires, by the three bargains underpinning the Treaty, and all of that restricts what you can do in terms of defining what "sound and economical" is, in a way that "commerce" in Navigational Rights was not so restricted. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 11) So now coming to the next aspect of Article 31(1), which is looking at the terms of the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to tomorrow are crucial to the identification of the object and purpose. So the reference to "object and purpose" has two related implications. First, it brings into the interpretation process the principle of effectiveness that I already mentioned in response to Mr Minear. So this is the idea that you do not pursue an interpretation that would render parts of the treaty superfluous or diminish its practical effect.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 the term is PROFESSOR WEBB: "Customary and accepted practice". THE CHAIRMAN: that you would say could be regarded as evolutionary in nature, but other terms that are not? PROFESSOR WEBB: I wouldn't say it as definitively as that. I would say that looking at the terms "sound and economical" and this will become more real when Dr Miles and I go through each of these provisions and how these terms have been interpreted and applied, and should be interpreted and applied. But "sound and economical" we wouldn't say is a completely generic term in the way that "commerce" was in Navigational Rights, because it is still impacted by paragraph 29(g), by the object and purpose of the Treaty, by the travaux préparatoires, by the three bargains underpinning the Treaty, and all of that restricts what you can do in terms of defining what "sound and economical" is, in a way that "commerce" in Navigational Rights was not so restricted. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 11) So now coming to the next aspect of Article 31(1), which is looking at the terms of the Treaty in their context. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 second type of context in its Treaty interpretation, specifically considering the permissibility of depletion of the dead storage level, referring to looking at the context of the Treaty as a whole. (Slide 14) So then we come to what could if Article 31 is the general rule, you could say object and purpose is the golden rule because it has so many knock-on effects to treaty interpretation. And as foreshadowed by Sir Daniel, the three bargains at the heart of the Treaty the peace bargain, the Treaty bargain and the hydro bargain that I will be turning to tomorrow are crucial to the identification of the object and purpose. So the reference to "object and purpose" has two related implications. First, it brings into the interpretation process the principle of effectiveness that I already mentioned in response to Mr Minear. So this is the idea that you do not pursue an interpretation that would render parts of the treaty superfluous or diminish its practical effect. And the second aspect is that object and purpose requires that account be taken not only of the rights and obligations created by the treaty, but also of the

12:08	1	we've heard about that from Ms Rees-Evans in the context	12:12 1	That Treaty of Amity, Freedom and Commerce was for the
	2	of the travaux.	2	purpose of encouraging mutually beneficial trade and
	3	(Slide 15) So turning to the preamble of the Indus	3	investments, and closer economic intercourse, and
	4	Waters Treaty. First of all, unusually again for	4	regulating consular relations. And the court held that
	5	a treaty, and part of the very comprehensive framework	5	immunities did not fall within that object and purpose.
	6	it creates, is Article XII(1), which defines the	6	So it therefore defined the "requirements of
	7	preamble as being an integral part of the Treaty.	7	international law", that phrase, more narrowly: as the
	8	Then we come to the preamble itself. And I won't	8	minimum standard of protection for property belonging to
	9	read it out, but I'll just highlight what was the	9	one party's nationals and companies.
	10	position of the parties in Kishenganga and what would,	10	(Slide 16) The object and purpose of the Indus
	11	I assume, be India's position today.	11	Waters Treaty has been considered by the Kishenganga
	12	So India's argument in the Kishenganga proceedings	12	Court, and as you've heard, its findings are
	13	was that the most important part of this preamble, and	13	dispositive. I'm just going to run through what they
	14	therefore what defined the object and purpose of the	14	have said in the partial award (PLA-3) on the object and
	15	Treaty, were the orange highlighted words: that the	15	purpose, and I won't read out everything, just the
	16	parties were "equally desirous of attaining the most	16	emphasised points.
	17	complete and satisfactory utilisation of the waters".	17	So in the context of interpreting and applying
	18	Pakistan, in contrast, read the preamble as a whole	18	paragraph 15(iii) of Annexure D, the Court said the
	19	and emphasised the importance of what follows in the	19	following in terms of how the object and purpose
	20	yellow:	20	influenced its interpretation of that provision. It
	21	" therefore, of fixing and delimiting, in	21	said (paragraph 407):
	22	a spirit of goodwill and friendship, the rights and	22	"The deliberate division and allocation of the six
	23	obligations of each in relation to the other concerning	23	main watercourses of the Indus system of rivers between
	24	the use of these waters"	24	the Parties is a defining characteristic of the Treaty."
	25	The word "therefore", in Pakistan's submission at	25	And it went on to say:
		Dags 90		Decc 01
		Page 89		Page 91
12:10	1	the time and now, meant that it was only by fixing and	12:13 1	"The right is subject to expressly enumerated Indian
			12.10 1	The fight is subject to expressiy chamerated metal
	2	delimiting the allocation of the waters that the object	2	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of
	2 3	delimiting the allocation of the waters that the object could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this		
			2	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of
	3	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this	2 3	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the
	3 4	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary	2 3 4	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty."
	3 4 5	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part.	2 3 4 5	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally:
	3 4 5 6	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and	2 3 4 5 6	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms
	3 4 5 6 7	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty?	2 3 4 5 6 7	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the
	3 4 5 6 7 8	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part.So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty?An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself."
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the relevance of the treaty's object and purpose is limited 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself." (Slide 17) And the Court added (paragraph 418), with
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the relevance of the treaty's object and purpose is limited by the ordinary meaning of the text of the treaty. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself." (Slide 17) And the Court added (paragraph 418), with respect to the object and purpose relevant to the
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the relevance of the treaty's object and purpose is limited by the ordinary meaning of the text of the treaty. So it has this dual effect.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself." (Slide 17) And the Court added (paragraph 418), with respect to the object and purpose relevant to the interpretation of Article III and Annexure D, that:
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the relevance of the treaty's object and purpose is limited by the ordinary meaning of the text of the treaty. So it has this dual effect. Let me give you an example to illustrate that. In	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself." (Slide 17) And the Court added (paragraph 418), with respect to the object and purpose relevant to the interpretation of Article III and Annexure D, that: "The Treaty allocates the use of the waters of the
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the relevance of the treaty's object and purpose is limited by the ordinary meaning of the text of the treaty. So it has this dual effect. Let me give you an example to illustrate that. In the Certain Iranian Assets case between Iran and the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself." (Slide 17) And the Court added (paragraph 418), with respect to the object and purpose relevant to the interpretation of Article III and Annexure D, that: "The Treaty allocates the use of the waters of the Western Rivers to Pakistan, curtailing, sometimes
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the relevance of the treaty's object and purpose is limited by the ordinary meaning of the text of the treaty. So it has this dual effect. Let me give you an example to illustrate that. In the Certain Iranian Assets case between Iran and the United States you don't need to turn it up, but to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself." (Slide 17) And the Court added (paragraph 418), with respect to the object and purpose relevant to the interpretation of Article III and Annexure D, that: "The Treaty allocates the use of the waters of the Western Rivers to Pakistan, curtailing, sometimes quite severely, India's freedom to utilize the waters of
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the relevance of the treaty's object and purpose is limited by the ordinary meaning of the text of the treaty. So it has this dual effect. Let me give you an example to illustrate that. In the Certain Iranian Assets case between Iran and the United States you don't need to turn it up, but to have the reference, that's at PLA-0041 the ICJ had to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself." (Slide 17) And the Court added (paragraph 418), with respect to the object and purpose relevant to the interpretation of Article III and Annexure D, that: "The Treaty allocates the use of the waters of the Western Rivers to Pakistan, curtailing, sometimes quite severely, India's freedom to utilize the waters of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydro-electric
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the relevance of the treaty's object and purpose is limited by the ordinary meaning of the text of the treaty. So it has this dual effect. Let me give you an example to illustrate that. In the Certain Iranian Assets case between Iran and the United States you don't need to turn it up, but to have the reference, that's at PLA-0041 the ICJ had to interpret the provisions of the 1955 Treaty of Amity.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself." (Slide 17) And the Court added (paragraph 418), with respect to the object and purpose relevant to the interpretation of Article III and Annexure D, that: "The Treaty allocates the use of the waters of the Western Rivers to Pakistan, curtailing, sometimes quite severely, India's freedom to utilize the waters of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydro-electric power"
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the relevance of the treaty's object and purpose is limited by the ordinary meaning of the text of the treaty. So it has this dual effect. Let me give you an example to illustrate that. In the Certain Iranian Assets case between Iran and the United States you don't need to turn it up, but to have the reference, that's at PLA-0041 the ICJ had to interpret the provisions of the 1955 Treaty of Amity. And the key phrase here was "requirements of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself." (Slide 17) And the Court added (paragraph 418), with respect to the object and purpose relevant to the interpretation of Article III and Annexure D, that: "The Treaty allocates the use of the waters of the Western Rivers to Pakistan, curtailing, sometimes quite severely, India's freedom to utilize the waters of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydro-electric power" (Slide 18) The Kishenganga Court also made a number
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the relevance of the treaty's object and purpose is limited by the ordinary meaning of the text of the treaty. So it has this dual effect. Let me give you an example to illustrate that. In the Certain Iranian Assets case between Iran and the United States you don't need to turn it up, but to have the reference, that's at PLA-0041 the ICJ had to interpret the provisions of the 1955 Treaty of Amity. And the key phrase here was "requirements of international law" in Article IV(2) of that treaty. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself." (Slide 17) And the Court added (paragraph 418), with respect to the object and purpose relevant to the interpretation of Article III and Annexure D, that: "The Treaty allocates the use of the waters of the Western Rivers to Pakistan, curtailing, sometimes quite severely, India's freedom to utilize the waters of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydro-electric power" (Slide 18) The Kishenganga Court also made a number of determinations regarding the object and purpose of
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the relevance of the treaty's object and purpose is limited by the ordinary meaning of the text of the treaty. So it has this dual effect. Let me give you an example to illustrate that. In the Certain Iranian Assets case between Iran and the United States you don't need to turn it up, but to have the reference, that's at PLA-0041 the ICJ had to interpret the provisions of the 1955 Treaty of Amity. And the key phrase here was "requirements of international law" in Article IV(2) of that treaty.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself." (Slide 17) And the Court added (paragraph 418), with respect to the object and purpose relevant to the interpretation of Article III and Annexure D, that: "The Treaty allocates the use of the waters of the Western Rivers to Pakistan, curtailing, sometimes quite severely, India's freedom to utilize the waters of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydro-electric power" (Slide 18) The Kishenganga Court also made a number of determinations regarding the object and purpose of the Treaty as part of its decision on drawdown flushing.
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the relevance of the treaty's object and purpose is limited by the ordinary meaning of the text of the treaty. So it has this dual effect. Let me give you an example to illustrate that. In the Certain Iranian Assets case between Iran and the United States you don't need to turn it up, but to have the reference, that's at PLA-0041 the ICJ had to interpret the provisions of the 1955 Treaty of Amity. And the key phrase here was "requirements of international law" in Article IV(2) of that treaty. Iran argued that "requirements of international law" imported into the treaty all of the rules of customary	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself." (Slide 17) And the Court added (paragraph 418), with respect to the object and purpose relevant to the interpretation of Article III and Annexure D, that: "The Treaty allocates the use of the waters of the Western Rivers to Pakistan, curtailing, sometimes quite severely, India's freedom to utilize the waters of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydro-electric power" (Slide 18) The Kishenganga Court also made a number of determinations regarding the object and purpose of the Treaty as part of its decision on drawdown flushing. And there it said (paragraph 504):
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the relevance of the treaty's object and purpose is limited by the ordinary meaning of the text of the treaty. So it has this dual effect. Let me give you an example to illustrate that. In the Certain Iranian Assets case between Iran and the United States you don't need to turn it up, but to have the reference, that's at PLA-0041 the ICJ had to interpret the provisions of the 1955 Treaty of Amity. And the key phrase here was "requirements of international law" in Article IV(2) of that treaty. Iran argued that "requirements of international law" imported into the treaty all of the rules of customary international law concerning sovereign immunity. The	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself." (Slide 17) And the Court added (paragraph 418), with respect to the object and purpose relevant to the interpretation of Article III and Annexure D, that: "The Treaty allocates the use of the waters of the Western Rivers to Pakistan, curtailing, sometimes quite severely, India's freedom to utilize the waters of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydro-electric power" (Slide 18) The Kishenganga Court also made a number of determinations regarding the object and purpose of the Treaty as part of its decision on drawdown flushing. And there it said (paragraph 504): " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	could be achieved. And I'm going to come back to this idea of delimitation when I look at peace and boundary treaty analogies in my fourth part. So drawing this together, how does the object and purpose relate to the text of the Treaty? An interpretation of a provision that does not align with a treaty's object and purpose is unlikely to be accepted or to be justified. At the same time, the relevance of the treaty's object and purpose is limited by the ordinary meaning of the text of the treaty. So it has this dual effect. Let me give you an example to illustrate that. In the Certain Iranian Assets case between Iran and the United States you don't need to turn it up, but to have the reference, that's at PLA-0041 the ICJ had to interpret the provisions of the 1955 Treaty of Amity. And the key phrase here was "requirements of international law" in Article IV(2) of that treaty. Iran argued that "requirements of international law" imported into the treaty all of the rules of customary international law concerning sovereign immunity. The ICJ rejected that interpretation as not consistent with	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 uses on the Western Rivers, including the generation of hydro-electric power to the extent permitted by the Treaty." And finally: " although the chapeau of Annexure D confirms India's right to generate hydro-electric power on the Western Rivers in language similar to that of Pakistan's unrestricted 'let flow' right, it is circumscribed by the terms of Annexure D itself." (Slide 17) And the Court added (paragraph 418), with respect to the object and purpose relevant to the interpretation of Article III and Annexure D, that: "The Treaty allocates the use of the waters of the Western Rivers to Pakistan, curtailing, sometimes quite severely, India's freedom to utilize the waters of the Western Rivers for the generation of hydro-electric power" (Slide 18) The Kishenganga Court also made a number of determinations regarding the object and purpose of the Treaty as part of its decision on drawdown flushing. And there it said (paragraph 504): " one of the primary objectives of the Treaty is to limit the storage of water by India on the Western

12:14 1	And it noted that this was "a careful balance	12:17 1	has to be interpreted restrictively. So the Permanent
2	between the Parties' respective negotiating positions",	2	Court said (PLA-22, page 76):
3	reflecting the role of travaux préparatoires in	3	" the liability to expropriation of rural
4	interpretation.	4	property constitutes, under the Geneva Convention,
5	It also said (paragraph 506) that:	5	an exception; in case of doubt as to the scope of this
6	" in many instances the Treaty does not simply	6	exception, its terms must therefore be strictly
7	restrict the Parties from taking certain actions, but	7	construed."
8	also constrains their entitlement to construct works	8	(Slide 22) In 1960, the same year as the Indus
9	that would enable such actions to be taken."	9	Waters Treaty was concluded, the International Court of
10	And that is a key principle for each criteria that	10	Justice gave an Advisory Opinion on the Constitution of
11	we are going to be assessing under paragraph 8.	11	the Maritime Safety Committee of the Inter-Governmental
12	(Slide 19) So the Court was very aware of the	12	Maritime Consultative Organisation. The question there
13	careful balance that is struck in the Treaty, the peace	13	was whether that committee, which had been elected the
14	treaty and hydro bargains. And it pointed out	14	previous year, had been constituted in accordance with
15	(paragraph 522) that:	15	the convention. And the court was interpreting the
16	"It is not for the Court to apply 'best practices'	16	meaning of the word "elected" there. And it looked at
17	in resolving the dispute any exercise of design	17	the context in which it was used, it looked at the
18	involves consideration of a variety of factors not	18	object and purpose, and it said:
19	all of them technical. Hydrologic, geologic, social,	19	"If the context requires a meaning which connotes
20	economic, environmental and regulatory considerations	20	a wide choice, it must be construed accordingly, just as
21	are all directly relevant, and the Court considers the	21	it must be given a restrictive meaning if the context in
22	Treaty restraints on the construction and operation by	22	which it is used so requires."
23	India of reservoirs to be such a regulatory factor."	23	So in that case, the context of that convention was
24	And in a very key finding, the Court said:	24	that the largest ship-owning nations should dominate the
25	" the optimal design and operation of	25	committee, and therefore the court concluded that the
	Page 93		Page 95
12:16 1	a hydro-electric plant is that which can be practically	12:18 1	committee was not constituted correctly because Liberia
2	achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty."	2	and Panama were not included.
2 3	achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on	2 3	and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will
2 3 4	achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation,	2 3 4	and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where
2 3 4 5	achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate	2 3 4 5	and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular
2 3 4 5 6	achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its	2 3 4 5 6	and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is
2 3 4 5 6 7	achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints	2 3 4 5 6 7	and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And]
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna Convention. But during the travaux préparatoires of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is mandatory."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna Convention. But during the travaux préparatoires of that treaty, the Vienna Convention, there was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is mandatory." (Slide 24) So in this case, we have a relationship
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna Convention. But during the travaux préparatoires of that treaty, the Vienna Convention, there was an understanding that exceptions to general rules should 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is mandatory." (Slide 24) So in this case, we have a relationship between the object and purpose of the Indus Waters
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna Convention. But during the travaux préparatoires of that treaty, the Vienna Convention, there was an understanding that exceptions to general rules should be strictly interpreted in order to promote the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is mandatory." (Slide 24) So in this case, we have a relationship between the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty, the rule, and the exception, which is to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna Convention. But during the travaux préparatoires of that treaty, the Vienna Convention, there was an understanding that exceptions to general rules should 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is mandatory." (Slide 24) So in this case, we have a relationship between the object and purpose of the Indus Waters
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna Convention. But during the travaux préparatoires of that treaty, the Vienna Convention, there was an understanding that exceptions to general rules should be strictly interpreted in order to promote the stability and security of treaties. And I would just 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	 and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is mandatory." (Slide 24) So in this case, we have a relationship between the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty, the rule, and the exception, which is to be interpreted restrictively.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna Convention. But during the travaux préparatoires of that treaty, the Vienna Convention, there was an understanding that exceptions to general rules should be strictly interpreted in order to promote the stability and security of treaties. And I would just refer you to our Memorial, paragraph 8.29, which clearly 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is mandatory." (Slide 24) So in this case, we have a relationship between the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty, the rule, and the exception, which is to be interpreted restrictively.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna Convention. But during the travaux préparatoires of that treaty, the Vienna Convention, there was an understanding that exceptions to general rules should be strictly interpreted in order to promote the stability and security of treaties. And I would just refer you to our Memorial, paragraph 8.29, which clearly shows a number of delegations reiterating this rule. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is mandatory." (Slide 24) So in this case, we have a relationship between the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty, the rule, and the exception, which is to be interpreted restrictively. This brings me to the Chairman's question in the previous session on "let flow". There was some
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna Convention. But during the travaux préparatoires of that treaty, the Vienna Convention, there was an understanding that exceptions to general rules should be strictly interpreted in order to promote the stability and security of treaties. And I would just refer you to our Memorial, paragraph 8.29, which clearly shows a number of delegations reiterating this rule. (Slide 21) But it even predates the negotiation of 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is mandatory." (Slide 24) So in this case, we have a relationship between the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty, the rule, and the exception, which is to be interpreted restrictively. This brings me to the Chairman's question in the previous session on "let flow". There was some discussion about the role of "let flow" and exceptions.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna Convention. But during the travaux préparatoires of that treaty, the Vienna Convention, there was an understanding that exceptions to general rules should be strictly interpreted in order to promote the stability and security of treaties. And I would just refer you to our Memorial, paragraph 8.29, which clearly shows a number of delegations reiterating this rule. (Slide 21) But it even predates the negotiation of the Vienna Convention. Nearly a century ago, the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is mandatory." (Slide 24) So in this case, we have a relationship between the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty, the rule, and the exception, which is to be interpreted restrictively. This brings me to the Chairman's question in the previous session on "let flow". There was some discussion about the role of "let flow" and exceptions. And I would just like to take this opportunity to say
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna Convention. But during the travaux préparatoires of that treaty, the Vienna Convention, there was an understanding that exceptions to general rules should be strictly interpreted in order to promote the stability and security of treaties. And I would just refer you to our Memorial, paragraph 8.29, which clearly shows a number of delegations reiterating this rule. (Slide 21) But it even predates the negotiation of the Vienna Convention. Nearly a century ago, the Permanent Court of International Justice, in the Certain 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is mandatory." (Slide 24) So in this case, we have a relationship between the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty, the rule, and the exception, which is to be interpreted restrictively. This brings me to the Chairman's question in the previous session on "let flow". There was some discussion about the role of "let flow" and exceptions. And I would just like to take this opportunity to say that Pakistan accepts that we have a rule and
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna Convention. But during the travaux préparatoires of that treaty, the Vienna Convention, there was an understanding that exceptions to general rules should be strictly interpreted in order to promote the stability and security of treaties. And I would just refer you to our Memorial, paragraph 8.29, which clearly shows a number of delegations reiterating this rule. (Slide 21) But it even predates the negotiation of the Vienna Convention. Nearly a century ago, the Permanent Court of International Justice, in the Certain German Interests in Upper Silesia case, held that the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is mandatory." (Slide 24) So in this case, we have a relationship between the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty, the rule, and the exception, which is to be interpreted restrictively. This brings me to the Chairman's question in the previous session on "let flow". There was some discussion about the role of "let flow" and exceptions. And I would just like to take this opportunity to say that Pakistan accepts that we have a rule and exceptions. And whether rooted in the text of the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna Convention. But during the travaux préparatoires of that treaty, the Vienna Convention, there was an understanding that exceptions to general rules should be strictly interpreted in order to promote the stability and security of treaties. And I would just refer you to our Memorial, paragraph 8.29, which clearly shows a number of delegations reiterating this rule. (Slide 21) But it even predates the negotiation of the Vienna Convention. Nearly a century ago, the Permanent Court of International Justice, in the Certain German Interests in Upper Silesia case, held that the liquidation of rural estates pursuant to treaties was an exception to a general rule of international law and 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is mandatory." (Slide 24) So in this case, we have a relationship between the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty, the rule, and the exception, which is to be interpreted restrictively. This brings me to the Chairman's question in the previous session on "let flow". There was some discussion about the role of "let flow" and exceptions. And I would just like to take this opportunity to say that Pakistan accepts that we have a rule and exceptions. And whether rooted in the text of the Treaty or the travaux préparatoires, we are not saying that there are no exceptions, evidently, to the let-flow
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	achieved within the constraints imposed by the Treaty." The Court reiterated this finding in its decision on India's request for clarification or interpretation, saying that "it is for India to secure appropriate locations and to draw appropriate designs for its Run-of-River Plants", bearing in mind the "constraints that are part of the Treaty's essential bargain" (PLA-21, paragraph 34). (Slide 20) So I now turn to the restrictive interpretation of exceptions to a rule. Now, this is not there in terms in Article 31 or 32 of the Vienna Convention. But during the travaux préparatoires of that treaty, the Vienna Convention, there was an understanding that exceptions to general rules should be strictly interpreted in order to promote the stability and security of treaties. And I would just refer you to our Memorial, paragraph 8.29, which clearly shows a number of delegations reiterating this rule. (Slide 21) But it even predates the negotiation of the Vienna Convention. Nearly a century ago, the Permanent Court of International Justice, in the Certain German Interests in Upper Silesia case, held that the liquidation of rural estates pursuant to treaties was	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 and Panama were not included. (Slide 23) The object and purpose of a treaty will sometimes call for a restrictive interpretation, where the rule purportedly derogated from is of particular importance to the parties' agreement. And that is an ICSID case, Enron v Argentina, which said (PLA-92, paragraph 331) that: " [an] interpretation resulting in an escape route from the obligations defined cannot be easily reconciled with that object and purpose. [And] a restrictive interpretation of any such alternative is mandatory." (Slide 24) So in this case, we have a relationship between the object and purpose of the Indus Waters Treaty, the rule, and the exception, which is to be interpreted restrictively. This brings me to the Chairman's question in the previous session on "let flow". There was some discussion about the role of "let flow" and exceptions. And I would just like to take this opportunity to say that Pakistan accepts that we have a rule and exceptions. And whether rooted in the text of the Treaty or the travaux préparatoires, we are not saying

12.20 1			
12:20 1	obligation. But we can't look at the phrase "let flow"	12:23 1	this Treaty, also affirms the restrictive interpretation
12.20 1	detached from what is also said in Article III:	2	of the paragraph 8 criteria. And an argument as
3	"unrestricted use" and non-interference. Those concepts	3	you've put forward on behalf of India that you would
4	operationalise the idea of "let flow".	4	only look at the detailed criteria and interpret them
5	I'll be setting this out in more detail in the	5	sort of in a vacuum would be completely contrary to the
6	presentation tomorrow on the hydro bargain. But just to	6	general rule of the Vienna Convention and contrary to
7	say, as is evident on the slide, that we do see this	7	what the Kishenganga Court held, how the Kishenganga
8	very much as a relationship, not one rule with no	8	Court approached these questions.
9	exceptions, but exceptions that do have to be	9	THE CHAIRMAN: So I'll just follow up. If you do go back,
10	interpreted restrictively.	10	I think it's Waldock's third report, in 1964. But let
10	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Professor Webb, for that	10	me pursue it a little further.
11	explanation. Let me just ask you about this principle	11	Is the principle you're advocating for, that we
12	of exception being construed narrowly.	12	should construe exceptions narrowly, applicable only in
13	There is arguably a different story one could tell	13	a situation where you have multiple possible
14		14	interpretations of the exception that is, you've
	in this regard, which is that that particular canon of	15	looked at the exception and you've determined that there
16 17	interpretation is one that was considered by the International Law Commission along with a number of	10	
17	-		is two or three or more possible interpretations, and we
18	other canons of interpretation, one of which is the	18	should pursue the one that's the narrowest because of
19	opposite to it I will dust off my Latin from grammar	19 20	the principle that you're advocating for or even if
20	school generalia specialibus non derogant, which is	20	you've settled upon what you think is the proper
21	the idea that the general should not derogate from the	21	interpretation, you somehow should be trying to pursue
22	special, if you will.	22	an even narrower approach to the text at hand?
23	And I believe it was the final rapporteur for the	23	PROFESSOR WEBB: So it would arise in a scenario where there
24	ILC, Sir Humphrey Waldock, who looked at these competing	24	are multiple possible interpretations, but it would not
25	canons of interpretation and said: these are certainly	25	only arise in that scenario. And I think the examples
	Page 97		Page 99
12:22 1	tools of the trade for lawyers, and perfectly reasonable	12:25 1	that we have given of Upper Silesia, of the Constitution
2	to employ in legal argumentation; but as a general	2	
3			of the Maritime Safety Committee, of Enron v Argentina,
	proposition, aren't core canons that should work their	3	of the Maritime Safety Committee, of Enron v Argentina, and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the
4	• •	3	and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the
4 5	way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and		and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the
	• •	3 4	and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the
5	way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty	3 4 5	and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation.
5 6	way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on,	3 4 5 6	and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it.
5 6 7	way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied	3 4 5 6 7	and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that
5 6 7 8	way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process.	3 4 5 6 7 8	and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this
5 6 7 8 9	way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina;
5 6 7 8 9 10	 way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not the one that Pakistan thinks should be employed in this 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more a sense of the object and purpose; or it might go back
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not the one that Pakistan thinks should be employed in this context, but that perhaps if India was here, it would 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more a sense of the object and purpose; or it might go back to the travaux.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not the one that Pakistan thinks should be employed in this context, but that perhaps if India was here, it would make the argument that we've got an exception that is 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more a sense of the object and purpose; or it might go back to the travaux. So I think there are multiple routes to
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not the one that Pakistan thinks should be employed in this context, but that perhaps if India was here, it would make the argument that we've got an exception that is relatively detailed in nature, and that the core of what 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more a sense of the object and purpose; or it might go back to the travaux. So I think there are multiple routes to a restrictive principle. And it is a principle as
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not the one that Pakistan thinks should be employed in this context, but that perhaps if India was here, it would make the argument that we've got an exception that is relatively detailed in nature, and that the core of what we need to be doing is interpreting that exception in 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more a sense of the object and purpose; or it might go back to the travaux. So I think there are multiple routes to a restrictive principle. And it is a principle as I said, we will go back to what Waldock said in his
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not the one that Pakistan thinks should be employed in this context, but that perhaps if India was here, it would make the argument that we've got an exception that is relatively detailed in nature, and that the core of what we need to be doing is interpreting that exception in and of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more a sense of the object and purpose; or it might go back to the travaux. So I think there are multiple routes to a restrictive principle. And it is a principle as I said, we will go back to what Waldock said in his third report. But since then, it is a principle that
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not the one that Pakistan thinks should be employed in this context, but that perhaps if India was here, it would make the argument that we've got an exception that is relatively detailed in nature, and that the core of what we need to be doing is interpreting that exception in and of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more a sense of the object and purpose; or it might go back to the travaux. So I think there are multiple routes to a restrictive principle. And it is a principle as I said, we will go back to what Waldock said in his third report. But since then, it is a principle that has been accepted and applied multiple times.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not the one that Pakistan thinks should be employed in this context, but that perhaps if India was here, it would make the argument that we've got an exception that is relatively detailed in nature, and that the core of what we need to be doing is interpreting that exception in and of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you. I'll just say that we will go 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more a sense of the object and purpose; or it might go back to the travaux. So I think there are multiple routes to a restrictive principle. And it is a principle as I said, we will go back to what Waldock said in his third report. But since then, it is a principle that has been accepted and applied multiple times. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not the one that Pakistan thinks should be employed in this context, but that perhaps if India was here, it would make the argument that we've got an exception that is relatively detailed in nature, and that the core of what we need to be doing is interpreting that exception in and of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you. I'll just say that we will go back to Humphrey Waldock and look specifically at that 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more a sense of the object and purpose; or it might go back to the travaux. So I think there are multiple routes to a restrictive principle. And it is a principle as I said, we will go back to what Waldock said in his third report. But since then, it is a principle that has been accepted and applied multiple times. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 25) So turning to the fourth aspect
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not the one that Pakistan thinks should be employed in this context, but that perhaps if India was here, it would make the argument that we've got an exception that is relatively detailed in nature, and that the core of what we need to be doing is interpreting that exception in and of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you. I'll just say that we will go back to Humphrey Waldock and look specifically at that point. But I would say that using what is in Article 31, what is completely undisputed in international law, 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more a sense of the object and purpose; or it might go back to the travaux. So I think there are multiple routes to a restrictive principle. And it is a principle as I said, we will go back to what Waldock said in his third report. But since then, it is a principle that has been accepted and applied multiple times. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 25) So turning to the fourth aspect of Article 31, paragraph 1, which is good faith. This,
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not the one that Pakistan thinks should be employed in this context, but that perhaps if India was here, it would make the argument that we've got an exception that is relatively detailed in nature, and that the core of what we need to be doing is interpreting that exception in and of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you. I'll just say that we will go back to Humphrey Waldock and look specifically at that point. But I would say that using what is in Article 31, what is completely undisputed in international law, which is ordinary meaning, good faith, context and 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more a sense of the object and purpose; or it might go back to the travaux. So I think there are multiple routes to a restrictive principle. And it is a principle as I said, we will go back to what Waldock said in his third report. But since then, it is a principle that has been accepted and applied multiple times. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 25) So turning to the fourth aspect of Article 31, paragraph 1, which is good faith. This, as we know, is a cornerstone principle of international law: it is to be applied to every aspect of the process of interpretation.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not the one that Pakistan thinks should be employed in this context, but that perhaps if India was here, it would make the argument that we've got an exception that is relatively detailed in nature, and that the core of what we need to be doing is interpreting that exception in and of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you. I'll just say that we will go back to Humphrey Waldock and look specifically at that point. But I would say that using what is in Article 31, what is completely undisputed in international law, 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more a sense of the object and purpose; or it might go back to the travaux. So I think there are multiple routes to a restrictive principle. And it is a principle as I said, we will go back to what Waldock said in his third report. But since then, it is a principle that has been accepted and applied multiple times. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 25) So turning to the fourth aspect of Article 31, paragraph 1, which is good faith. This, as we know, is a cornerstone principle of international law: it is to be applied to every aspect of the process
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not the one that Pakistan thinks should be employed in this context, but that perhaps if India was here, it would make the argument that we've got an exception that is relatively detailed in nature, and that the core of what we need to be doing is interpreting that exception in and of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you. I'll just say that we will go back to Humphrey Waldock and look specifically at that point. But I would say that using what is in Article 31, what is completely undisputed in international law, which is ordinary meaning, good faith, context and object and purpose, all of that in this case, applied to 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more a sense of the object and purpose; or it might go back to the travaux. So I think there are multiple routes to a restrictive principle. And it is a principle as I said, we will go back to what Waldock said in his third report. But since then, it is a principle that has been accepted and applied multiple times. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 25) So turning to the fourth aspect of Article 31, paragraph 1, which is good faith. This, as we know, is a cornerstone principle of international law: it is to be applied to every aspect of the process of interpretation. (Slide 26) It is reinforced by Article 26 of the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 way into what became Vienna Convention Articles 31 and 32; that the core canons of "Look at the treaty language, look at the object and purpose" and so on, these are the ones that, if you will, should be applied systematically when one does the interpretative process. So I suppose that's just a general way of asking whether there is a story here that would say: there is a competing canon of interpretation, it's obviously not the one that Pakistan thinks should be employed in this context, but that perhaps if India was here, it would make the argument that we've got an exception that is relatively detailed in nature, and that the core of what we need to be doing is interpreting that exception in and of itself, without regard to some idea that it needs to be narrowly construed. PROFESSOR WEBB: Thank you. I'll just say that we will go back to Humphrey Waldock and look specifically at that point. But I would say that using what is in Article 31, what is completely undisputed in international law, which is ordinary meaning, good faith, context and 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 and also we referred in our Memorial to Whaling in the Antarctic, are all cases that have approved of the restrictive interpretation. There have been varied reasons for adopting it. Once again, going back to Article 31, it might be that the parties' agreement clearly hinged on this restrictive interpretation, that was Enron v Argentina; or it could be the context, that was in the Constitution of the Maritime Safety Committee; or it might be more a sense of the object and purpose; or it might go back to the travaux. So I think there are multiple routes to a restrictive principle. And it is a principle as I said, we will go back to what Waldock said in his third report. But since then, it is a principle that has been accepted and applied multiple times. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. PROFESSOR WEBB: (Slide 25) So turning to the fourth aspect of Article 31, paragraph 1, which is good faith. This, as we know, is a cornerstone principle of international law: it is to be applied to every aspect of the process of interpretation.

-	-	-	
12:26 1	Vienna Convention, which refers again to good faith as	12:30 1	Treaty.
12:20 1	part of and now I can bring up some Latin pacta	12:50 1	(Slide 30) The third agreement was the 1989
	sunt servanda. This means that as long as a treaty		arrangements about communication of flood flows (P-331).
3		3	-
4	remains in force, it must be observed as it stands, and	4	So it was codified in 1989 and then renewed annually for
5	good faith would not be served by interpreting a treaty	5	20 years. And as Pakistan's Commissioner explained
6	as broadly as possible. And in the case of uncertainty	6	yesterday, this was an arrangement for the
7	or of divergent interpretations, good faith calls on the	7	implementation of the Treaty in a very specific aspect;
8	interpreter and the decision-maker to look to the	8	it is not a position regarding a changing interpretation
9	proposal that led to the text of the treaty and the good	9	of the Treaty.
10	faith of the parties in negotiating on that basis.	10	So we would say that these three agreements do not
11	(Slide 27) So I now move on from the first paragraph	11	need to be taken into account for the interpretation of
12	of Article 31 to the third paragraph, which is	12	the provisions of the Treaty in these proceedings.
13	subsequent agreements and subsequent practice.	13	Mr Chairman, yesterday you noted that India pointed
14	Now, what constitutes an agreement or practice is	14	to hydroelectric plants constructed between 1968 and
15	not always clear. But a similar test applies, which is:	15	1990 and Pakistan did not protest the same method of
16	in order to be "taken into account" the language of	16	calculating pondage as it later protested in the context
17	Article 31(3) it has to be a practice or agreement	17	of the Baglihar proceedings. I just wanted to come back
18	that embraces all the parties to the original treaty and	18	to you on that. I have three points in that regard.
19	a practice that occurs in the application of that	19	So first, over the decades there have been extensive
20	treaty.	20	discussions in the Permanent Indus Commission, and it
21	Now, yesterday, in the Court's exchange with	21	may be and it has been that disagreements about
22	Pakistan's Commissioner, three agreements that were made	22	the compliance of certain HEP designs with the Treaty
23	subsequent to the Indus Waters Treaty were identified.	23	reoccur over the years, being discussed in various
24	And I'm just going to now place these in the context of	24	meetings, and then fade away. In our submission, that
25	Article 31(3), building on what Sir Daniel said	25	would be unlikely to constitute conduct in the
_		_	·
	Page 101		Page 103
12.28 1	vesterday	12.31 1	application of the Treaty or an agreement between the
12:28 1	yesterday. (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This	12:31 1	application of the Treaty or an agreement between the parties on an interpretation of the Treaty
2	(Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This	2	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty.
2 3	(Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content	2 3	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that
2 3 4	(Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday.	2 3 4	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had
2 3 4 5	(Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the	2 3 4 5	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million
2 3 4 5 6	(Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties	2 3 4 5 6	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise
2 3 4 5 6 7	(Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday.The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of	2 3 4 5 6 7	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role of the Commission; they are not relevant to the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday, Article IV(14) of the Treaty, which states that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role of the Commission; they are not relevant to the provisions of the Treaty that we are looking at in these 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday, Article IV(14) of the Treaty, which states that: "In the event that either Party should develop a use
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role of the Commission; they are not relevant to the provisions of the Treaty that we are looking at in these proceedings. Just to give you an example of one of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday, Article IV(14) of the Treaty, which states that: "In the event that either Party should develop a use of the waters of the Rivers which is not in accordance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role of the Commission; they are not relevant to the provisions of the Treaty that we are looking at in these proceedings. Just to give you an example of one of them, "Can the Commission examine a claim for financial 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday, Article IV(14) of the Treaty, which states that: "In the event that either Party should develop a use of the waters of the Rivers which is not in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, that Party shall not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role of the Commission; they are not relevant to the provisions of the Treaty that we are looking at in these proceedings. Just to give you an example of one of them, "Can the Commission examine a claim for financial compensation?", and the answer was "Yes". 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday, Article IV(14) of the Treaty, which states that: "In the event that either Party should develop a use of the waters of the Rivers which is not in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, that Party shall not acquire by reason of such use any right, by prescription
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role of the Commission; they are not relevant to the provisions of the Treaty that we are looking at in these proceedings. Just to give you an example of one of them, "Can the Commission examine a claim for financial compensation?", and the answer was "Yes". (Slide 29) The next agreement was the 1978 agreement 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday, Article IV(14) of the Treaty, which states that: "In the event that either Party should develop a use of the waters of the Rivers which is not in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, that Party shall not acquire by reason of such use any right, by prescription or otherwise, to a continuance of such use."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role of the Commission; they are not relevant to the provisions of the Treaty that we are looking at in these proceedings. Just to give you an example of one of them, "Can the Commission examine a claim for financial compensation?", and the answer was "Yes". (Slide 29) The next agreement was the 1978 agreement regarding the design of the Salal plant, and that's at 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday, Article IV(14) of the Treaty, which states that: "In the event that either Party should develop a use of the waters of the Rivers which is not in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, that Party shall not acquire by reason of such use any right, by prescription or otherwise, to a continuance of such use."
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role of the Commission; they are not relevant to the provisions of the Treaty that we are looking at in these proceedings. Just to give you an example of one of them, "Can the Commission examine a claim for financial compensation?", and the answer was "Yes". (Slide 29) The next agreement was the 1978 agreement regarding the design of the Salal plant, and that's at PLA-0053. As was said by Pakistan's Commissioner 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday, Article IV(14) of the Treaty, which states that: "In the event that either Party should develop a use of the waters of the Rivers which is not in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, that Party shall not acquire by reason of such use any right, by prescription or otherwise, to a continuance of such use." THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Professor Webb, for that follow-up on the question I asked yesterday. It's very helpful.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role of the Commission; they are not relevant to the provisions of the Treaty that we are looking at in these proceedings. Just to give you an example of one of them, "Can the Commission examine a claim for financial compensation?", and the answer was "Yes". (Slide 29) The next agreement was the 1978 agreement regarding the design of the Salal plant, and that's at PLA-0053. As was said by Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, this is a plant-specific agreement; it is 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array} $	 parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday, Article IV(14) of the Treaty, which states that: "In the event that either Party should develop a use of the waters of the Rivers which is not in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, that Party shall not acquire by reason of such use any right, by prescription or otherwise, to a continuance of such use." THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Professor Webb, for that follow-up on the question I asked yesterday. It's very helpful. My own reaction on this particular provision that
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role of the Commission; they are not relevant to the provisions of the Treaty that we are looking at in these proceedings. Just to give you an example of one of them, "Can the Commission examine a claim for financial compensation?", and the answer was "Yes". (Slide 29) The next agreement was the 1978 agreement regarding the design of the Salal plant, and that's at PLA-0053. As was said by Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, this is a plant-specific agreement; it is very much under the auspices of the Treaty. So I've 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday, Article IV(14) of the Treaty, which states that: "In the event that either Party should develop a use of the waters of the Rivers which is not in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, that Party shall not acquire by reason of such use any right, by prescription or otherwise, to a continuance of such use." THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Professor Webb, for that follow-up on the question I asked yesterday. It's very helpful. My own reaction on this particular provision that you have on the screen, Article IV, paragraph (14), is
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role of the Commission; they are not relevant to the provisions of the Treaty that we are looking at in these proceedings. Just to give you an example of one of them, "Can the Commission examine a claim for financial compensation?", and the answer was "Yes". (Slide 29) The next agreement was the 1978 agreement regarding the design of the Salal plant, and that's at PLA-0053. As was said by Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, this is a plant-specific agreement; it is very much under the auspices of the Treaty. So I've extracted Article III and Article IV there that clearly 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday, Article IV(14) of the Treaty, which states that: "In the event that either Party should develop a use of the waters of the Rivers which is not in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, that Party shall not acquire by reason of such use any right, by prescription or otherwise, to a continuance of such use." THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Professor Webb, for that follow-up on the question I asked yesterday. It's very helpful. My own reaction on this particular provision that you have on the screen, Article IV, paragraph (14), is that it's a bit circular. We're trying to determine
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role of the Commission; they are not relevant to the provisions of the Treaty that we are looking at in these proceedings. Just to give you an example of one of them, "Can the Commission examine a claim for financial compensation?", and the answer was "Yes". (Slide 29) The next agreement was the 1978 agreement regarding the design of the Salal plant, and that's at PLA-0053. As was said by Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, this is a plant-specific agreement; it is very much under the auspices of the Treaty. So I've extracted Article III and Article IV there that clearly state that this is not 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday, Article IV(14) of the Treaty, which states that: "In the event that either Party should develop a use of the waters of the Rivers which is not in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, that Party shall not acquire by reason of such use any right, by prescription or otherwise, to a continuance of such use." THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Professor Webb, for that follow-up on the question I asked yesterday. It's very helpful. My own reaction on this particular provision that you have on the screen, Article IV, paragraph (14), is that it's a bit circular. We're trying to determine what the Treaty requires. And to the extent that the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role of the Commission; they are not relevant to the provisions of the Treaty that we are looking at in these proceedings. Just to give you an example of one of them, "Can the Commission examine a claim for financial compensation?", and the answer was "Yes". (Slide 29) The next agreement was the 1978 agreement regarding the design of the Salal plant, and that's at PLA-0053. As was said by Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, this is a plant-specific agreement; it is very much under the auspices of the Treaty. So I've extracted Article III and Article IV there that clearly 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday, Article IV(14) of the Treaty, which states that: "In the event that either Party should develop a use of the waters of the Rivers which is not in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, that Party shall not acquire by reason of such use any right, by prescription or otherwise, to a continuance of such use." THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Professor Webb, for that follow-up on the question I asked yesterday. It's very helpful. My own reaction on this particular provision that you have on the screen, Article IV, paragraph (14), is that it's a bit circular. We're trying to determine
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 (Slide 28) So the first is the 1976 agreement. This is a new document, but we did explain its content yesterday. The context for this is that on 31 March 1967, the Permanent Indus Commission submitted to both parties a report on five disputes concerning Article IX(1) of the Treaty. And the two states appointed negotiators and they held four meetings and resolved all five disputes about the functioning of Article IX(1), and they were distilled into this resolution. Now, these disputes were about clarifying the role of the Commission; they are not relevant to the provisions of the Treaty that we are looking at in these proceedings. Just to give you an example of one of them, "Can the Commission examine a claim for financial compensation?", and the answer was "Yes". (Slide 29) The next agreement was the 1978 agreement regarding the design of the Salal plant, and that's at PLA-0053. As was said by Pakistan's Commissioner yesterday, this is a plant-specific agreement; it is very much under the auspices of the Treaty. So I've extracted Article III and Article IV there that clearly state that this is not 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 parties on an interpretation of the Treaty. The second point is a practical one, which is that five of the six plants that fell within that period had very small pondage: between 0.1 and 0.9 million cubic metres. So it may be that they just didn't rise to the level of importance to create any subsequent practice. (Slide 31) And finally, the absence of protest by Pakistan cannot be considered acquiescence, let alone a subsequent practice. And this is reinforced by the provision that Sir Daniel referred to yesterday, Article IV(14) of the Treaty, which states that: "In the event that either Party should develop a use of the waters of the Rivers which is not in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, that Party shall not acquire by reason of such use any right, by prescription or otherwise, to a continuance of such use." THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Professor Webb, for that follow-up on the question I asked yesterday. It's very helpful. My own reaction on this particular provision that you have on the screen, Article IV, paragraph (14), is that it's a bit circular. We're trying to determine what the Treaty requires. And to the extent that the

10.22	1		10.26 1	
12:33		there's a particular interpretation that's appropriate,	12:36 1	with what she said about: the next question, once it
	2	then that's what we are trying to determine, and	2	falls within Article 32, is what weight you give to it,
	3	it doesn't trigger this particular provision.	3	which will really be on a document-by-document basis.
	4	You're correct that I asked in the context of the	4	The use of supplementary means of interpretation is
	5	Baglihar proceedings, where India, in its	5	not restricted to such cases in which the result of the
	6	counter-memorial, pointed to several hydroelectric plant	6	application of the general rule under Article 31 would
	7	constructions. But at the risk of giving you more	7	be ambiguous, obscure, or lead to an absurd or
	8	homework, it does strike me that in your Memorial at	8	unreasonable result. As you can see in the chapeau to
	9	Appendix C1, you do provide a list of 54 completed	9	Article 32, it is also to determine the meaning or
	10	hydroelectric plants on the Western Rivers.	10	confirm the meaning, and that is where it can play
	11	Now, some of those may have existed at the time of	11	a role in illuminating what was the intention.
	12	the Treaty, in which case they wouldn't be so relevant,	12	The Kishenganga Court had recourse to supplementary
	13	but presumably some number of them were constructed with	13	means to confirm its interpretation of Article IX of the
	14	the understanding by Pakistan that they were occurring.	14	Treaty and paragraph 15(iii) of Annexure D; and this
	15	They would have included some amount of pondage within	15	Court also had recourse to supplementary means in
	16	them; they would have included outlets of one kind or	16	interpreting and applying Article IX of the Treaty.
	17	another; they would have included a freeboard of some	17	(Slide 33) So I'm now going to turn to paragraph 29
	18	sort.	18	of Annexure G, the applicable law provision.
	19	It may be in all instances you would say that	19	So the meaning of paragraph 29 of Annexure G is that
	20	it sheds no light on the parties' interpretation of the	20	while a court seised of a dispute concerning the
	21	Treaty. But it just feels as though there should be	21	interpretation or application of the Treaty may look
	22	some degree of practice operating here that the parties	22	beyond the terms of the Treaty, it may do so only when
	23	were in relative harmony on, up until the point where	23	this is "necessary" for the interpretation or
	24	you get to Baglihar. And if that's true, then it seems	24	application of the Treaty, and "only to the extent
	25	like it should give us some insights into how the	25	necessary for that purpose". So this is a restrictive
		D 105		
		Page 105		Page 107
12:35	1	parties were jointly interpreting the treaties up until	12:38 1	provision on bringing in rules of customary and
12:35	1 2	parties were jointly interpreting the treaties up until that point.	12:38 1 2	provision on bringing in rules of customary and conventional international law.
12:35		that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well,		conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this
12:35	2	that point.	2	conventional international law.
12:35	2 3	that point.So if you were able to look at that issue as well,I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be thatthe pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no	2 3	conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation
12:35	2 3 4	that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that	2 3 4	conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that
12:35	2 3 4 5	that point.So if you were able to look at that issue as well,I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be thatthe pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were noissues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding.But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our	2 3 4 5	conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation
12:35	2 3 4 5 6	that point.So if you were able to look at that issue as well,I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be thatthe pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were noissues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding.	2 3 4 5 6	conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it
12:35	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that point.So if you were able to look at that issue as well,I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be thatthe pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were noissues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding.But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in ourunderstanding of this element of the way in whichwe might be interpreting the Treaty.	2 3 4 5 6 7	conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that point.So if you were able to look at that issue as well,I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be thatthe pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were noissues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding.But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in ourunderstanding of this element of the way in which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that point.So if you were able to look at that issue as well,I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be thatthe pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were noissues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding.But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in ourunderstanding of this element of the way in whichwe might be interpreting the Treaty.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. I would just say that this is also part of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section. And I'm going to take you to the analysis of the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. I would just say that this is also part of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section. And I'm going to take you to the analysis of the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. I would just say that this is also part of the exercise of document disclosure that Sir Daniel addressed yesterday, and we very much have this point in mind as we're reviewing all of these materials, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section. And I'm going to take you to the analysis of the Kishenganga Court in its final award, which Pakistan submits is correct and dispositive. So Mr Fietta will soon after lunch develop the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. I would just say that this is also part of the exercise of document disclosure that Sir Daniel addressed yesterday, and we very much have this point in mind as we're reviewing all of these materials, including the pre-Baglihar materials. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section. And I'm going to take you to the analysis of the Kishenganga Court in its final award, which Pakistan submits is correct and dispositive. So Mr Fietta will soon after lunch develop the idea of water usage and sustainability and make the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. I would just say that this is also part of the exercise of document disclosure that Sir Daniel addressed yesterday, and we very much have this point in mind as we're reviewing all of these materials, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section. And I'm going to take you to the analysis of the Kishenganga Court in its final award, which Pakistan submits is correct and dispositive. So Mr Fietta will soon after lunch develop the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. I would just say that this is also part of the exercise of document disclosure that Sir Daniel addressed yesterday, and we very much have this point in mind as we're reviewing all of these materials, including the pre-Baglihar materials. (Slide 32) So this now brings me to Article 32, "supplementary means" of interpretation. And you've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section. And I'm going to take you to the analysis of the Kishenganga Court in its final award, which Pakistan submits is correct and dispositive. So Mr Fietta will soon after lunch develop the idea of water usage and sustainability and make the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. I would just say that this is also part of the exercise of document disclosure that Sir Daniel addressed yesterday, and we very much have this point in mind as we're reviewing all of these materials, including the pre-Baglihar materials. (Slide 32) So this now brings me to Article 32, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section. And I'm going to take you to the analysis of the Kishenganga Court in its final award, which Pakistan submits is correct and dispositive. So Mr Fietta will soon after lunch develop the idea of water usage and sustainability and make the point that Pakistan and India are vulnerable to the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. I would just say that this is also part of the exercise of document disclosure that Sir Daniel addressed yesterday, and we very much have this point in mind as we're reviewing all of these materials, including the pre-Baglihar materials. (Slide 32) So this now brings me to Article 32, "supplementary means" of interpretation. And you've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section. And I'm going to take you to the analysis of the Kishenganga Court in its final award, which Pakistan submits is correct and dispositive. So Mr Fietta will soon after lunch develop the idea of water usage and sustainability and make the point that Pakistan and India are vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Climate change can be taken
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. I would just say that this is also part of the exercise of document disclosure that Sir Daniel addressed yesterday, and we very much have this point in mind as we're reviewing all of these materials, including the pre-Baglihar materials. (Slide 32) So this now brings me to Article 32, "supplementary means" of interpretation. And you've heard from Ms Rees-Evans on the travaux préparatoires.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section. And I'm going to take you to the analysis of the Kishenganga Court in its final award, which Pakistan submits is correct and dispositive. So Mr Fietta will soon after lunch develop the idea of water usage and sustainability and make the point that Pakistan and India are vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Climate change can be taken into account in the interpretation and application of
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. I would just say that this is also part of the exercise of document disclosure that Sir Daniel addressed yesterday, and we very much have this point in mind as we're reviewing all of these materials, including the pre-Baglihar materials. (Slide 32) So this now brings me to Article 32, "supplementary means" of interpretation. And you've heard from Ms Rees-Evans on the travaux préparatoires. I would just make the point, reflecting on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section. And I'm going to take you to the analysis of the Kishenganga Court in its final award, which Pakistan submits is correct and dispositive. So Mr Fietta will soon after lunch develop the idea of water usage and sustainability and make the point that Pakistan and India are vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Climate change can be taken into account in the interpretation and application of the Indus Waters Treaty, but within two parameters.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. I would just say that this is also part of the exercise of document disclosure that Sir Daniel addressed yesterday, and we very much have this point in mind as we're reviewing all of these materials, including the pre-Baglihar materials. (Slide 32) So this now brings me to Article 32, "supplementary means" of interpretation. And you've heard from Ms Rees-Evans on the travaux préparatoires. I would just make the point, reflecting on the discussion that you had near the end of Ms Rees-Evans's 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section. And I'm going to take you to the analysis of the Kishenganga Court in its final award, which Pakistan submits is correct and dispositive. So Mr Fietta will soon after lunch develop the idea of water usage and sustainability and make the point that Pakistan and India are vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Climate change can be taken into account in the interpretation and application of the Indus Waters Treaty, but within two parameters. The first is that climate change does not require
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. I would just say that this is also part of the exercise of document disclosure that Sir Daniel addressed yesterday, and we very much have this point in mind as we're reviewing all of these materials, including the pre-Baglihar materials. (Slide 32) So this now brings me to Article 32, "supplementary means" of interpretation. And you've heard from Ms Rees-Evans on the travaux préparatoires. I would just make the point, reflecting on the discussion that you had near the end of Ms Rees-Evans's presentation on non-travaux materials from the time, 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section. And I'm going to take you to the analysis of the Kishenganga Court in its final award, which Pakistan submits is correct and dispositive. So Mr Fietta will soon after lunch develop the idea of water usage and sustainability and make the point that Pakistan and India are vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Climate change can be taken into account in the interpretation and application of the Indus Waters Treaty, but within two parameters. The first is that climate change does not require a different interpretative approach from what I've set
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. I would just say that this is also part of the exercise of document disclosure that Sir Daniel addressed yesterday, and we very much have this point in mind as we're reviewing all of these materials, including the pre-Baglihar materials. (Slide 32) So this now brings me to Article 32, "supplementary means" of interpretation. And you've heard from Ms Rees-Evans on the travaux préparatoires. I would just make the point, reflecting on the discussion that you had near the end of Ms Rees-Evans's presentation on non-travaux materials from the time, that these may fall within Article 32, as she stated, 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section. And I'm going to take you to the analysis of the Kishenganga Court in its final award, which Pakistan submits is correct and dispositive. So Mr Fietta will soon after lunch develop the idea of water usage and sustainability and make the point that Pakistan and India are vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Climate change can be taken into account in the interpretation and application of the Indus Waters Treaty, but within two parameters. The first is that climate change does not require a different interpretative approach from what I've set out and from what the Kishenganga Court adopted; it does
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 that point. So if you were able to look at that issue as well, I'd welcome that. Perhaps the answer will still be that the pondage was minimal; perhaps that there were no issues of the kind that are at stake in this proceeding. But it feels as though there's a bit of a gap in our understanding of this element of the way in which we might be interpreting the Treaty. PROFESSOR WEBB: Certainly, and we will come back to you on that. I would just say that this is also part of the exercise of document disclosure that Sir Daniel addressed yesterday, and we very much have this point in mind as we're reviewing all of these materials, including the pre-Baglihar materials. (Slide 32) So this now brings me to Article 32, "supplementary means" of interpretation. And you've heard from Ms Rees-Evans on the travaux préparatoires. I would just make the point, reflecting on the discussion that you had near the end of Ms Rees-Evans's presentation on non-travaux materials from the time, that these may fall within Article 32, as she stated, because preparatory work is just one example of 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 conventional international law. And this is consistent with the approach of this Court in its Competence Award. It recognised that resort to the customary rules of treaty interpretation that we've been discussing was possible only because it was necessary for interpreting the Treaty. Here I want to come to the Court's questions about climate change and the Treaty that arose yesterday, and I'm also going to come to Dr Blackmore's question about innovation and cloud seeding at the end of this section. And I'm going to take you to the analysis of the Kishenganga Court in its final award, which Pakistan submits is correct and dispositive. So Mr Fietta will soon after lunch develop the idea of water usage and sustainability and make the point that Pakistan and India are vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Climate change can be taken into account in the interpretation and application of the Indus Waters Treaty, but within two parameters. The first is that climate change does not require a different interpretative approach from what I've set out and from what the Kishenganga Court adopted; it does not require an evolutionary interpretation. And second,

12:39 1	interpretation; indeed, that would be impermissible.	12:42 1	that point, prescription by the Court is not only
2	In Kishenganga, the Court found it necessary	2	unnecessary, it is prohibited by the Treaty. If
3	going through the gateway of paragraph 29 for its	3	customary international law were applied not to
4	interpretation and application of the Treaty to	4	circumscribe, but to negate rights expressly granted in
5	determine the minimum flow, and in this respect it had	5	the Treaty, this would no longer be 'interpretation or
6	regard to the customary requirement of mitigating	6	application' of the Treaty but the constitution of
0 7	significant harm to the environment in a transboundary	7	customary law in place of the Treaty That
8	context. This was necessary. But the Court said that	8	Paragraph 29 does not permit."
8 9	going further than that, and starting to enter into the	9	(Slide 36) And in applying this, in paragraph 115 it
9 10	precautionary approach and starting to enter into the	10	concluded that a minimum flow of 9 cumecs was the right
		10	outcome.
11 12	a balancing exercise between environmental considerations and express treaty obligations, would	11	
12	impermissibly put the Court in the role of policy-maker.	12	This brings me to Dr Blackmore's question about whether there is room for innovation in the Treaty, and
			you gave the example of cloud seeding. You also noted
14	So it restricted itself, based on paragraph 29, to the	14	
15	requirement of mitigating significant harm.	15	that the Treaty is of its time and dealing with very
16 17	(Slide 34) So I'm just going to take you to the	16	specific issues. There are issues that the Treaty does
17	emphasised lines in the key paragraphs of the final	17	not address: either deliberately, or could not address
18	award on this point. So in paragraph 87, the Court	18	because they did not exist yet.
19	noted that:	19	There is scope for innovation, but within the
20	" in fixing this minimum flow, the Court must	20	constraints of the Treaty. So if sound and economical
21	give due regard, in keeping with Paragraph 29 of	21	design or satisfactory construction calls for such
22	Annexure G, to the customary international law	22	innovation and we will, as I said, make this real
23	requirements of avoiding or mitigating trans-boundary	23	during our analysis of the paragraph 8 criteria then
24	harm and of reconciling economic development with the	24	that is acceptable under the Treaty.
25	protection of the environment"	25	Now, evidently cloud seeding is not mentioned in the
	Page 109		Page 111
12:41 1	And in paragraph 111:	12:44 1	Treaty and we cannot read it into the Treaty through
12:41 1 2	" the Court notes that the place of customary	12:44 1	interpretation. That's an example of a new technology
	" the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application		interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in
2	" the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to	2	interpretation. That's an example of a new technology
2 3	" the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in	2 3	interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement.
2 3 4	" the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine"	2 3 4 5 6	interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement.But the more important point is that this exercise
2 3 4 5 6 7	" the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly:	2 3 4 5 6 7	interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement.But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract.
2 3 4 5 6	" the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to	2 3 4 5 6	interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement.But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract.Whether innovation is required for a provision of the
2 3 4 5 6 7	" the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources	2 3 4 5 6 7	interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement.But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	" the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement.But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract.Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	" the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	" the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the final award. And just to emphasise again, Pakistan	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	" the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it is not apparent that climate change requires a new
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	" the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the final award. And just to emphasise again, Pakistan submits this is the correct approach to paragraph 29 and customary rules:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it is not apparent that climate change requires a new approach to interpreting these provisions. And as we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 " the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the final award. And just to emphasise again, Pakistan submits this is the correct approach to paragraph 29 and customary rules: " the Court does not consider it appropriate, and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it is not apparent that climate change requires a new approach to interpreting these provisions. And as we will explain, the components covered by these provisions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 " the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the final award. And just to emphasise again, Pakistan submits this is the correct approach to paragraph 29 and customary rules: " the Court does not consider it appropriate, and certainly not 'necessary', for it to adopt 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it is not apparent that climate change requires a new approach to interpreting these provisions. And as we will explain, the components covered by these provisions reflect the means by which a HEP operator can control
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 " the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the final award. And just to emphasise again, Pakistan submits this is the correct approach to paragraph 29 and customary rules: " the Court does not consider it appropriate, and certainly not 'necessary', for it to adopt a precautionary approach and assume the role of 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it is not apparent that climate change requires a new approach to interpreting these provisions. And as we will explain, the components covered by these provisions reflect the means by which a HEP operator can control water that has been stored, and we don't see at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 " the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the final award. And just to emphasise again, Pakistan submits this is the correct approach to paragraph 29 and customary rules: " the Court does not consider it appropriate, and certainly not 'necessary', for it to adopt a precautionary approach and assume the role of policymaker in determining the balance between 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it is not apparent that climate change requires a new approach to interpreting these provisions. And as we will explain, the components covered by these provisions reflect the means by which a HEP operator can control water that has been stored, and we don't see at the moment a clear link there to climate change. There may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 " the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the final award. And just to emphasise again, Pakistan submits this is the correct approach to paragraph 29 and customary rules: " the Court does not consider it appropriate, and certainly not 'necessary', for it to adopt a precautionary approach and assume the role of policymaker in determining the balance between acceptable environmental change and other priorities, or 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it is not apparent that climate change requires a new approach to interpreting these provisions. And as we will explain, the components covered by these provisions reflect the means by which a HEP operator can control water that has been stored, and we don't see at the moment a clear link there to climate change. There may be other provisions of the Treaty in which a climate
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 " the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the final award. And just to emphasise again, Pakistan submits this is the correct approach to paragraph 29 and customary rules: " the Court does not consider it appropriate, and certainly not 'necessary', for it to adopt a precautionary approach and assume the role of policymaker in determining the balance between acceptable environmental considerations to override the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it is not apparent that climate change requires a new approach to interpreting these provisions. And as we will explain, the components covered by these provisions reflect the means by which a HEP operator can control water that has been stored, and we don't see at the moment a clear link there to climate change. There may be other provisions of the Treaty in which a climate change analysis could play a role, such as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 " the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the final award. And just to emphasise again, Pakistan submits this is the correct approach to paragraph 29 and customary rules: " the Court does not consider it appropriate, and certainly not 'necessary', for it to adopt a precautionary approach and assume the role of policymaker in determining the balance between acceptable environmental change and other priorities, or to permit environmental considerations to override the balance of other rights and obligations expressly 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it is not apparent that climate change requires a new approach to interpreting these provisions. And as we will explain, the components covered by these provisions reflect the means by which a HEP operator can control water that has been stored, and we don't see at the moment a clear link there to climate change. There may be other provisions of the Treaty in which a climate change analysis could play a role, such as information-sharing requirements.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 " the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the final award. And just to emphasise again, Pakistan submits this is the correct approach to paragraph 29 and customary rules: " the Court does not consider it appropriate, and certainly not 'necessary', for it to adopt a precautionary approach and assume the role of policymaker in determining the balance between acceptable environmental considerations to override the balance of other rights and obligations expressly identified in the Treaty in particular the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it is not apparent that climate change requires a new approach to interpreting these provisions. And as we will explain, the components covered by these provisions reflect the means by which a HEP operator can control water that has been stored, and we don't see at the moment a clear link there to climate change. There may be other provisions of the Treaty in which a climate change analysis could play a role, such as information-sharing requirements. (Slide 37) So paragraph 29 of Annexure G is not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 " the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the final award. And just to emphasise again, Pakistan submits this is the correct approach to paragraph 29 and customary rules: " the Court does not consider it appropriate, and certainly not 'necessary', for it to adopt a precautionary approach and assume the role of policymaker in determining the balance between acceptable environmental change and other priorities, or to permit environmental considerations to override the balance of other rights and obligations expressly identified in the Treaty in particular the entitlement of India to divert the waters of a tributary 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it is not apparent that climate change requires a new approach to interpreting these provisions. And as we will explain, the components covered by these provisions reflect the means by which a HEP operator can control water that has been stored, and we don't see at the moment a clear link there to climate change. There may be other provisions of the Treaty in which a climate change analysis could play a role, such as information-sharing requirements. (Slide 37) So paragraph 29 of Annexure G is not a licence to import customary international law. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 " the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the final award. And just to emphasise again, Pakistan submits this is the correct approach to paragraph 29 and customary rules: " the Court does not consider it appropriate, and certainly not 'necessary', for it to adopt a precautionary approach and assume the role of policymaker in determining the balance between acceptable environmental change and other priorities, or to permit environmental considerations to override the balance of other rights and obligations expressly identified in the Treaty in particular the entitlement of India to divert the waters of a tributary of the Jhelum. The Court's authority is more limited 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it is not apparent that climate change requires a new approach to interpreting these provisions. And as we will explain, the components covered by these provisions reflect the means by which a HEP operator can control water that has been stored, and we don't see at the moment a clear link there to climate change. There may be other provisions of the Treaty in which a climate change analysis could play a role, such as information-sharing requirements. (Slide 37) So paragraph 29 of Annexure G is not a licence to import customary international law. It circumscribes the circumstances in which this Court may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 " the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the final award. And just to emphasise again, Pakistan submits this is the correct approach to paragraph 29 and customary rules: " the Court does not consider it appropriate, and certainly not 'necessary', for it to adopt a precautionary approach and assume the role of policymaker in determining the balance between acceptable environmental change and other priorities, or to permit environmental considerations to override the balance of other rights and obligations expressly identified in the Treaty in particular the entitlement of India to divert the waters of a tributary 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it is not apparent that climate change requires a new approach to interpreting these provisions. And as we will explain, the components covered by these provisions reflect the means by which a HEP operator can control water that has been stored, and we don't see at the moment a clear link there to climate change. There may be other provisions of the Treaty in which a climate change analysis could play a role, such as information-sharing requirements. (Slide 37) So paragraph 29 of Annexure G is not a licence to import customary international law. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 " the Court notes that the place of customary international law in the interpretation or application of the Indus Waters Treaty remains subject to Paragraph 29. Unlike the treaty at issue in Iron Rhine" And I'm going to come to that shortly: " this Treaty expressly limits the extent to which the Court may have recourse to, and apply, sources of law beyond the Treaty itself." (Slide 35) The key paragraph is paragraph 112 of the final award. And just to emphasise again, Pakistan submits this is the correct approach to paragraph 29 and customary rules: " the Court does not consider it appropriate, and certainly not 'necessary', for it to adopt a precautionary approach and assume the role of policymaker in determining the balance between acceptable environmental change and other priorities, or to permit environmental considerations to override the balance of other rights and obligations expressly identified in the Treaty in particular the entitlement of India to divert the waters of a tributary of the Jhelum. The Court's authority is more limited 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 interpretation. That's an example of a new technology or a new technique that would have to be addressed in further negotiations between the parties, a protocol or a new agreement. But the more important point is that this exercise of interpretation is not innovation in the abstract. Whether innovation is required for a provision of the Treaty will depend on the specific wording of those provisions. So in the disputes before this Court, which concern paragraphs 8(a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Annexure D, it is not apparent that climate change requires a new approach to interpreting these provisions. And as we will explain, the components covered by these provisions reflect the means by which a HEP operator can control water that has been stored, and we don't see at the moment a clear link there to climate change. There may be other provisions of the Treaty in which a climate change analysis could play a role, such as information-sharing requirements. (Slide 37) So paragraph 29 of Annexure G is not a licence to import customary international law. It circumscribes the circumstances in which this Court may

12:45	1	and it should be viewed as a lex specialis.	12:48 1	this in his determination. This is at page 14 of his
	2	We can turn here to the Kishenganga order on interim	2	determination, and I'm going to read from again near the
	3	measures (PLA-42, paragraph 130), which was looking at	3	bottom:
	4	the relevance of broader practice on provisional	4	"Sovereign rights cannot be exercised without
	5	measures, including Article 41 of the ICJ Statute. And	5	consideration of the limits imposed by the Treaty. In
	6	it found that paragraph 29 is "a kind of lex specialis"	6	this context, it is not appropriate for the NE to
	7	that makes it unnecessary to impose further requirements	7	qualify the Treaty as, inter alia, a 'delimitation' or
	8	that you may find in statute or custom outside of the	8	a 'boundary' Treaty. The task of the NE with respect to
	9	Treaty.	9	the present difference is not to qualify the Treaty but
	10	So I now come to this idea of a boundary treaty,	10	to decide on a question posed by Pakistan with respect
	11	a delimitation treaty, a treaty akin to a peace	11	to Annexure D, Part 3 of the Treaty which deals with
	12	agreement. Paragraph 29 reflects the Treaty's status as	12	New Run-of-River Plants."
	13	akin to these types of treaties.	13	As we have already stated, and was clearly dealt
	14	Mr Chairman, yesterday you observed it may not be	14	with in the Competence Award, the Neutral Expert has no
	15	obvious that one can extend the reasoning of the Temple	15	competence to enter into systemic issues of treaty
	16	of Preah Vihear to this Treaty, and you asked: how far	16	interpretation. So any comment that he makes about
	17	can we go in the idea of a treaty for stability? And	17	a boundary treaty analogy cannot be given any weight.
	18	I want to answer those concerns now, including how this	18	But in any event, reading this paragraph in context, it
	19	was addressed in Baglihar and Kishenganga.	19	seems that Monsieur Lafitte was actually recognising
	20	(Slide 39) But let me just go back to the Temple of	20	that it was not appropriate to his task to qualify the
	21	Preah Vihear statement which Sir Daniel brought you to	21	Treaty, whether as a boundary treaty or something else.
	22	(PLA-101, page 34), which is saying that if you have	22	So Pakistan's argument in that respect was not touched.
	23	a treaty that is establishing something stable and	23	(Slide 43) Turning to the Kishenganga proceedings,
	24	permanent, like a frontier, then you cannot have	24	Pakistan and India did exchange and engage arguments on
	25	"a continuously available process" that can be calling	25	the boundary analogy. And this comes from the
		Page 113		Page 115
10.47	1		12.50 1	
12:47	1	that agreement into question.	12:50 1	transcript.
12:47	2	(Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal	2	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is
12:47	2 3	(Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime	2 3	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going
12:47	2 3 4	(Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that	2 3 4	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point
12:47	2 3 4 5	(Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that:	2 3 4 5	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real:
12:47	2 3 4 5 6	(Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries,	2 3 4 5 6	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word
12:47	2 3 4 5 6 7	(Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful	2 3 4 5 6 7	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and
12:47	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble that I showed you earlier.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation on India to let flow the waters of the Western Rivers
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 (Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble that I showed you earlier. (Slide 41) And this precise point was made by 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation on India to let flow the waters of the Western Rivers subject only to the expressly permitted uses as per
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 (Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble that I showed you earlier. (Slide 41) And this precise point was made by Pakistan in its reply in the Baglihar proceedings. And 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation on India to let flow the waters of the Western Rivers subject only to the expressly permitted uses as per Annexures C, D and E. That is what the second part of
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 (Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble that I showed you earlier. (Slide 41) And this precise point was made by Pakistan in its reply in the Baglihar proceedings. And I'm just going to read from the second half of this 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation on India to let flow the waters of the Western Rivers subject only to the expressly permitted uses as per Annexures C, D and E. That is what the second part of the preamble refers to, the part of the preamble that
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 (Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble that I showed you earlier. (Slide 41) And this precise point was made by Pakistan in its reply in the Baglihar proceedings. And I'm just going to read from the second half of this paragraph: 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation on India to let flow the waters of the Western Rivers subject only to the expressly permitted uses as per Annexures C, D and E. That is what the second part of the preamble refers to, the part of the preamble that India doesn't like and won't read.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 (Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble that I showed you earlier. (Slide 41) And this precise point was made by Pakistan in its reply in the Baglihar proceedings. And I'm just going to read from the second half of this paragraph: "The Preamble to the Treaty itself records that the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation on India to let flow the waters of the Western Rivers subject only to the expressly permitted uses as per Annexures C, D and E. That is what the second part of the preamble refers to, the part of the preamble that India doesn't like and won't read. it says 'most complete'."
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 (Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble that I showed you earlier. (Slide 41) And this precise point was made by Pakistan in its reply in the Baglihar proceedings. And I'm just going to read from the second half of this paragraph: "The Preamble to the Treaty itself records that the parties intended to achieve the development of the Indus 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation on India to let flow the waters of the Western Rivers subject only to the expressly permitted uses as per Annexures C, D and E. That is what the second part of the preamble refers to, the part of the preamble that India doesn't like and won't read. it says 'most complete'." That's referring to "most complete utilisation
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 (Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble that I showed you earlier. (Slide 41) And this precise point was made by Pakistan in its reply in the Baglihar proceedings. And I'm just going to read from the second half of this paragraph: "The Preamble to the Treaty itself records that the parties intended to achieve the development but through 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation on India to let flow the waters of the Western Rivers subject only to the expressly permitted uses as per Annexures C, D and E. That is what the second part of the preamble refers to, the part of the preamble that India doesn't like and won't read. it says 'most complete'." That's referring to "most complete utilisation of the waters":
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 (Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble that I showed you earlier. (Slide 41) And this precise point was made by Pakistan in its reply in the Baglihar proceedings. And I'm just going to read from the second half of this paragraph: "The Preamble to the Treaty itself records that the parties intended to achieve the development of the Indus basin not through cooperative development but through the 'fixing and delimiting' of each other's rights and 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation on India to let flow the waters of the Western Rivers subject only to the expressly permitted uses as per Annexures C, D and E. That is what the second part of the preamble refers to, the part of the preamble that India doesn't like and won't read. it says 'most complete'." That's referring to "most complete utilisation of the waters": "The fact is there isn't enough water to go around,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 (Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble that I showed you earlier. (Slide 41) And this precise point was made by Pakistan in its reply in the Baglihar proceedings. And I'm just going to read from the second half of this paragraph: "The Preamble to the Treaty itself records that the parties intended to achieve the development of the Indus basin not through cooperative development but through the 'fixing and delimiting' of each other's rights and obligations. It is this statement of intent which 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation on India to let flow the waters of the Western Rivers subject only to the expressly permitted uses as per Annexures C, D and E. That is what the second part of the preamble refers to, the part of the preamble that India doesn't like and won't read. it says 'most complete'." That's referring to "most complete utilisation of the waters": "The fact is there isn't enough water to go around, and therefore there is some need for compromise. The
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 (Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble that I showed you earlier. (Slide 41) And this precise point was made by Pakistan in its reply in the Baglihar proceedings. And I'm just going to read from the second half of this paragraph: "The Preamble to the Treaty itself records that the parties intended to achieve the development of the Indus basin not through cooperative development but through the 'fixing and delimiting' of each other's rights and obligations. It is this statement of intent which self-evidently governs the whole Treaty, not any other." 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation on India to let flow the waters of the Western Rivers subject only to the expressly permitted uses as per Annexures C, D and E. That is what the second part of the preamble refers to, the part of the preamble that India doesn't like and won't read. it says 'most complete'." That's referring to "most complete utilisation of the waters": "The fact is there isn't enough water to go around, and therefore there is some need for compromise. The question was whether the compromise was to be achieved
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 (Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble that I showed you earlier. (Slide 41) And this precise point was made by Pakistan in its reply in the Baglihar proceedings. And I'm just going to read from the second half of this paragraph: "The Preamble to the Treaty itself records that the parties intended to achieve the development of the Indus basin not through cooperative development but through the 'fixing and delimiting' of each other's rights and obligations. It is this statement of intent which self-evidently governs the whole Treaty, not any other." (Slide 42) India did not address the point in 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation on India to let flow the waters of the Western Rivers subject only to the expressly permitted uses as per Annexures C, D and E. That is what the second part of the preamble refers to, the part of the preamble that India doesn't like and won't read. it says 'most complete'." That's referring to "most complete utilisation of the waters": "The fact is there isn't enough water to go around, and therefore there is some need for compromise. The question was whether the compromise was to be achieved through the ongoing work of an executive commission,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 (Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble that I showed you earlier. (Slide 41) And this precise point was made by Pakistan in its reply in the Baglihar proceedings. And I'm just going to read from the second half of this paragraph: "The Preamble to the Treaty itself records that the parties intended to achieve the development of the Indus basin not through cooperative development but through the 'fixing and delimiting' of each other's rights and obligations. It is this statement of intent which self-evidently governs the whole Treaty, not any other." (Slide 42) India did not address the point in Baglihar in its written pleadings. But as Mr Minear 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation on India to let flow the waters of the Western Rivers subject only to the expressly permitted uses as per Annexures C, D and E. That is what the second part of the preamble refers to, the part of the preamble that India doesn't like and won't read. it says 'most complete'." That's referring to "most complete utilisation of the waters": "The fact is there isn't enough water to go around, and therefore there is some need for compromise. The question was whether the compromise was to be achieved through the ongoing work of an executive commission, with presumably tie-breaking rules, and so on, or
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 (Slide 40) Building on that in the Bay of Bengal case, which was not dealing with land but with maritime delimitation, the tribunal accepted and followed that reasoning, saying (PLA-102, paragraph 216) that: " maritime delimitations, like land boundaries, must be stable and definitive to ensure a peaceful relationship between the States concerned in the long term." The Indus Waters Treaty is also a kind of delimitation treaty. This is expressed in the preamble that I showed you earlier. (Slide 41) And this precise point was made by Pakistan in its reply in the Baglihar proceedings. And I'm just going to read from the second half of this paragraph: "The Preamble to the Treaty itself records that the parties intended to achieve the development of the Indus basin not through cooperative development but through the 'fixing and delimiting' of each other's rights and obligations. It is this statement of intent which self-evidently governs the whole Treaty, not any other." (Slide 42) India did not address the point in 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	The first extract is from P-0488, and this is quoting Professor Crawford, as he then was. I am going to quote it in full because I think this makes the point real: "The fact is and this is the point of the word 'therefore' in the preamble it was only by fixing and delimiting the allocation of waters that the agreement had a reasonable chance of success, a reasonable chance to survive. And central to that delimitation, a sort of hydraulic boundary treaty, was the obligation on India to let flow the waters of the Western Rivers subject only to the expressly permitted uses as per Annexures C, D and E. That is what the second part of the preamble refers to, the part of the preamble that India doesn't like and won't read. it says 'most complete'." That's referring to "most complete utilisation of the waters": "The fact is there isn't enough water to go around, and therefore there is some need for compromise. The question was whether the compromise was to be achieved through the ongoing work of an executive commission,

12:51 1	That's why I describe the Treaty as a hydraulic boundary	12:54 1	the ICJ, did indeed find that its meaning was evolving.
2	treaty."	2	But that is not analogous to the Indus Waters
3	In his closing statement, which is at P-0129,	3	Treaty. That treaty had specific provisions,
4	he said:	4	Articles 15 and 19 in particular, that called for taking
5	"I said in opening that the Indus Waters Treaty was	5	into account the evolution of environmental norms. And
6	like a hydraulic boundary treaty, and I come back to	6	there was also an ongoing process there which was called
7	that idea. Its concern was to delimit the uses of the	7	a "joint contractual plan". There was also no
8	Western Rivers, and of course to give to India the very	8	equivalent to paragraph 29 of Annexure G.
9	considerable benefit of the use of the Eastern Rivers,	9	The Iron Rhine award was cited in the Kishenganga
10	which has been taken to its full extent."	10	final award at paragraph 111 as a contrasting type of
11	Mr Nariman, for India, replied during the closing,	11	treaty. So whereas the Kishenganga Court rightly said
12	he said that:	12	that this is not an evolutionary interpretation, in
13	"Professor Crawford [has] also stated in rebuttal	13	Iron Rhine there was a living instrument approach.
14	that the treaty was a hydraulic boundary treaty; his own	14	But again, the treaty differs. The object and
15	assessment. I respectfully submit it is not, see	15	purpose of that treaty called for new technological
16	Article XI: it is a treaty for water uses, not	16	developments relating to the operation and capacity of
17	a boundary treaty."	17	the railway to be taken into account by the parties.
18	Article XI(1) of course says that:	18	There was no equivalent to paragraph 29 of Annexure G.
19	"It is understood that this Treaty governs	19	Finally, Costa Rica v Nicaragua, Navigational and
20	the rights and obligations of each Party in relation to	20	Related Rights, was an 1858 treaty fixing the boundary
21	the other with respect to the use of the waters of the	21	along the right bank of the San Juan River. But the
22	Rivers"	22	real dispute before the court was the navigational
23	Of course, we would say this has to be seen in the	23	rights of Costa Rica under that treaty and the
24	light of the object and purpose, context and travaux of	24	interpretation of the word "commerce": whether it had
25	the Treaty.	25	the meaning in 1858 or the meaning in 2009, at the time
	Page 117		Page 119
12:53 1	Now, the Kishenganga Court did not directly address	12:56 1	it was decided.
12:53 1 2	this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope	12:56 1 2	And there the court said this was a deliberate use
	this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and		And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms
2 3 4	this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the	2 3 4	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had
2 3 4 5	this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to	2 3 4 5	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G.
2 3 4 5 6	this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position.	2 3 4 5 6	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean
2 3 4 5 6 7	this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second	2 3 4 5 6 7	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the product of three specific bargains, and could not, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our scenario. Our legal regime is premised on stability.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the product of three specific bargains, and could not, therefore, create a precedent for others. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our scenario. Our legal regime is premised on stability. If there are no further questions and I realise
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the product of three specific bargains, and could not, therefore, create a precedent for others. (Slide 47) Mr Chairman, I'm coming to my last point, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our scenario. Our legal regime is premised on stability. If there are no further questions and I realise we are up to the lunch break that concludes my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the product of three specific bargains, and could not, therefore, create a precedent for others. (Slide 47) Mr Chairman, I'm coming to my last point, which is that yesterday you noted and also earlier 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our scenario. Our legal regime is premised on stability. If there are no further questions and I realise we are up to the lunch break that concludes my submissions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the product of three specific bargains, and could not, therefore, create a precedent for others. (Slide 47) Mr Chairman, I'm coming to my last point, which is that yesterday you noted and also earlier today that we have cases where treaties are viewed as 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our scenario. Our legal regime is premised on stability. If there are no further questions and I realise we are up to the lunch break that concludes my submissions. (12.57 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the product of three specific bargains, and could not, therefore, create a precedent for others. (Slide 47) Mr Chairman, I'm coming to my last point, which is that yesterday you noted and also earlier today that we have cases where treaties are viewed as a "living instrument" where the meaning isn't fixed. In 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our scenario. Our legal regime is premised on stability. If there are no further questions and I realise we are up to the lunch break that concludes my submissions. (12.57 pm) Questions from THE COURT
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the product of three specific bargains, and could not, therefore, create a precedent for others. (Slide 47) Mr Chairman, I'm coming to my last point, which is that yesterday you noted and also earlier today that we have cases where treaties are viewed as a "living instrument" where the meaning isn't fixed. In Pakistan's submission, those cases can be distinguished 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our scenario. Our legal regime is premised on stability. If there are no further questions and I realise we are up to the lunch break that concludes my submissions. (12.57 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: So just one question from me, Professor Webb.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the product of three specific bargains, and could not, therefore, create a precedent for others. (Slide 47) Mr Chairman, I'm coming to my last point, which is that yesterday you noted and also earlier today that we have cases where treaties are viewed as a "living instrument" where the meaning isn't fixed. In Pakistan's submission, those cases can be distinguished from the Indus Waters Treaty. And I'm just going to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our scenario. Our legal regime is premised on stability. If there are no further questions and I realise we are up to the lunch break that concludes my submissions. (12.57 pm) Questions from THE COURT
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the product of three specific bargains, and could not, therefore, create a precedent for others. (Slide 47) Mr Chairman, I'm coming to my last point, which is that yesterday you noted and also earlier today that we have cases where treaties are viewed as a "living instrument" where the meaning isn't fixed. In Pakistan's submission, those cases can be distinguished from the Indus Waters Treaty. And I'm just going to highlight three of them, and I can also address Aegean 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our scenario. Our legal regime is premised on stability. If there are no further questions and I realise we are up to the lunch break that concludes my submissions. (12.57 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: So just one question from me, Professor Webb. Again, just looking at the approach you've taken in
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the product of three specific bargains, and could not, therefore, create a precedent for others. (Slide 47) Mr Chairman, I'm coming to my last point, which is that yesterday you noted and also earlier today that we have cases where treaties are viewed as a "living instrument" where the meaning isn't fixed. In Pakistan's submission, those cases can be distinguished from the Indus Waters Treaty. And I'm just going to highlight three of them, and I can also address Aegean Continental Shelf. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our scenario. Our legal regime is premised on stability. If there are no further questions and I realise we are up to the lunch break that concludes my submissions. (12.57 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: So just one question from me, Professor Webb. Again, just looking at the approach you've taken in the Memorial and the way that you proceeded today with
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the product of three specific bargains, and could not, therefore, create a precedent for others. (Slide 47) Mr Chairman, I'm coming to my last point, which is that yesterday you noted and also earlier today that we have cases where treaties are viewed as a "living instrument" where the meaning isn't fixed. In Pakistan's submission, those cases can be distinguished from the Indus Waters Treaty. And I'm just going to highlight three of them, and I can also address Aegean 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our scenario. Our legal regime is premised on stability. If there are no further questions and I realise we are up to the lunch break that concludes my submissions. (12.57 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: So just one question from me, Professor Webb. Again, just looking at the approach you've taken in the Memorial and the way that you proceeded today with your presentation, it seems as though you may be arguing
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the product of three specific bargains, and could not, therefore, create a precedent for others. (Slide 47) Mr Chairman, I'm coming to my last point, which is that yesterday you noted and also earlier today that we have cases where treaties are viewed as a "living instrument" where the meaning isn't fixed. In Pakistan's submission, those cases can be distinguished from the Indus Waters Treaty. And I'm just going to highlight three of them, and I can also address Aegean Continental Shelf. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our scenario. Our legal regime is premised on stability. If there are no further questions and I realise we are up to the lunch break that concludes my submissions. (12.57 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: So just one question from me, Professor Webb. Again, just looking at the approach you've taken in the Memorial and the way that you proceeded today with your presentation, it seems as though you may be arguing that there are certain treaties that, as a whole, are
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the product of three specific bargains, and could not, therefore, create a precedent for others. (Slide 47) Mr Chairman, I'm coming to my last point, which is that yesterday you noted and also earlier today that we have cases where treaties are viewed as a "living instrument" where the meaning isn't fixed. In Pakistan's submission, those cases can be distinguished from the Indus Waters Treaty. And I'm just going to highlight three of them, and I can also address Aegean Continental Shelf. The first is the Gabcikovo-Nagymaros Project (PLA-94). That was a treaty of 1977 regarding a specific construction and operation, and the court, 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our scenario. Our legal regime is premised on stability. If there are no further questions and I realise we are up to the lunch break that concludes my submissions. (12.57 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: So just one question from me, Professor Webb. Again, just looking at the approach you've taken in the Memorial and the way that you proceeded today with your presentation, it seems as though you may be arguing that there are certain treaties that, as a whole, are not susceptible to evolutive interpretation. But that clearly isn't the lesson of, say, the 2009 Navigational
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 this phrase "hydraulic boundary treaty". But as I hope I've shown you, in its approach on the object and purpose and its approach to the interpretation of the provisions and the role of Article 29, it appears to have accepted Pakistan's position. (Slide 46) It's also worth noting the second paragraph of Article XI of the Treaty, which says: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed as in any way establishing any general principle of law or any precedent." This is because the Treaty was bespoke. It was the product of three specific bargains, and could not, therefore, create a precedent for others. (Slide 47) Mr Chairman, I'm coming to my last point, which is that yesterday you noted and also earlier today that we have cases where treaties are viewed as a "living instrument" where the meaning isn't fixed. In Pakistan's submission, those cases can be distinguished from the Indus Waters Treaty. And I'm just going to highlight three of them, and I can also address Aegean Continental Shelf. The first is the Gabcikovo-Nagymaros Project (PLA-94). That was a treaty of 1977 regarding 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	And there the court said this was a deliberate use of generic terms: not special meaning, but generic terms that were meant to evolve over time. And they also had no equivalent of paragraph 29 of Annexure G. In that same judgment, they referred to the Aegean Continental Shelf case that you referred to earlier, Mr Chairman. That's where we also had generic terms: "domestic jurisdiction", "territorial status". And it's interesting that in that case, the Aegean case, the court said the legal regime of perpetuity in the Aegean case was premised on evolution. That is not our scenario. Our legal regime is premised on stability. If there are no further questions and I realise we are up to the lunch break that concludes my submissions. (12.57 pm) Questions from THE COURT THE CHAIRMAN: So just one question from me, Professor Webb. Again, just looking at the approach you've taken in the Memorial and the way that you proceeded today with your presentation, it seems as though you may be arguing that there are certain treaties that, as a whole, are not susceptible to evolutive interpretation. But that

12:58 1	Rights case, which is basically a boundary treaty that	13:01 1	innovations, but they always have to serve the bargains
12.50 1	did have within it terms that the court regarded as	2	underpinning the Treaty and the understanding that this
3	evolutionary in nature.	3	Treaty was meant to provide a legal regime of perpetuity
4	PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes.	4	premised on stability.
5	THE CHAIRMAN: So it seems to me that it's relevant to think	5	THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much.
6	about this Treaty as a whole, and its object and	6	During the course of your presentation there was
0 7	purpose, which presumably is to create stability on	7	a crowd outside the window that applauded, so you had
8	a very significant level; but that within it, there	8	certainly a receptive group behind us, and certainly the
9	could easily be terms that might be regarded as	9	Court was very receptive to your arguments as well. So
10	evolutionary in nature. And then the question becomes:	10	thank you very much, Professor Webb.
10	are there any such terms? And in the context in which	10	As you say, we are at the lunch hour. So we will
11	they appear in the Treaty, are they to be regarded in	11	break, and see everyone at 2 o'clock this afternoon.
12	that way? And I assume that's what we will be talking	12	Thank you very much.
13	about in some of your later presentations.	13	(1.02 pm)
14	So I'm just trying to follow up on clarifying.	14	(Adjourned until 2.00 pm)
15	You're not making the pitch that the Treaty as a whole	15	(2.04 pm)
10	has to be approached through a static interpretation,	10	THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back, everyone. I hope you had
17	but that there may well be provisions that are	17	a pleasant lunch.
10	evolutionary in nature. And in that regard, if that's	10	There was an application received that Pakistan be
20	correct, I'm wondering if you draw any significance from	20	allowed to refer to two articles, one by Dr Morris and
20	the fact that there are several provisions within the	20	one by Mr Ren, and we certainly are agreeable to them
21	Treaty where the reference to what is customary	21	being referenced. Was the application to introduce them
22	specifies "customary on the Effective Date", which,	22	into the record as well?
23 24	pursuant to the definition of "Effective Date", is	23 24	SIR DANIEL: Yes, I think it was an application to introduce
24	1 April 1960; whereas in other places, including in	25	them into the record, because Dr Morris is intending to
23		25	
	Page 121		Page 123
12:59 1	Annexure D, paragraph 8, that language doesn't appear.	14:04 1	refer to them in response to the questions raised by
12:59 1 2	Annexure D, paragraph 8, that language doesn't appear. PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is	14:04 1 2	refer to them in response to the questions raised by Dr Blackmore.
2	PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is	2	Dr Blackmore.
2 3	PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is	2 3	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So
2 3 4	PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to	2 3 4	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with
2 3 4 5	PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the	2 3 4 5	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation.
2 3 4 5 6	PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to	2 3 4 5 6	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there.
2 3 4 5 6 7	PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to	2 3 4 5 6 7	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and the reference "on the Effective Date". 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm) Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and the reference "on the Effective Date". But I would just like to clarify: we wouldn't say 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm) Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability MR FIETTA: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, members of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and the reference "on the Effective Date". But I would just like to clarify: we wouldn't say that there are specific terms that are generic in the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm) Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability MR FIETTA: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. It's an honour for me to appear again on behalf
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and the reference "on the Effective Date". But I would just like to clarify: we wouldn't say that there are specific terms that are generic in the sense that "commerce" was in the Navigational Rights 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm) Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability MR FIETTA: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. It's an honour for me to appear again on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to address you on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and the reference "on the Effective Date". But I would just like to clarify: we wouldn't say that there are specific terms that are generic in the sense that "commerce" was in the Navigational Rights case. We wouldn't make it as broad as that, because 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm) Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability MR FIETTA: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. It's an honour for me to appear again on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to address you on the subject of water usage and sustainability on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and the reference "on the Effective Date". But I would just like to clarify: we wouldn't say that there are specific terms that are generic in the sense that "commerce" was in the Navigational Rights case. We wouldn't make it as broad as that, because that was very much in the context of the court looking 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm) Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability MR FIETTA: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. It's an honour for me to appear again on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to address you on the subject of water usage and sustainability on the Western Rivers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and the reference "on the Effective Date". But I would just like to clarify: we wouldn't say that there are specific terms that are generic in the sense that "commerce" was in the Navigational Rights case. We wouldn't make it as broad as that, because that was very much in the context of the court looking at the intention the parties that this had to keep 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm) Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability MR FIETTA: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. It's an honour for me to appear again on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to address you on the subject of water usage and sustainability on the Western Rivers. Before we start, I have delivered to you or my
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and the reference "on the Effective Date". But I would just like to clarify: we wouldn't say that there are specific terms that are generic in the sense that "commerce" was in the Navigational Rights case. We wouldn't make it as broad as that, because that was very much in the context of the court looking at the intention the parties that this had to keep evolving. That's not the intention that we see from the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm) Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability MR FIETTA: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. It's an honour for me to appear again on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to address you on the subject of water usage and sustainability on the Western Rivers. Before we start, I have delivered to you or my colleagues have a slide pack which should be in front
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and the reference "on the Effective Date". But I would just like to clarify: we wouldn't say that there are specific terms that are generic in the sense that "commerce" was in the Navigational Rights case. We wouldn't make it as broad as that, because that was very much in the context of the court looking at the intention the parties that this had to keep evolving. That's not the intention that we see from the parties, nor the object and purpose of the Treaty, when 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm) Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability MR FIETTA: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. It's an honour for me to appear again on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to address you on the subject of water usage and sustainability on the Western Rivers. Before we start, I have delivered to you or my colleagues have a slide pack which should be in front of you; I think it may be behind tab 4 in your folders.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and the reference "on the Effective Date". But I would just like to clarify: we wouldn't say that there are specific terms that are generic in the sense that "commerce" was in the Navigational Rights case. We wouldn't make it as broad as that, because that was very much in the context of the court looking at the intention the parties that this had to keep evolving. That's not the intention that we see from the parties, nor the object and purpose of the Treaty, when we look at terms like "sound", like "economical", like 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm) Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability MR FIETTA: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. It's an honour for me to appear again on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to address you on the subject of water usage and sustainability on the Western Rivers. Before we start, I have delivered to you or my colleagues have a slide pack which should be in front of you; I think it may be behind tab 4 in your folders. All of the slides of course will appear on the screen,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and the reference "on the Effective Date". But I would just like to clarify: we wouldn't say that there are specific terms that are generic in the sense that "commerce" was in the Navigational Rights case. We wouldn't make it as broad as that, because that was very much in the context of the court looking at the intention the parties that this had to keep evolving. That's not the intention that we see from the parties, nor the object and purpose of the Treaty, when we look at terms like "sound", like "economical", like "satisfactory". 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm) Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability MR FIETTA: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. It's an honour for me to appear again on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to address you on the subject of water usage and sustainability on the Western Rivers. Before we start, I have delivered to you or my colleagues have a slide pack which should be in front of you; I think it may be behind tab 4 in your folders. All of the slides of course will appear on the screen, but you will want to keep it to hand, possibly,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and the reference "on the Effective Date". But I would just like to clarify: we wouldn't say that there are specific terms that are generic in the sense that "commerce" was in the Navigational Rights case. We wouldn't make it as broad as that, because that was very much in the context of the court looking at the intention the parties that this had to keep evolving. That's not the intention that we see from the parties, nor the object and purpose of the Treaty, when we look at terms like "sound", like "economical", like "satisfactory". 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm) Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability MR FIETTA: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. It's an honour for me to appear again on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to address you on the subject of water usage and sustainability on the Western Rivers. Before we start, I have delivered to you or my colleagues have a slide pack which should be in front of you; I think it may be behind tab 4 in your folders. All of the slides of course will appear on the screen, but you will want to keep it to hand, possibly, particularly when we get to some of the presentation on
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and the reference "on the Effective Date". But I would just like to clarify: we wouldn't say that there are specific terms that are generic in the sense that "commerce" was in the Navigational Rights case. We wouldn't make it as broad as that, because that was very much in the context of the court looking at the intention the parties that this had to keep evolving. That's not the intention that we see from the parties, nor the object and purpose of the Treaty, when we look at terms like "sound", like "economical", like "satisfactory". 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm) Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability MR FIETTA: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. It's an honour for me to appear again on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to address you on the subject of water usage and sustainability on the Western Rivers. Before we start, I have delivered to you or my colleagues have a slide pack which should be in front of you; I think it may be behind tab 4 in your folders. All of the slides of course will appear on the screen, but you will want to keep it to hand, possibly,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 PROFESSOR WEBB: Yes. So we would not say that it is completely static in nature. We have set out how it is meant to provide security and stability. It is akin to peace, it is akin to a boundary. It cannot, in the words of the Temple of Preah Vihear case, be subject to "a continuously available process". But that's not to say that it can't be applied to current conditions, and certainly it has to be. As I said, this will become more concrete as we look at the specific provisions of paragraph 8, including this reference to "customary and accepted practice" and the reference "on the Effective Date". But I would just like to clarify: we wouldn't say that there are specific terms that are generic in the sense that "commerce" was in the Navigational Rights case. We wouldn't make it as broad as that, because that was very much in the context of the court looking at the intention the parties that this had to keep evolving. That's not the intention that we see from the parties, nor the object and purpose of the Treaty, when we look at terms like "sound", like "economical", like "satisfactory". 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Dr Blackmore. THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, the application is granted. So please do introduce them into the record with appropriate numerical designation. SIR DANIEL: In the next two minutes they'll be there. THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you. Okay, I think at this point we are ready to hear from Mr Fietta. So whenever you're ready, please proceed. MR FIETTA: Thank you. (2.05 pm) Submissions on Water Usage and Sustainability MR FIETTA: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, members of the Court. It's an honour for me to appear again on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to address you on the subject of water usage and sustainability on the Western Rivers. Before we start, I have delivered to you or my colleagues have a slide pack which should be in front of you; I think it may be behind tab 4 in your folders. All of the slides of course will appear on the screen, but you will want to keep it to hand, possibly, particularly when we get to some of the presentation on

14:05 1	because we have some A3 illustrations at the back.	14:09 1	issues.
2	So when we get to that, you'll see at the back of	2	My first slide sets out the structure of my
3	the tab there are four A3 sheets relating to the	3	presentation.
4	irrigation network, and the reason we've blown them up	4	I will start by giving an overview of the Indus
5	is to make them legible for you. And it may be helpful	5	Basin and the Western and Eastern Rivers.
6	to have those open when we get to it, and of course	6	I will then discuss how in my second part
7	you're free to open the remainder of the slideshow as	7	India has worked to maximise its hydroelectric and
8	you see fit as we go through.	8	irrigation development on the Eastern Rivers since 1960,
9	THE CHAIRMAN: Why don't we let the Secretariat distribute	9	such that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan.
10	those before you keep going, Mr Fietta, just so that	10	The third part will look at seasonal flows, and
11	everyone has it in front of them before you address the	10	agricultural usage and irrigation on the Western
12	substance.	12	Rivers and this will probably be the most substantial
13	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, may I also just say I think the	13	part of my presentation including Pakistan's
14	audiovisual is not working for some reason. So I don't	13	irrigation network on the Western Rivers in order to
15	know whether it needs to be turned on. We can't project	15	supply water to large areas previously supplied by the
16	slides just at the moment.	16	Eastern Rivers.
17	There we are. Thank you.	17	The fourth part of my presentation will give
18	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we are all set now.	18	an overview of Pakistani and Indian power generation
19	MR FIETTA: Very good.	19	usage on the Western Rivers; the latter of which, the
20	So this topic of water usage and sustainability is	20	Indian usage, is of course closely regulated by the
21	essential context to Pakistan's right under Article III	21	Treaty.
22	of the Treaty to "receive for unrestricted use" the	22	The fifth topic will address demand-side pressures
23	waters of the Western Rivers, and India's, of course,	23	on the Western Rivers in Pakistan, caused in particular
24	concomitant obligation under that provision to "let flow	24	by dramatic demographic changes and associated growth in
25	all the waters of the Western Rivers".	25	agricultural and other use in Pakistan.
		_	
	Page 125		Page 127
14:07 1	I will demonstrate Pakistan's overwhelming reliance	14:10 1	The sixth topic, the penultimate one, will address
14:07 1 2	I will demonstrate Pakistan's overwhelming reliance on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in	14:10 1 2	The sixth topic, the penultimate one, will address the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent
			* *
2	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in	2	the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent
2 3	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern	2 3	the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part.
2 3 4	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan.	2 3 4	the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks
2 3 4 5	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for	2 3 4 5	the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part.
2 3 4 5 6	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since	2 3 4 5 6	the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change.And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part.So I will begin by presenting an overview of the
2 3 4 5 6 7	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside	2 3 4 5 6 7	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change. Much of my presentation today elaborates on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River, with its six principal tributaries, the Jhelum, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change. Much of my presentation today elaborates on submissions made by Pakistan at chapter 3 of its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River, with its six principal tributaries, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej, the Beas and the Kabul;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change. Much of my presentation today elaborates on submissions made by Pakistan at chapter 3 of its Memorial dated 22 March 2024. That chapter was entitled	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River, with its six principal tributaries, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej, the Beas and the Kabul; the last of which of course, the Kabul River, is not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change. Much of my presentation today elaborates on submissions made by Pakistan at chapter 3 of its Memorial dated 22 March 2024. That chapter was entitled "The Indus Basin Topography, Hydrology, Demography,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River, with its six principal tributaries, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej, the Beas and the Kabul; the last of which of course, the Kabul River, is not regulated by the Treaty.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change. Much of my presentation today elaborates on submissions made by Pakistan at chapter 3 of its Memorial dated 22 March 2024. That chapter was entitled "The Indus Basin Topography, Hydrology, Demography, Water Security and Climate Change". However, some of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River, with its six principal tributaries, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej, the Beas and the Kabul; the last of which of course, the Kabul River, is not regulated by the Treaty.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change. Much of my presentation today elaborates on submissions made by Pakistan at chapter 3 of its Memorial dated 22 March 2024. That chapter was entitled "The Indus Basin Topography, Hydrology, Demography, Water Security and Climate Change". However, some of the more technical aspects of that chapter of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River, with its six principal tributaries, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej, the Beas and the Kabul; the last of which of course, the Kabul River, is not regulated by the Treaty. This map also shows the location of all of Pakistan's major cities, most of which are located
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change. Much of my presentation today elaborates on submissions made by Pakistan at chapter 3 of its Memorial dated 22 March 2024. That chapter was entitled "The Indus Basin Topography, Hydrology, Demography, Water Security and Climate Change". However, some of the more technical aspects of that chapter of the Memorial will be picked up by my colleague Dr Morris,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River, with its six principal tributaries, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej, the Beas and the Kabul; the last of which of course, the Kabul River, is not regulated by the Treaty. This map also shows the location of all of Pakistan's major cities, most of which are located within the drainage area of the Indus Basin, as we will
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change. Much of my presentation today elaborates on submissions made by Pakistan at chapter 3 of its Memorial dated 22 March 2024. That chapter was entitled "The Indus Basin Topography, Hydrology, Demography, Water Security and Climate Change". However, some of the more technical aspects of that chapter of the Memorial will be picked up by my colleague Dr Morris, who will address you immediately after me with	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River, with its six principal tributaries, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej, the Beas and the Kabul; the last of which of course, the Kabul River, is not regulated by the Treaty. This map also shows the location of all of Pakistan's major cities, most of which are located within the drainage area of the Indus Basin, as we will see. This fact is, of course, unsurprising, because the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change. Much of my presentation today elaborates on submissions made by Pakistan at chapter 3 of its Memorial dated 22 March 2024. That chapter was entitled "The Indus Basin Topography, Hydrology, Demography, Water Security and Climate Change". However, some of the more technical aspects of that chapter of the Memorial will be picked up by my colleague Dr Morris, who will address you immediately after me with an engineer's perspective on the design and operation of	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River, with its six principal tributaries, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej, the Beas and the Kabul; the last of which of course, the Kabul River, is not regulated by the Treaty. This map also shows the location of all of Pakistan's major cities, most of which are located within the drainage area of the Indus Basin, as we will see. This fact is, of course, unsurprising, because the Indus is Pakistan's only river system of any note. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change. Much of my presentation today elaborates on submissions made by Pakistan at chapter 3 of its Memorial dated 22 March 2024. That chapter was entitled "The Indus Basin Topography, Hydrology, Demography, Water Security and Climate Change". However, some of the more technical aspects of that chapter of the Memorial will be picked up by my colleague Dr Morris, who will address you immediately after me with an engineer's perspective on the design and operation of Himalayan run-of-river HEPs. In particular, Dr Morris	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River, with its six principal tributaries, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej, the Beas and the Kabul; the last of which of course, the Kabul River, is not regulated by the Treaty. This map also shows the location of all of Pakistan's major cities, most of which are located within the drainage area of the Indus Basin, as we will see. This fact is, of course, unsurprising, because the Indus is Pakistan's only river system of any note. It supplies approximately 95% of the country's water;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change. Much of my presentation today elaborates on submissions made by Pakistan at chapter 3 of its Memorial dated 22 March 2024. That chapter was entitled "The Indus Basin Topography, Hydrology, Demography, Water Security and Climate Change". However, some of the more technical aspects of that chapter of the Memorial will be picked up by my colleague Dr Morris, who will address you immediately after me with an engineer's perspective on the design and operation of Himalayan run-of-river HEPs. In particular, Dr Morris will address you on issues of geology, sediment and	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River, with its six principal tributaries, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej, the Beas and the Kabul; the last of which of course, the Kabul River, is not regulated by the Treaty. This map also shows the location of all of Pakistan's major cities, most of which are located within the drainage area of the Indus Basin, as we will see. This fact is, of course, unsurprising, because the Indus is Pakistan's only river system of any note. It supplies approximately 95% of the country's water; that's Exhibit P-248, page 2.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change. Much of my presentation today elaborates on submissions made by Pakistan at chapter 3 of its Memorial dated 22 March 2024. That chapter was entitled "The Indus Basin Topography, Hydrology, Demography, Water Security and Climate Change". However, some of the more technical aspects of that chapter of the Memorial will be picked up by my colleague Dr Morris, who will address you immediately after me with an engineer's perspective on the design and operation of Himalayan run-of-river HEPs. In particular, Dr Morris will address you on issues of geology, sediment and sediment management, and relevant issues of hydrology in	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River, with its six principal tributaries, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej, the Beas and the Kabul; the last of which of course, the Kabul River, is not regulated by the Treaty. This map also shows the location of all of Pakistan's major cities, most of which are located within the drainage area of the Indus Basin, as we will see. This fact is, of course, unsurprising, because the Indus is Pakistan's only river system of any note. It supplies approximately 95% of the country's water; that's Exhibit P-248, page 2.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change. Much of my presentation today elaborates on submissions made by Pakistan at chapter 3 of its Memorial dated 22 March 2024. That chapter was entitled "The Indus Basin Topography, Hydrology, Demography, Water Security and Climate Change". However, some of the more technical aspects of that chapter of the Memorial will be picked up by my colleague Dr Morris, who will address you immediately after me with an engineer's perspective on the design and operation of Himalayan run-of-river HEPs. In particular, Dr Morris will address you on issues of geology, sediment and	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River, with its six principal tributaries, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej, the Beas and the Kabul; the last of which of course, the Kabul River, is not regulated by the Treaty. This map also shows the location of all of Pakistan's major cities, most of which are located within the drainage area of the Indus Basin, as we will see. This fact is, of course, unsurprising, because the Indus is Pakistan's only river system of any note. It supplies approximately 95% of the country's water; that's Exhibit P-248, page 2.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	on the free flow of the Western Rivers, especially in light of India's total exploitation of the Eastern Rivers, which now essentially run dry in Pakistan. I will explain also the substantial growth in demand for water from the Western Rivers in Pakistan, both since the 1960s and projected into the future. And alongside that increase in demand, I will identify supply-side pressures created by a reduction in flows on the Western Rivers received since 1960, which threaten to become significantly worse later this century due to the impacts mainly of climate change. Much of my presentation today elaborates on submissions made by Pakistan at chapter 3 of its Memorial dated 22 March 2024. That chapter was entitled "The Indus Basin Topography, Hydrology, Demography, Water Security and Climate Change". However, some of the more technical aspects of that chapter of the Memorial will be picked up by my colleague Dr Morris, who will address you immediately after me with an engineer's perspective on the design and operation of Himalayan run-of-river HEPs. In particular, Dr Morris will address you on issues of geology, sediment and sediment management, and relevant issues of hydrology in	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 the reduction in flows on the Western Rivers over recent years, and the potential impacts of climate change. And then I will make some brief concluding remarks in the final part. So I will begin by presenting an overview of the Indus Basin, and a brief refresher on the six rivers which are the focal point of the Treaty. This is slide 2. I can do that by reference to my first map, which will be a template for a number of maps that will follow. Here we see the Indus River system: the Indus River, with its six principal tributaries, the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Sutlej, the Beas and the Kabul; the last of which of course, the Kabul River, is not regulated by the Treaty. This map also shows the location of all of Pakistan's major cities, most of which are located within the drainage area of the Indus Basin, as we will see. This fact is, of course, unsurprising, because the Indus is Pakistan's only river system of any note. It supplies approximately 95% of the country's water; that's Exhibit P-248, page 2.

14:12 1	at map 3.3 of the Memorial; we don't need to go to that	14:15 1	in India.
2	now. And the Ganges-Brahmaputra-Meghna river system	2	The Ravi flows through India's Punjab province, and
3	accounts for almost 60% of India's water needs, while	3	then meanders along the India-Pakistan working boundary
4	the Eastern Rivers of the Indus Basin here, allocated to	4	for approximately 100 kilometres or so, before finally
5	India under the Treaty, account for just 4% of India's	5	entering Pakistan and converging with the Chenab. So
6	needs. That's Exhibit P-247, page 265.	6	there you can see the Ravi joining the Chenab in
7	So my next slide (3) shows that Pakistan administers	7	Pakistan's territory on the slide.
8	the vast majority, that's the green area: approximately	8	(Slide 9) And the Beas merges with the Sutlej before
9	59% of the Indus River Basin. India, by contrast,	9	entering Pakistan. The Beas has just appeared. You
10	administers just over 20%, 21%, a large part of which	10	will see that it enters the Sutlej River it's
11	approximately 100,000 square kilometres of which	11	a tributary, effectively, of the Sutlej and it joins
12	comprises Indian Administered Kashmir.	12	the Sutlej before crossing the boundary into Pakistan.
13	This slide and those that follow also show India's	13	The Sutlej is much longer, therefore, than the Beas.
14	position as the de facto upper riparian on each of the	14	It rises in the Tibetan highlands before flowing through
15	three [Western] Rivers, and of course each of the	15	Himachal Pradesh and the Indian Punjab, then passing
16	Eastern Rivers as well.	16	into the Pakistani Punjab and converging with the Chenab
17	My next series of slides introduces each of the	17	downstream.
18	three Western Rivers.	18	So these slides show the historic course the
19	(Slide 4) So we start with the Indus itself, here on	19	natural course of the rivers of the Indus. However,
20	the slide. This rises in the Tibetan highlands of	20	the waters of the Eastern Rivers of course no longer
21	Western China, it flows through Indian Administered	21	reach Pakistan due to Indian development upstream. With
22	Kashmir, entering Pakistani territory through	22	the exception of occasional floodwater released by
23	Gilgit-Baltistan, before flowing approximately	23	India, the only water that ever reaches the riverbeds of
24	2,000 kilometres through the entire length of Pakistan,	24	the Eastern Rivers today is actually supplied by waters
25	and discharging into the Arabian Sea near Karachi.	25	transported from the Western Rivers by the world's
	Page 129		Page 131
14:14 1	The second Western River is the Chenab, which has	14:16 1	largest irrigation network, a topic to which I will
14:14 1 2	The second Western River is the Chenab, which has just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is	14:16 1 2	largest irrigation network, a topic to which I will return.
2	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is	2	return.
2 3	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal	2 3	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier
2 3 4	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered	2 3 4	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This
2 3 4 5	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter	2 3 4 5	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square
2 3 4 5 6	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can	2 3 4 5 6	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45.
2 3 4 5 6 7	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map.	2 3 4 5 6 7	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the Jhelum, which is a tributary of the Indus that originates in Indian Administered Kashmir, and is joined	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from rainfall, and a disproportionate amount of that rainfall
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the Jhelum, which is a tributary of the Indus that originates in Indian Administered Kashmir, and is joined by the Neelum-Kishenganga tributary in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from rainfall, and a disproportionate amount of that rainfall falls in the Karakoram foothills, which are of course
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the Jhelum, which is a tributary of the Indus that originates in Indian Administered Kashmir, and is joined	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from rainfall, and a disproportionate amount of that rainfall
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the Jhelum, which is a tributary of the Indus that originates in Indian Administered Kashmir, and is joined by the Neelum-Kishenganga tributary in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from rainfall, and a disproportionate amount of that rainfall falls in the Karakoram foothills, which are of course
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the Jhelum, which is a tributary of the Indus that originates in Indian Administered Kashmir, and is joined by the Neelum-Kishenganga tributary in Pakistan-administered Kashmir, before descending into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from rainfall, and a disproportionate amount of that rainfall falls in the Karakoram foothills, which are of course upstream. Most of these critical areas of glacier, snow and rainfall, including those feeding the Chenab and the Jhelum Rivers, are located in India or in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the Jhelum, which is a tributary of the Indus that originates in Indian Administered Kashmir, and is joined by the Neelum-Kishenganga tributary in Pakistan-administered Kashmir, before descending into the Punjab province of Pakistan and merging with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from rainfall, and a disproportionate amount of that rainfall falls in the Karakoram foothills, which are of course upstream. Most of these critical areas of glacier, snow and rainfall, including those feeding the Chenab and the Jhelum Rivers, are located in India or in Indian-controlled territory. Consequently, but for the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the Jhelum, which is a tributary of the Indus that originates in Indian Administered Kashmir, and is joined by the Neelum-Kishenganga tributary in Pakistan-administered Kashmir, before descending into the Punjab province of Pakistan and merging with the Chenab. You can see the route of the Jhelum there on slide 7.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from rainfall, and a disproportionate amount of that rainfall falls in the Karakoram foothills, which are of course upstream. Most of these critical areas of glacier, snow and rainfall, including those feeding the Chenab and the Jhelum Rivers, are located in India or in Indian-controlled territory. Consequently, but for the Treaty, it is no exaggeration to say that India, as the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the Jhelum, which is a tributary of the Indus that originates in Indian Administered Kashmir, and is joined by the Neelum-Kishenganga tributary in Pakistan-administered Kashmir, before descending into the Punjab province of Pakistan and merging with the Chenab. You can see the route of the Jhelum there on slide 7. So that's the Western Rivers in overview.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from rainfall, and a disproportionate amount of that rainfall falls in the Karakoram foothills, which are of course upstream. Most of these critical areas of glacier, snow and rainfall, including those feeding the Chenab and the Jhelum Rivers, are located in India or in Indian-controlled territory. Consequently, but for the Treaty, it is no exaggeration to say that India, as the upper riparian, would have the potential ability to
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the Jhelum, which is a tributary of the Indus that originates in Indian Administered Kashmir, and is joined by the Neelum-Kishenganga tributary in Pakistan-administered Kashmir, before descending into the Punjab province of Pakistan and merging with the Chenab. You can see the route of the Jhelum there on slide 7. So that's the Western Rivers in overview. Then we come to the Eastern Rivers. They comprise	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from rainfall, and a disproportionate amount of that rainfall falls in the Karakoram foothills, which are of course upstream. Most of these critical areas of glacier, snow and rainfall, including those feeding the Chenab and the Jhelum Rivers, are located in India or in Indian-controlled territory. Consequently, but for the Treaty, it is no exaggeration to say that India, as the upper riparian, would have the potential ability to control the flows of the Western Rivers.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the Jhelum, which is a tributary of the Indus that originates in Indian Administered Kashmir, and is joined by the Neelum-Kishenganga tributary in Pakistan-administered Kashmir, before descending into the Punjab province of Pakistan and merging with the Chenab. You can see the route of the Jhelum there on slide 7. So that's the Western Rivers in overview. Then we come to the Eastern Rivers. They comprise the Ravi, the Beas and the Sutlej, of course. The Ravi	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from rainfall, and a disproportionate amount of that rainfall falls in the Karakoram foothills, which are of course upstream. Most of these critical areas of glacier, snow and rainfall, including those feeding the Chenab and the Jhelum Rivers, are located in India or in Indian-controlled territory. Consequently, but for the Treaty, it is no exaggeration to say that India, as the upper riparian, would have the potential ability to control the flows of the Western Rivers. My next slide, slide 11, shows the catchment areas
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the Jhelum, which is a tributary of the Indus that originates in Indian Administered Kashmir, and is joined by the Neelum-Kishenganga tributary in Pakistan-administered Kashmir, before descending into the Punjab province of Pakistan and merging with the Chenab. You can see the route of the Jhelum there on slide 7. So that's the Western Rivers in overview. Then we come to the Eastern Rivers. They comprise the Ravi, the Beas and the Sutlej, of course. The Ravi has just appeared on my next slide, slide 8. And the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from rainfall, and a disproportionate amount of that rainfall falls in the Karakoram foothills, which are of course upstream. Most of these critical areas of glacier, snow and rainfall, including those feeding the Chenab and the Jhelum Rivers, are located in India or in Indian-controlled territory. Consequently, but for the Treaty, it is no exaggeration to say that India, as the upper riparian, would have the potential ability to control the flows of the Western Rivers. My next slide, slide 11, shows the catchment areas of the Western Rivers, in green. Now, note that the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the Jhelum, which is a tributary of the Indus that originates in Indian Administered Kashmir, and is joined by the Neelum-Kishenganga tributary in Pakistan-administered Kashmir, before descending into the Punjab province of Pakistan and merging with the Chenab. You can see the route of the Jhelum there on slide 7. So that's the Western Rivers in overview. Then we come to the Eastern Rivers. They comprise the Ravi, the Beas and the Sutlej, of course. The Ravi	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from rainfall, and a disproportionate amount of that rainfall falls in the Karakoram foothills, which are of course upstream. Most of these critical areas of glacier, snow and rainfall, including those feeding the Chenab and the Jhelum Rivers, are located in India or in Indian-controlled territory. Consequently, but for the Treaty, it is no exaggeration to say that India, as the upper riparian, would have the potential ability to control the flows of the Western Rivers. My next slide, slide 11, shows the catchment areas
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the Jhelum, which is a tributary of the Indus that originates in Indian Administered Kashmir, and is joined by the Neelum-Kishenganga tributary in Pakistan-administered Kashmir, before descending into the Punjab province of Pakistan and merging with the Chenab. You can see the route of the Jhelum there on slide 7. So that's the Western Rivers in overview. Then we come to the Eastern Rivers. They comprise the Ravi, the Beas and the Sutlej, of course. The Ravi has just appeared on my next slide, slide 8. And the Beas alongside the Ravi, they rise in Himachal Pradesh	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from rainfall, and a disproportionate amount of that rainfall falls in the Karakoram foothills, which are of course upstream. Most of these critical areas of glacier, snow and rainfall, including those feeding the Chenab and the Jhelum Rivers, are located in India or in Indian-controlled territory. Consequently, but for the Treaty, it is no exaggeration to say that India, as the upper riparian, would have the potential ability to control the flows of the Western Rivers. My next slide, slide 11, shows the catchment areas of the Western Rivers, in green. Now, note that the vast majority of the course of the Western Rivers and
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	just appeared on the slide, slide 5. This is a tributary to the Indus. It originates in Himachal Pradesh in India. It passes through Indian Administered Kashmir, before descending from the mountains to enter Pakistan on the plains of the Punjab province. You can see the topography of the Chenab here on this map. The fact that the Chenab enters Pakistan having already descended from the mountains of Kashmir is an important topological aspect of the Chenab River, to which I will return later. My next slide (6) shows the third Western River, the Jhelum, which is a tributary of the Indus that originates in Indian Administered Kashmir, and is joined by the Neelum-Kishenganga tributary in Pakistan-administered Kashmir, before descending into the Punjab province of Pakistan and merging with the Chenab. You can see the route of the Jhelum there on slide 7. So that's the Western Rivers in overview. Then we come to the Eastern Rivers. They comprise the Ravi, the Beas and the Sutlej, of course. The Ravi has just appeared on my next slide, slide 8. And the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	return. My next slide, slide 10, shows the areas of glacier and permanent snow cover in the Indus Basin. This extends over an area of more than 20,000 square kilometres, approximately. It's Exhibit P-264, page 45. Snow and glacier melt amounts for between 72% and 80% of the total flows in the basin's rivers, making the Indus Basin one of the most meltwater-dependent river basins in the world. There's a number of exhibits on that point: P-265, P-263 and P-244, elaborated in the Memorial. The remainder of the water in the basin comes from rainfall, and a disproportionate amount of that rainfall falls in the Karakoram foothills, which are of course upstream. Most of these critical areas of glacier, snow and rainfall, including those feeding the Chenab and the Jhelum Rivers, are located in India or in Indian-controlled territory. Consequently, but for the Treaty, it is no exaggeration to say that India, as the upper riparian, would have the potential ability to control the flows of the Western Rivers. My next slide, slide 11, shows the catchment areas of the Western Rivers, in green. Now, note that the

14:18 1	their catchment area is located in Pakistan. However,	14:21 1	in 1960.
2	a disproportionate source of the waters comprising the	2	I'll discuss all of this in more detail shortly.
3	Western Rivers is located in, or flows through, India,	3	But before that, I want to move on to my second topic,
4	the upper reaches of the Indus Basin in	4	which is India's development of the Eastern Rivers. And
5	Indian-administered areas. This is because the major	5	slide 13 shows the Eastern Rivers in isolation here.
6	contributor to the flows in each of the Western Rivers	6	As the Court is aware, Article II of the Treaty
7	is meltwater from snow and glaciers in the Hindu Kush,	7	states:
8	in the Karakoram and in the Himalayan mountain ranges in	8	"All the waters of the Eastern Rivers shall be
9	India or Indian-administered areas.	9	available for the unrestricted use of India, except as
10	My next slide (12) adds to the Western Rivers the	10	otherwise expressly provided in this Article."
11	catchment of the Eastern Rivers. This catchment area is	11	Article II then sets out the relevant exceptions,
12	split almost equally between India and Pakistan, but	12	which extend variously to domestic use, non-consumptive
13	includes three of the five largest cities in Pakistan.	13	use and agricultural use in Pakistan, together with
14	So it's much more heavily populated on the Pakistani	14	a series of provisions concerning the ten-year
15	side.	15	transition period between April 1960 and March 1970.
16	These cities include the ancient city of Lahore,	16	Now, during that ten-year transition period, but
17	which is the capital and largest city of the Pakistani	17	only during that period, only during that period under
18	province of Punjab. It is the second largest city in	18	the Treaty, Pakistan was entitled to receive
19	Pakistan. And according to the World Population Review,	19	unrestricted use of the waters of the Eastern Rivers, to
20	a public source, it's the 21st largest city in the	20	be released by India in accordance with Annexure H of
21	world, with a population today of over 13 million people	21	the Treaty. Although we don't need to go to that
22	as of the last census in 2023.	22	annexure now, it's plain from its face that its
23	Lahore was founded on the River Ravi, one of the	23	overriding purpose was to safeguard Pakistani
24	Eastern Rivers, more than 1,000 years ago, and was one	24	agricultural needs from the Eastern Rivers during the
25	of the largest cities of the world between the 16th and	25	Kharif and Rabi crop seasons, until such time that
	Page 133		Page 135
14:20 1	18th centuries in particular, thriving as a commercial	14:23 1	Pakistan was able to replace those waters from the
14:20 1 2	18th centuries in particular, thriving as a commercial centre for river-based commerce during the time of the	14:23 1 2	Pakistan was able to replace those waters from the Western Rivers.
			—
2	centre for river-based commerce during the time of the	2	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the
2 3	centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire.	2 3	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970,
2 3 4	centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian,	2 3 4	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the
2 3 4 5	centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that	2 3 4 5	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by
2 3 4 5 6	centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently	2 3 4 5 6	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly. As a result of those works, and the corresponding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises a 160-metre-high, 600-metre-long dam with gross storage
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly. As a result of those works, and the corresponding loss of water supply on the Eastern Rivers, Pakistan has 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises a 160-metre-high, 600-metre-long dam with gross storage of 3,280 million cubic metres. It is capable of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly. As a result of those works, and the corresponding loss of water supply on the Eastern Rivers, Pakistan has had to expand its irrigation network enormously since 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises a 160-metre-high, 600-metre-long dam with gross storage of 3,280 million cubic metres. It is capable of irrigating almost 350,000 hectares, or 860[,000] acres,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly. As a result of those works, and the corresponding loss of water supply on the Eastern Rivers, Pakistan has had to expand its irrigation network enormously since 1960 in order to supply these large areas, in yellow 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises a 160-metre-high, 600-metre-long dam with gross storage of 3,280 million cubic metres. It is capable of irrigating almost 350,000 hectares, or 860[,000] acres, of Indian agricultural land, and of generating 600 MW of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly. As a result of those works, and the corresponding loss of water supply on the Eastern Rivers, Pakistan has had to expand its irrigation network enormously since 1960 in order to supply these large areas, in yellow here including around Lahore of the Eastern Rivers 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises a 160-metre-high, 600-metre-long dam with gross storage of 3,280 million cubic metres. It is capable of irrigating almost 350,000 hectares, or 860[,000] acres, of Indian agricultural land, and of generating 600 MW of power.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly. As a result of those works, and the corresponding loss of water supply on the Eastern Rivers, Pakistan has had to expand its irrigation network enormously since 1960 in order to supply these large areas, in yellow here including around Lahore of the Eastern Rivers catchment, together with its huge population, with 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises a 160-metre-high, 600-metre-long dam with gross storage of 3,280 million cubic metres. It is capable of irrigating almost 350,000 hectares, or 860[.000] acres, of Indian agricultural land, and of generating 600 MW of power. This is just one of a number of such combined
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly. As a result of those works, and the corresponding loss of water supply on the Eastern Rivers, Pakistan has had to expand its irrigation network enormously since 1960 in order to supply these large areas, in yellow here including around Lahore of the Eastern Rivers catchment, together with its huge population, with waters from the Western Rivers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises a 160-metre-high, 600-metre-long dam with gross storage of 3,280 million cubic metres. It is capable of irrigating almost 350,000 hectares, or 860[,000] acres, of Indian agricultural land, and of generating 600 MW of power. This is just one of a number of such combined irrigation and hydroelectric projects commissioned by
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly. As a result of those works, and the corresponding loss of water supply on the Eastern Rivers, Pakistan has had to expand its irrigation network enormously since 1960 in order to supply these large areas, in yellow here including around Lahore of the Eastern Rivers catchment, together with its huge population, with waters from the Western Rivers. The fact that Pakistan has had to expand its use of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises a 160-metre-high, 600-metre-long dam with gross storage of 3,280 million cubic metres. It is capable of irrigating almost 350,000 hectares, or 860[,000] acres, of Indian agricultural land, and of generating 600 MW of power. This is just one of a number of such combined irrigation and hydroelectric projects commissioned by India on the Eastern Rivers since the creation of the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly. As a result of those works, and the corresponding loss of water supply on the Eastern Rivers, Pakistan has had to expand its irrigation network enormously since 1960 in order to supply these large areas, in yellow here including around Lahore of the Eastern Rivers catchment, together with its huge population, with waters from the Western Rivers. The fact that Pakistan has had to expand its use of the Western River waters in order to replace waters lost 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises a 160-metre-high, 600-metre-long dam with gross storage of 3,280 million cubic metres. It is capable of irrigating almost 350,000 hectares, or 860[,000] acres, of Indian agricultural land, and of generating 600 MW of power. This is just one of a number of such combined irrigation and hydroelectric projects commissioned by India on the Eastern Rivers since the creation of the Treaty. And on the Ravi alone, India has completed at
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly. As a result of those works, and the corresponding loss of water supply on the Eastern Rivers, Pakistan has had to expand its irrigation network enormously since 1960 in order to supply these large areas, in yellow here including around Lahore of the Eastern Rivers catchment, together with its huge population, with waters from the Western Rivers. The fact that Pakistan has had to expand its use of the Western River waters in order to replace waters lost from the Eastern Rivers adds further resonance to 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises a 160-metre-high, 600-metre-long dam with gross storage of 3,280 million cubic metres. It is capable of irrigating almost 350,000 hectares, or 860[,000] acres, of Indian agricultural land, and of generating 600 MW of power. This is just one of a number of such combined irrigation and hydroelectric projects commissioned by India on the Eastern Rivers since the creation of the Treaty. And on the Ravi alone, India has completed at least five further HEPs upstream of the Thein Dam, with
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly. As a result of those works, and the corresponding loss of water supply on the Eastern Rivers, Pakistan has had to expand its irrigation network enormously since 1960 in order to supply these large areas, in yellow here including around Lahore of the Eastern Rivers catchment, together with its huge population, with waters from the Western Rivers. The fact that Pakistan has had to expand its use of the Western River and the tre resonance to India's obligation under the Treaty to "let flow" the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises a 160-metre-high, 600-metre-long dam with gross storage of 3,280 million cubic metres. It is capable of irrigating almost 350,000 hectares, or 860[,000] acres, of Indian agricultural land, and of generating 600 MW of power. This is just one of a number of such combined irrigation and hydroelectric projects commissioned by India on the Eastern Rivers since the creation of the Treaty. And on the Ravi alone, India has completed at least five further HEPs upstream of the Thein Dam, with a total installed capacity of more than 1,370 MW.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly. As a result of those works, and the corresponding loss of water supply on the Eastern Rivers, Pakistan has had to expand its irrigation network enormously since 1960 in order to supply these large areas, in yellow here including around Lahore of the Eastern Rivers catchment, together with its huge population, with waters from the Western Rivers. The fact that Pakistan has had to expand its use of the Western Rivers adds further resonance to India's obligation under the Treaty to "let flow" the waters of the Western Rivers, and highlights why the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises a 160-metre-high, 600-metre-long dam with gross storage of 3,280 million cubic metres. It is capable of irrigating almost 350,000 hectares, or 860[,000] acres, of Indian agricultural land, and of generating 600 MW of power. This is just one of a number of such combined irrigation and hydroelectric projects commissioned by India on the Eastern Rivers since the creation of the Treaty. And on the Ravi alone, India has completed at least five further HEPs upstream of the Thein Dam, with a total installed capacity of more than 1,370 MW. That's Exhibit P-578.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly. As a result of those works, and the corresponding loss of water supply on the Eastern Rivers, Pakistan has had to expand its irrigation network enormously since 1960 in order to supply these large areas, in yellow here including around Lahore of the Eastern Rivers catchment, together with its huge population, with waters from the Western Rivers. The fact that Pakistan has had to expand its use of the Western River waters in order to replace waters lost from the Eastern Rivers adds further resonance to India's obligation under the Treaty to "let flow" the waters of the Western Rivers, and highlights why the uninterrupted flow of the Western Rivers is just as, if 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises a 160-metre-high, 600-metre-long dam with gross storage of 3,280 million cubic metres. It is capable of irrigating almost 350,000 hectares, or 860[,000] acres, of Indian agricultural land, and of generating 600 MW of power. This is just one of a number of such combined irrigation and hydroelectric projects commissioned by India on the Eastern Rivers since the creation of the Treaty. And on the Ravi alone, India has completed at least five further HEPs upstream of the Thein Dam, with a total installed capacity of more than 1,370 MW. That's Exhibit P-578. India has also dramatically expanded its irrigation
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 centre for river-based commerce during the time of the Mughal Empire. Following partition in 1947, as the upper riparian, India has the ability to control the flows of the Eastern Rivers, including of course the Ravi that passes through Lahore. India has done so to such a degree that those rivers now run dry in Pakistan almost permanently due to Indian development upstream. And I'll talk about India's post-partition and post-Treaty development works upstream shortly. As a result of those works, and the corresponding loss of water supply on the Eastern Rivers, Pakistan has had to expand its irrigation network enormously since 1960 in order to supply these large areas, in yellow here including around Lahore of the Eastern Rivers catchment, together with its huge population, with waters from the Western Rivers. The fact that Pakistan has had to expand its use of the Western Rivers adds further resonance to India's obligation under the Treaty to "let flow" the waters of the Western Rivers, and highlights why the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 Western Rivers. Since the end of the transition period in 1970, India has exploited its right of unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers, and it has done so to the full, by building a series of enormous structures, often for combined hydroelectric and irrigation purposes. India's upstream projects have included the Thein or Ranjit Sagar Dam on the Ravi River, upstream of Lahore, which was commissioned by the Government of Indian Punjab in 1999. That project comprises a 160-metre-high, 600-metre-long dam with gross storage of 3,280 million cubic metres. It is capable of irrigating almost 350,000 hectares, or 860[,000] acres, of Indian agricultural land, and of generating 600 MW of power. This is just one of a number of such combined irrigation and hydroelectric projects commissioned by India on the Eastern Rivers since the creation of the Treaty. And on the Ravi alone, India has completed at least five further HEPs upstream of the Thein Dam, with a total installed capacity of more than 1,370 MW. That's Exhibit P-578.

14:25	1	Jammu and Kashmir, India Punjab and even Rajasthan. For	14:28 1	India for its utilization in India, following steps have
	2	example, India's Indira Gandhi Nahar Project, or IGNP,	2	been taken:"
	3	is fed by the Sutlej and Beas Rivers. That project	3	And there are three steps in the document, but the
	4	supplies water to the vast Greater Indian Desert, also	4	most significant one by some margin is the first one,
	5	known as the Thar Desert, in Western Rajasthan. That	5	which is the Shahpurkandi project, which Sir Daniel
	6	Indian network, which was completed in 2010, includes	6	Bethlehem mentioned briefly yesterday. And as the
		-		
	7	the longest canal in India, which runs for	7	ministry said:
	8	650 kilometres, and which supplies an area approximately	8	"This project will help in utilizing the waters
	9	60 kilometres wide and 1,000 kilometres long, spread	9	coming out from [the] powerhouse of [the] Thein dam to
	10	over a gross command area of 2.5 million hectares.	10	irrigate 37000 hectares of land in [Jammu and Kashmir]
	11	That's Exhibit P-578.	11	and Punjab and generate 206 MW of [electricity]."
	12	India's development of these rivers, the Eastern	12	In February of this year, India completed
	13	Rivers, is such that those rivers now run permanently	13	construction of the Shahpurkandi Barrage. And there is
	14	dry downstream in Pakistan, except during periods of	14	a picture of it, I think, on my next slide, slide 16.
	15	heavy flooding. India's complete appropriation of the	15	This is the latest in a line of large Indian
	16	waters of the Eastern Rivers has been deliberate, and	16	multipurpose irrigation and power generation projects
	17	based on an understanding that Article II of the Treaty	17	built on the Eastern Rivers since the 1960s. And the
	18	entitles it to run those rivers dry before they enter	18	completion of the barrage was reported in India as
	19	Pakistan.	19	having "effectively ceased the flow of water from the
	20	Now, in its Memorial, Pakistan wrote that the	20	Ravi River into Pakistan". That's Exhibit P-559.
	21	Eastern Rivers run dry for 335 days per year. It cited	21	Despite all its construction works since 1960,
	22	a 2011 study for that purpose, indicating a reduction of	22	however, the flows of the Eastern Rivers within India
	23	more than 90% of the Eastern River flows into Pakistan	23	still have significant untapped potential, particularly
	24	by 2010, as compared to flows before the Treaty. And	24	hydroelectric potential. We know that because in 2022,
2	25	that was with reference to Exhibit P-263.	25	consultants at the Indian government-owned company that
		Page 137		Page 139
14:27	1	(Slide 14) We see that on the slide. The reference	14:30 1	runs five large dams on the Ravi wrote, in
	2	was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers	2	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of
	2 3	was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%,	2 3	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of
	2 3 4	was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and	2 3 4	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility,
	2 3 4 5	was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows	2 3 4 5	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric
	2 3 4 5 6	was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they	2 3 4 5 6	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers.
	2 3 4 5 6 7	was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize nearly [its] entire share" of 95% or 95%, they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or applicable customary international law, but this is not
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize nearly [its] entire share" of 95% or 95%, they said "of the waters of [the] Eastern Rivers" at that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or applicable customary international law, but this is not a question arising for decision in the present
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize nearly [its] entire share" of 95% or 95%, they said "of the waters of [the] Eastern Rivers" at that time, in 2019.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or applicable customary international law, but this is not a question arising for decision in the present proceeding.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize nearly [its] entire share" of 95% or 95%, they said "of the waters of [the] Eastern Rivers" at that time, in 2019. So there we can see the reference to the current 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or applicable customary international law, but this is not a question arising for decision in the present proceeding. In any event, the dramatic impact downstream in
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize nearly [its] entire share" of 95% or 95%, they said "of the waters of [the] Eastern Rivers" at that time, in 2019. So there we can see the reference to the current status of development in India at the time in the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	 Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or applicable customary international law, but this is not a question arising for decision in the present proceeding. In any event, the dramatic impact downstream in Pakistan of India's aggressive development of the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize nearly [its] entire share" of 95% or 95%, they said "of the waters of [the] Eastern Rivers" at that time, in 2019. So there we can see the reference to the current status of development in India at the time in the Eastern Rivers: an exploitation of nearly the entire 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or applicable customary international law, but this is not a question arising for decision in the present proceeding. In any event, the dramatic impact downstream in Pakistan of India's aggressive development of the Eastern Rivers is confirmed by flow data. And we
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize nearly [its] entire share" of 95% or 95%, they said "of the waters of [the] Eastern Rivers" at that time, in 2019. So there we can see the reference to the current status of development in India at the time in the Eastern Rivers: an exploitation of nearly the entire share. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or applicable customary international law, but this is not a question arising for decision in the present proceeding. In any event, the dramatic impact downstream in Pakistan of India's aggressive development of the Eastern Rivers is confirmed by flow data. And we summarise that on my next slide and the one to follow.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize nearly [its] entire share" of 95% or 95%, they said "of the waters of [the] Eastern Rivers" at that time, in 2019. So there we can see the reference to the current status of development in India at the time in the Eastern Rivers: an exploitation of nearly the entire share. But then the Ministry of Water Resources noted that: 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or applicable customary international law, but this is not a question arising for decision in the present proceeding. In any event, the dramatic impact downstream in Pakistan of India's aggressive development of the Eastern Rivers is confirmed by flow data. And we summarise that on my next slide and the one to follow. On this one, slide 17 both slides are based on
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize nearly [its] entire share" of 95% or 95%, they said "of the waters of [the] Eastern Rivers" at that time, in 2019. So there we can see the reference to the current status of development in India at the time in the Eastern Rivers: an exploitation of nearly the entire share. But then the Ministry of Water Resources noted that: " about 2 MAF of water annually from [the] Ravi 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or applicable customary international law, but this is not a question arising for decision in the present proceeding. In any event, the dramatic impact downstream in Pakistan of India's aggressive development of the Eastern Rivers is confirmed by flow data. And we summarise that on my next slide and the one to follow. On this one, slide 17 both slides are based on data using the flows of the Eastern Rivers as they enter
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize nearly [its] entire share" of 95% or 95%, they said "of the waters of [the] Eastern Rivers" at that time, in 2019. So there we can see the reference to the current status of development in India at the time in the Eastern Rivers: an exploitation of nearly the entire share. But then the Ministry of Water Resources noted that: " about 2 MAF of water annually from [the] Ravi 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or applicable customary international law, but this is not a question arising for decision in the present proceeding. In any event, the dramatic impact downstream in Pakistan of India's aggressive development of the Eastern Rivers is confirmed by flow data. And we summarise that on my next slide and the one to follow. On this one, slide 17 both slides are based on data using the flows of the Eastern Rivers as they enter Pakistan. This one shows cumulative flows over time on
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize nearly [its] entire share" of 95% or 95%, they said "of the waters of [the] Eastern Rivers" at that time, in 2019. So there we can see the reference to the current status of development in India at the time in the Eastern Rivers: an exploitation of nearly the entire share. But then the Ministry of Water Resources noted that: " about 2 MAF of water annually from [the] Ravi [was] reported to be still flowing unutilized to Pakistan below Madhopur." 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or applicable customary international law, but this is not a question arising for decision in the present proceeding. In any event, the dramatic impact downstream in Pakistan of India's aggressive development of the Eastern Rivers is confirmed by flow data. And we summarise that on my next slide and the one to follow. On this one, slide 17 both slides are based on data using the flows of the Eastern Rivers as they enter Pakistan. This one shows cumulative flows over time on the Sutlej and the Ravi as they enter Pakistan. You can
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize nearly [its] entire share" of 95% or 95%, they said "of the waters of [the] Eastern Rivers" at that time, in 2019. So there we can see the reference to the current status of development in India at the time in the Eastern Rivers: an exploitation of nearly the entire share. But then the Ministry of Water Resources noted that: " about 2 MAF of water annually from [the] Ravi [was] reported to be still flowing unutilized to Pakistan below Madhopur." And then the ministry said: 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or applicable customary international law, but this is not a question arising for decision in the present proceeding. In any event, the dramatic impact downstream in Pakistan of India's aggressive development of the Eastern Rivers is confirmed by flow data. And we summarise that on my next slide and the one to follow. On this one, slide 17 both slides are based on data using the flows of the Eastern Rivers as they enter Pakistan. This one shows cumulative flows over time on the Sutlej and the Ravi as they enter Pakistan. You can see very quickly the flatlining of those flows over
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize nearly [its] entire share" of 95% or 95%, they said "of the waters of [the] Eastern Rivers" at that time, in 2019. So there we can see the reference to the current status of development in India at the time in the Eastern Rivers: an exploitation of nearly the entire share. But then the Ministry of Water Resources noted that: " about 2 MAF of water annually from [the] Ravi [was] reported to be still flowing unutilized to Pakistan below Madhopur." 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or applicable customary international law, but this is not a question arising for decision in the present proceeding. In any event, the dramatic impact downstream in Pakistan of India's aggressive development of the Eastern Rivers is confirmed by flow data. And we summarise that on my next slide and the one to follow. On this one, slide 17 both slides are based on data using the flows of the Eastern Rivers as they enter Pakistan. This one shows cumulative flows over time on the Sutlej and the Ravi as they enter Pakistan. You can
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 was made then to the average flow of the Eastern Rivers into Pakistan having been reduced by 75% and 92%, respectively, during the periods 1985-2002 and 2007-2010. And you can see there the reduction of flows highlighted of the Ravi and the Sutlej Rivers as they enter Pakistan: a significant reduction. But those figures are now outdated. By 2019, a press release by the Indian Ministry of Water Resources, Development and Ganga Rejuvenation (P-563) this is my next slide, slide 15 stated that India's works on the Eastern Rivers had "helped [to] utilize nearly [its] entire share" of 95% or 95%, they said "of the waters of [the] Eastern Rivers" at that time, in 2019. So there we can see the reference to the current status of development in India at the time in the Eastern Rivers: an exploitation of nearly the entire share. But then the Ministry of Water Resources noted that: " about 2 MAF of water annually from [the] Ravi [was] reported to be still flowing unutilized to Pakistan below Madhopur." And then the ministry said: 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 Exhibit P-578, that India had developed 2,177 MW of an available 3,229 MW of the hydroelectric potential of the Ravi River alone. So India retains the possibility, the paper reported, of expanding its hydroelectric generation capacity in the Eastern Rivers. With the opening of this barrage, the Shahpurkandi Barrage, India's appropriation though of the waters of the Eastern Rivers is complete. It's open to question whether India's cumulative conduct since 1960 on the Eastern Rivers, which has run those rivers dry as they enter Pakistan, is compatible with the Treaty or applicable customary international law, but this is not a question arising for decision in the present proceeding. In any event, the dramatic impact downstream in Pakistan of India's aggressive development of the Eastern Rivers is confirmed by flow data. And we summarise that on my next slide and the one to follow. On this one, slide 17 both slides are based on data using the flows of the Eastern Rivers as they enter Pakistan. This one shows cumulative flows over time on the Sutlej and the Ravi as they enter Pakistan. You can see very quickly the flatlining of those flows over

14:31 1	And the next slide (18) similarly, in a different	14:35 1	his submissions. And Pakistan has provided analysis of
2	way, charts the level of the flows over that period each	2	that data in Appendix D to its Memorial, again thanks
3	year. These show the significant drop-off in the flows,	3	largely to Dr Morris.
4	measured on the Eastern Rivers in Pakistan since 1960.	4	The data shows that over the past 30 years, the
5	So, Mr Chairman and members of the Court, all of	5	total annual flow on the Western Rivers is just under
6	this essential context in connection with the Eastern	6	104 million acre-feet. Of this, approximately 57% of
7	Rivers we say is a critical counterweight in the Treaty	7	the flow enters Pakistan on the Indus, 23% enters
8	to India's unrestricted use of the Eastern Rivers. So	8	Pakistan on the Chenab, and the remaining 20% enters
9	there's a counterweight to that unrestricted use in the	9	Pakistan on the Jhelum.
10	Treaty, and that is Pakistan's unrestricted use of the	10	All of these flows on the Western Rivers are highly
11	Western Rivers under Article III. That was the broad	11	seasonal because of their heavy dependence on glacier
12	hydro bargain, if you like, that we've heard about	12	and snowmelt upstream during warmer months. And this
13	before.	13	seasonality can be seen on my next slide (20), which
14	So having discussed the Eastern Rivers, I'd like to	14	shows ten years of daily discharges of the Indus and
15	move on to discuss Pakistan's use of the Western Rivers,	15	Chenab Rivers at the Tarbela and Marala monitoring
16	following the Treaty.	16	stations, respectively. This is figure 3.4 in the
17	The Treaty, as you know, provides in the same way	17	Memorial.
18	that it provides essentially for unrestricted use,	18	The seasonality of flows dovetails with Pakistan's
19	subject to some exceptions, by India on the Eastern	19	national crop seasons, namely the Kharif crop season,
20	Rivers, it provides for unrestricted use by Pakistan,	20	which runs between April and September, and the Rabi
21	subject to different exceptions on the Western Rivers,	21	crop season, which runs between October and March. More
22	under Article III.	22	than 80% of the seasonal flows on the Western Rivers
23	The critical importance of the free flow of the	23	occur during the Kharif crop season, with the remaining
24	Western Rivers for the people, environment and national	24	20% occurring during the Rabi season. Even in the
25	economy of Pakistan cannot be overstated. A 2021	25	Kharif crop season, most of the flows occur during the
	Page 141		Page 143
14:33 1	publication of the World Bank entitled "Groundwater in	14:37 1	three-month period between mid-June and mid-September.
2	Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248	2	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192.
2 3	Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total	2 3	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier
2 3 4	Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan.	2 3 4	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown
2 3 4 5	Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019	2 3	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low,
2 3 4 5 6	Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water	2 3 4 5 6	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under
2 3 4 5 6 7	Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And	2 3 4 5 6 7	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern Rivers at that time made up only 1.5% of the resource. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that forms the centrepiece of the Indus Basin Irrigation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern Rivers at that time made up only 1.5% of the resource. Of course, after completion of the Shahpurkandi 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that forms the centrepiece of the Indus Basin Irrigation System, or IBIS. The Indus Basin Irrigation System is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern Rivers at that time made up only 1.5% of the resource. Of course, after completion of the Shahpurkandi Barrage, the Eastern Rivers will be essentially 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that forms the centrepiece of the Indus Basin Irrigation System, or IBIS. The Indus Basin Irrigation System is the largest on Earth; or the largest contiguous
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern Rivers at that time made up only 1.5% of the resource. Of course, after completion of the Shahpurkandi Barrage, the Eastern Rivers will be essentially contributing nothing to Pakistan's water resources going 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that forms the centrepiece of the Indus Basin Irrigation System, or IBIS. The Indus Basin Irrigation System is the largest on Earth; or the largest contiguous irrigation system, certainly, on Earth. It services
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern Rivers at that time made up only 1.5% of the resource. Of course, after completion of the Shahpurkandi Barrage, the Eastern Rivers will be essentially contributing nothing to Pakistan's water resources going forward; and Pakistan's reliance on the Western Rivers 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that forms the centrepiece of the Indus Basin Irrigation System, or IBIS. The Indus Basin Irrigation System is the largest on Earth; or the largest contiguous irrigation system, certainly, on Earth. It services more than 25 million hectares of agricultural land, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern Rivers at that time made up only 1.5% of the resource. Of course, after completion of the Shahpurkandi Barrage, the Eastern Rivers will be essentially contributing nothing to Pakistan's water resources going forward; and Pakistan's reliance on the Western Rivers will only increase, as compared to the illustration of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that forms the centrepiece of the Indus Basin Irrigation System, or IBIS. The Indus Basin Irrigation System is the largest on Earth; or the largest contiguous irrigation system, certainly, on Earth. It services more than 25 million hectares of agricultural land, the vast majority of which is in Pakistan: approximately
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern Rivers at that time made up only 1.5% of the resource. Of course, after completion of the Shahpurkandi Barrage, the Eastern Rivers will be essentially contributing nothing to Pakistan's water resources going forward; and Pakistan's reliance on the Western Rivers will only increase, as compared to the illustration of that reliance here in 2019. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that forms the centrepiece of the Indus Basin Irrigation System, or IBIS. The Indus Basin Irrigation System is the largest on Earth; or the largest contiguous irrigation system, certainly, on Earth. It services more than 25 million hectares of agricultural land, the vast majority of which is in Pakistan: approximately 84%. That's figure 3.8 in the Memorial.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern Rivers at that time made up only 1.5% of the resource. Of course, after completion of the Shahpurkandi Barrage, the Eastern Rivers will be essentially contributing nothing to Pakistan's water resources going forward; and Pakistan's reliance on the Western Rivers will only increase, as compared to the illustration of that reliance here in 2019. The average annual flow of water into Pakistan on	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that forms the centrepiece of the Indus Basin Irrigation System, or IBIS. The Indus Basin Irrigation System is the largest on Earth; or the largest contiguous irrigation system, certainly, on Earth. It services more than 25 million hectares of agricultural land, the vast majority of which is in Pakistan: approximately 84%. That's figure 3.8 in the Memorial. I will spend a few minutes perhaps more than
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern Rivers at that time made up only 1.5% of the resource. Of course, after completion of the Shahpurkandi Barrage, the Eastern Rivers will be essentially contributing nothing to Pakistan's water resources going forward; and Pakistan's reliance on the Western Rivers will only increase, as compared to the illustration of that reliance here in 2019. The average annual flow of water into Pakistan on the Western Rivers is measured at monitoring stations 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that forms the centrepiece of the Indus Basin Irrigation System, or IBIS. The Indus Basin Irrigation System is the largest on Earth; or the largest contiguous irrigation system, certainly, on Earth. It services more than 25 million hectares of agricultural land, the vast majority of which is in Pakistan: approximately 84%. That's figure 3.8 in the Memorial. I will spend a few minutes perhaps more than a few minutes describing Pakistan's irrigation system
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array} $	 Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern Rivers at that time made up only 1.5% of the resource. Of course, after completion of the Shahpurkandi Barrage, the Eastern Rivers will be essentially contributing nothing to Pakistan's water resources going forward; and Pakistan's reliance on the Western Rivers will only increase, as compared to the illustration of that reliance here in 2019. The average annual flow of water into Pakistan on the Western Rivers is measured at monitoring stations situated close to the Line of Control with India. The 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that forms the centrepiece of the Indus Basin Irrigation System, or IBIS. The Indus Basin Irrigation System is the largest on Earth; or the largest contiguous irrigation system, certainly, on Earth. It services more than 25 million hectares of agricultural land, the vast majority of which is in Pakistan: approximately 84%. That's figure 3.8 in the Memorial. I will spend a few minutes perhaps more than a few minutes describing Pakistan's irrigation system shortly. For now, the critical point is that by means
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern Rivers at that time made up only 1.5% of the resource. Of course, after completion of the Shahpurkandi Barrage, the Eastern Rivers will be essentially contributing nothing to Pakistan's water resources going forward; and Pakistan's reliance on the Western Rivers will only increase, as compared to the illustration of that reliance here in 2019. The average annual flow of water into Pakistan on the Western Rivers is measured at monitoring stations situated close to the Line of Control with India. The flow data appears it's before you at 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that forms the centrepiece of the Indus Basin Irrigation System, or IBIS. The Indus Basin Irrigation System is the largest on Earth; or the largest contiguous irrigation system, certainly, on Earth. It services more than 25 million hectares of agricultural land, the vast majority of which is in Pakistan: approximately 84%. That's figure 3.8 in the Memorial. I will spend a few minutes perhaps more than a few minutes describing Pakistan's irrigation system shortly. For now, the critical point is that by means of that irrigation system largely constructed, as
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern Rivers at that time made up only 1.5% of the resource. Of course, after completion of the Shahpurkandi Barrage, the Eastern Rivers will be essentially contributing nothing to Pakistan's water resources going forward; and Pakistan's reliance on the Western Rivers will only increase, as compared to the illustration of that reliance here in 2019. The average annual flow of water into Pakistan on the Western Rivers is measured at monitoring stations situated close to the Line of Control with India. The 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that forms the centrepiece of the Indus Basin Irrigation System, or IBIS. The Indus Basin Irrigation System is the largest on Earth; or the largest contiguous irrigation system, certainly, on Earth. It services more than 25 million hectares of agricultural land, the vast majority of which is in Pakistan: approximately 84%. That's figure 3.8 in the Memorial. I will spend a few minutes perhaps more than a few minutes describing Pakistan's irrigation system shortly. For now, the critical point is that by means
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern Rivers at that time made up only 1.5% of the resource. Of course, after completion of the Shahpurkandi Barrage, the Eastern Rivers will be essentially contributing nothing to Pakistan's water resources going forward; and Pakistan's reliance on the Western Rivers will only increase, as compared to the illustration of that reliance here in 2019. The average annual flow of water into Pakistan on the Western Rivers is measured at monitoring stations situated close to the Line of Control with India. The flow data appears it's before you at Exhibit P-402. It's extensive, and it's been analysed very closely particularly by Dr Morris for purposes of 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that forms the centrepiece of the Indus Basin Irrigation System, or IBIS. The Indus Basin Irrigation System is the largest on Earth; or the largest contiguous irrigation system, certainly, on Earth. It services more than 25 million hectares of agricultural land, the vast majority of which is in Pakistan: approximately 84%. That's figure 3.8 in the Memorial. I will spend a few minutes perhaps more than a few minutes describing Pakistan's irrigation system shortly. For now, the critical point is that by means of that irrigation system largely constructed, as we'll see, since the Treaty the Western Rivers are truly the lifeblood of Pakistan's huge agricultural
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 Pakistan's Indus Basin" and that's Exhibit P-248 calculated that the basin contributes 95% of the total water resources in Pakistan. (Slide 19) Another World Bank publication of 2019 that's P-249 calculated that two thirds of this water comprised inflows of the Western Rivers from India. And that's shown in the slide. That appears at figure 3.1 of the Memorial. You can see here the reference to "external inflows" on the Western Rivers at that time, in 2019, constituting 66% of the total water resource or renewable water resource in Pakistan. The Eastern Rivers at that time made up only 1.5% of the resource. Of course, after completion of the Shahpurkandi Barrage, the Eastern Rivers will be essentially contributing nothing to Pakistan's water resources going forward; and Pakistan's reliance on the Western Rivers will only increase, as compared to the illustration of that reliance here in 2019. The average annual flow of water into Pakistan on the Western Rivers is measured at monitoring stations situated close to the Line of Control with India. The flow data appears it's before you at Exhibit P-402. It's extensive, and it's been analysed 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	That's Exhibit P-268 at page 192. The maintenance of flows during the critical earlier part of that crop season, while the crops are being sown and while the availability of water is relatively low, is critical. Without the let-flow obligation under Article III of the Treaty, Pakistan would be unable to irrigate its national crops, particularly during that early period of the Kharif season, when the rivers run low during April, May and early June. Pakistan's crops receive their water from the Western Rivers via a national irrigation system that forms the centrepiece of the Indus Basin Irrigation System, or IBIS. The Indus Basin Irrigation System is the largest on Earth; or the largest contiguous irrigation system, certainly, on Earth. It services more than 25 million hectares of agricultural land, the vast majority of which is in Pakistan: approximately 84%. That's figure 3.8 in the Memorial. I will spend a few minutes perhaps more than a few minutes describing Pakistan's irrigation system shortly. For now, the critical point is that by means of that irrigation system largely constructed, as we'll see, since the Treaty the Western Rivers are

14:39 1	sector.	14:42 1	colonial rule. And following Pakistan's independence,
14.37 1	That sector consumes approximately 93% of the	14.42 1	the second significant expansion took place immediately
3	country's available water resources annually. Other	3	before and during the transition period under the
4	uses of the Western Rivers, such as non-agricultural	4	Treaty. That phase of expansion was focused, of course,
5	activities like domestic and industrial use, including	4 5	on the formidable task of transporting waters vast
6	power generation, pale into relative insignificance	6	distances from the Western Rivers into large areas of
0 7	compared to the agricultural demand: they consume only	7	Pakistan which had previously been supplied by the
			Eastern Rivers.
8	7%. That's all Exhibit P-280.	8	
9	According to the Pakistan Economic Survey 2022-23,	9	These works conducted following the Treaty in 1960,
10	published by the Pakistani Ministry of Finance, the	10	these irrigation works, were described by the World Bank
11	agricultural sector contributes approximately 23% of	11	at the time as "the largest programme of its kind ever
12	Pakistan's national GDP and employs approximately 37.5%	12	to be undertaken anywhere in the world". That's P-277,
13	of its labour force; Exhibit P-281, page 19.	13	paragraph 7. They were undertaken by Pakistan pursuant
14	So, members of the Court, Mr Chairman, it's no	14	to its obligation at Article IV of the Treaty, and they
15	exaggeration to say that Pakistan has a water-based	15	were undertaken with estimated costs of just over
16 17	economy; there's no doubt of that. And that economy is	16	US\$1.1 billion at the time, which equates to roughly
17	based itself on the Western Rivers.	17	US\$12.5 billion today. That's Exhibit P-244 at
18	In fact, 90% of Pakistan's agricultural production	18	page 231.
19	relies on irrigated water, of which about 70% is	19	They were financed by multiple countries. And those
20	provided by the Western Rivers. That's Exhibit P-244 at	20	countries contributed to the Indus Basin Development
21	page 231. Up to 80% of those Western Rivers waters are	21	Fund, which was established under the Treaty in
22	derived upstream from the glaciers and snowmelt in	22	September 1960. India alone contributed in those days
23	Indian-administered territory. One can estimate that up	23	£62,060,000, which equates to more than US\$1.5 billion
24	to half, therefore, of the agricultural production of	24 25	today, so just over 10% of the cost of the irrigation
25	Pakistan relies on waters flowing into Pakistan from	23	expansion, as it was required to do by Article V of the
	Page 145		Page 147
14:40 1	India on the Western Rivers.	14:44 1	Treaty.
2	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the	2	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the
2 3	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more	2 3	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for
2 3 4	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops,	2 3 4	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to
2 3 4 5	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty,	2 3 4 5	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers
2 3 4 5 6	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation	2 3 4 5 6	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers.
2 3 4 5 6 7	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed	2 3 4 5 6 7	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in Pakistan is "heavily dependent on water originating from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 (Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for irrigation canals
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in Pakistan is "heavily dependent on water originating from snow and glacier melt at high altitudes"; Exhibit P-283.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on 15th August 1947, were dependent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in Pakistan is "heavily dependent on water originating from snow and glacier melt at high altitudes"; Exhibit P-283. The irrigation system in Pakistan is crucial, due to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on 15th August 1947, were dependent on water supplies from the Eastern Rivers."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in Pakistan is "heavily dependent on water originating from snow and glacier melt at high altitudes"; Exhibit P-283. The irrigation system in Pakistan is crucial, due to the combination of the seasonality of river flows on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 (Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on 15th August 1947, were dependent on water supplies from the Eastern Rivers."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in Pakistan is "heavily dependent on water originating from snow and glacier melt at high altitudes"; Exhibit P-283. The irrigation system in Pakistan is crucial, due to the combination of the seasonality of river flows on the Western Rivers, the arid climate in much of the country	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 (Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on 15th August 1947, were dependent on water supplies from the Eastern Rivers." You can see then in the provisions of Article V
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in Pakistan is "heavily dependent on water originating from snow and glacier melt at high altitudes"; Exhibit P-283. The irrigation system in Pakistan is crucial, due to the combination of the seasonality of river flows on the Western Rivers, the arid climate in much of the country outside of the monsoon season and, following the Treaty,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on 15th August 1947, were dependent on water supplies from the Eastern Rivers." You can see then in the provisions of Article V India's large contribution to the funding of those works was "In consideration" and they were the words
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in Pakistan is "heavily dependent on water originating from snow and glacier melt at high altitudes"; Exhibit P-283. The irrigation system in Pakistan is crucial, due to the combination of the seasonality of river flows on the Western Rivers, the arid climate in much of the country outside of the monsoon season and, following the Treaty, the non-availability of the Eastern Rivers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 (Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on 15th August 1947, were dependent on water supplies from the Eastern Rivers." You can see then in the provisions of Article V India's large contribution to the funding of those works was "In consideration" for the fact that they were
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in Pakistan is "heavily dependent on water originating from snow and glacier melt at high altitudes"; Exhibit P-283. The irrigation system in Pakistan is crucial, due to the combination of the seasonality of river flows on the Western Rivers, the arid climate in much of the country outside of the monsoon season and, following the Treaty, the non-availability of the Eastern Rivers. The Memorial, at paragraphs 3.39 to 3.49, gives	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 (Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on 15th August 1947, were dependent on water supplies from the Eastern Rivers." You can see then in the provisions of Article V India's large contribution to the funding of those works was "In consideration" <i></i> and they were the words used "In consideration" for the fact that they were required in order to replace water supplies in Pakistan
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in Pakistan is "heavily dependent on water originating from snow and glacier melt at high altitudes"; Exhibit P-283. The irrigation system in Pakistan is crucial, due to the combination of the seasonality of river flows on the Western Rivers, the arid climate in much of the country outside of the monsoon season and, following the Treaty, the non-availability of the Eastern Rivers. The Memorial, at paragraphs 3.39 to 3.49, gives a brief history of the irrigation system in Pakistan,	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 (Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on 15th August 1947, were dependent on water supplies from the Eastern Rivers." You can see then in the provisions of Article V India's large contribution to the funding of those works was "In consideration" and they were the words used "In consideration" for the fact that they were required in order to replace water supplies in Pakistan previously received from Eastern Rivers, with supplies
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in Pakistan is "heavily dependent on water originating from snow and glacier melt at high altitudes"; Exhibit P-283. The irrigation system in Pakistan is crucial, due to the combination of the seasonality of river flows on the Western Rivers, the arid climate in much of the country outside of the monsoon season and, following the Treaty, the non-availability of the Eastern Rivers. The Memorial, at paragraphs 3.39 to 3.49, gives a brief history of the irrigation system in Pakistan, which originates several thousand years ago. That	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 (Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on 15th August 1947, were dependent on water supplies from the Eastern Rivers." You can see then in the provisions of Article V India's large contribution to the funding of those works was "In consideration" and they were the words used "In consideration" for the fact that they were required in order to replace water supplies in Pakistan previously received from Eastern Rivers, with supplies to be transported, via the new canals, from the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in Pakistan is "heavily dependent on water originating from snow and glacier melt at high altitudes"; Exhibit P-283. The irrigation system in Pakistan is crucial, due to the combination of the seasonality of river flows on the Western Rivers, the arid climate in much of the country outside of the monsoon season and, following the Treaty, the non-availability of the Eastern Rivers. The Memorial, at paragraphs 3.39 to 3.49, gives a brief history of the irrigation system in Pakistan, which originates several thousand years ago. That system has though seen two periods of substantial	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on 15th August 1947, were dependent on water supplies from the Eastern Rivers." You can see then in the provisions of Article V India's large contribution to the funding of those works was "In consideration" and they were the words used "In consideration" for the fact that they were required in order to replace water supplies in Pakistan previously received from Eastern Rivers, with supplies to be transported, via the new canals, from the Western Rivers.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in Pakistan is "heavily dependent on water originating from snow and glacier melt at high altitudes"; Exhibit P-283. The irrigation system in Pakistan is crucial, due to the combination of the seasonality of river flows on the Western Rivers, the arid climate in much of the country outside of the monsoon season and, following the Treaty, the non-availability of the Eastern Rivers. The Memorial, at paragraphs 3.39 to 3.49, gives a brief history of the irrigation system in Pakistan, which originates several thousand years ago. That system has though seen two periods of substantial expansion. The first, which is not so important to us,	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 (Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on 15th August 1947, were dependent on water supplies from the Eastern Rivers." You can see then in the provisions of Article V India's large contribution to the funding of those works was "In consideration" and they were the words used "In consideration" for the fact that they were required in order to replace water supplies in Pakistan previously received from Eastern Rivers, with supplies to be transported, via the new canals, from the Western Rivers.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in Pakistan is "heavily dependent on water originating from snow and glacier melt at high altitudes"; Exhibit P-283. The irrigation system in Pakistan is crucial, due to the combination of the seasonality of river flows on the Western Rivers, the arid climate in much of the country outside of the monsoon season and, following the Treaty, the non-availability of the Eastern Rivers. The Memorial, at paragraphs 3.39 to 3.49, gives a brief history of the irrigation system in Pakistan, which originates several thousand years ago. That system has though seen two periods of substantial expansion. The first, which is not so important to us, is the expansion during the late 19th century, under	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	(Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on 15th August 1947, were dependent on water supplies from the Eastern Rivers." You can see then in the provisions of Article V India's large contribution to the funding of those works was "In consideration" and they were the words used "In consideration" for the fact that they were required in order to replace water supplies in Pakistan previously received from Eastern Rivers, with supplies to be transported, via the new canals, from the Western Rivers.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	This is confirmed by scientific commentary on the importance of mountain water and meltwater, more specifically for production of early Kharif crops, such as cotton, which is of course particularly thirsty, and rice and sugar cane. There's an organisation based in Nepal, I think called HI-AWARE: it's aimed at enhancing climate resilience in the mountains and floodplains of the Indus. This is a different one; this is not the Nepalese one, I'm sorry. But that organisation, that focuses on climate resilience in the Indus, observed in a 2018 study that food production in Pakistan is "heavily dependent on water originating from snow and glacier melt at high altitudes"; Exhibit P-283. The irrigation system in Pakistan is crucial, due to the combination of the seasonality of river flows on the Western Rivers, the arid climate in much of the country outside of the monsoon season and, following the Treaty, the non-availability of the Eastern Rivers. The Memorial, at paragraphs 3.39 to 3.49, gives a brief history of the irrigation system in Pakistan, which originates several thousand years ago. That system has though seen two periods of substantial expansion. The first, which is not so important to us,	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 (Slide 21) We can look at Articles IV and V, the relevant parts, now. They make detailed provision for the expansion of Pakistan's irrigation network so as to supply areas previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers with irrigation from the Western Rivers. So there you can see Article IV(1) required Pakistan to: " use its best endeavours to construct and bring into operation, with due regard to expedition and economy, that part of a system of works which will accomplish the replacement, from the Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on 15th August 1947, were dependent on water supplies from the Eastern Rivers." You can see then in the provisions of Article V India's large contribution to the funding of those works was "In consideration" and they were the words used "In consideration" for the fact that they were required in order to replace water supplies in Pakistan previously received from Eastern Rivers, with supplies to be transported, via the new canals, from the Western Rivers.

		1	
14.45 1	21 million bostones of conjusting lond in Polyiston	14.40 1	in India now also irrigated by the Eastern Divers
14:45 1	21 million hectares of agricultural land in Pakistan alone. As the table in my next slide, slide 22 which	14:49 1 2	in India now also irrigated by the Eastern Rivers, including those canals I mentioned earlier, which extend
23	is also Memorial figure 3.8 shows, this comprises	3	hundreds of kilometres into India, as far away as
4	more than 84% of the total irrigated agricultural land	4	Rajasthan.
5	in the Indus Basin.	5	(Slide 28) there's an additional small area of
6	The areas served by the Western Rivers irrigation	6	long-standing Indian irrigation upstream on the Western
7	network in Pakistan are illustrated in my next slide	7	Rivers; this is the red one. This predates 1960, and
8	(23). Here it is. This is based on Memorial map 3.7	8	was explicitly preserved, under Article III of the
9	and it shows the total area of agricultural land in	9	Treaty and Annexure C, as an exception to India's
10	Pakistan that is irrigated by the Western Rivers.	10	let-flow obligation in relation to the Western Rivers.
10	(Slide 24) It is split into three. The green part,	10	And finally, the 1.5% or so in Afghanistan is in
11	the first part there, is the areas that are irrigated	11	purple, as I mentioned.
12	and are located within the natural catchment area of the	12	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Fietta, I don't know if anything turns on
13	Western Rivers. So they are, if you like, naturally	13	this for our current case, but I'm curious whether the
14	irrigated by the Western Rivers.	15	diversion of water from essentially the green area here
16	(Slide 25) But there are two significant additional	16	down to the yellow area, and perhaps the pink as well,
10	areas. The first is the yellow one that we can see now,	10	resulted in a decrease in the waters that normally would
18	and that is the area irrigated by the Western Rivers	18	have been in the green area in a manner that worked to
10	today that [is] located in areas previously irrigated by	10	the detriment of those in the original catchment area,
20	the Eastern Rivers. This is the area that was the focus	20	if you will.
20	of the post-Treaty irrigation works, to which I'll	21	MR FIETTA: Yes, thank you for the question. I will come to
22	return shortly. It covers approximately 50,500 square	22	that; I was going to address it briefly later. But the
23	kilometres or 5 million hectares.	23	answer, essentially, is: yes.
24	(Slide 26) Then the second additional area is the	24	The expansion of the irrigation network, the very
25	pink one in the Lower Indus Valley. But this is outside	25	substantial expansion east into the yellow area, has
	-		
	Page 149		Page 151
14:47 1	of the natural catchment of the Indus actually, so I may	14:51 1	placed stress significant stress, at times on the
	of the natural catchment of the Indus actually, so I may have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley.	14:51 1	placed stress significant stress, at times on the waters of the Western Rivers within their natural
14:47 1 2 3	of the natural catchment of the Indus actually, so I may have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation		· ·
2	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley.	2	waters of the Western Rivers within their natural
2 3	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation	2 3	waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area,
2 3 4	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is	2 3 4	waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the
2 3 4 5	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in	2 3 4 5	waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in
2 3 4 5 6	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country	2 3 4 5 6	waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry.
2 3 4 5 6 7	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin	2 3 4 5 6 7	 waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the irrigated area in the Indus Basin, and of course that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of the irrigation areas of the basin. And that does mean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the irrigated area in the Indus Basin, and of course that's irrigated from the Eastern Rivers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of the irrigation areas of the basin. And that does mean that at times some areas, including areas that would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the irrigated area in the Indus Basin, and of course that's irrigated from the Eastern Rivers. Between them, the blue area in Indian-administered	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of the irrigation areas of the basin. And that does mean that at times some areas, including areas that would otherwise have been more plentiful with water in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the irrigated area in the Indus Basin, and of course that's irrigated from the Eastern Rivers. Between them, the blue area in Indian-administered areas and the remainder in Pakistan comprise 98.5% of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of the irrigation areas of the basin. And that does mean that at times some areas, including areas that would otherwise have been more plentiful with water in the western catchment, have to make sacrifices for other
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the irrigated area in the Indus Basin, and of course that's irrigated from the Eastern Rivers. Between them, the blue area in Indian-administered areas and the remainder in Pakistan comprise 98.5% of the irrigation in the Indus Basin. The remaining 1.5%	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of the irrigation areas of the basin. And that does mean that at times some areas, including areas that would otherwise have been more plentiful with water in the western catchment, have to make sacrifices for other areas.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the irrigated area in the Indus Basin, and of course that's irrigated from the Eastern Rivers. Between them, the blue area in Indian-administered areas and the remainder in Pakistan comprise 98.5% of the irrigation in the Indus Basin. The remaining 1.5% is located in Afghanistan, on the Kabul River. You can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of the irrigation areas of the basin. And that does mean that at times some areas, including areas that would otherwise have been more plentiful with water in the western catchment, have to make sacrifices for other areas. This map, perhaps more than any others that you'll
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the irrigated area in the Indus Basin, and of course that's irrigated from the Eastern Rivers. Between them, the blue area in Indian-administered areas and the remainder in Pakistan comprise 98.5% of the irrigation in the Indus Basin. The remaining 1.5% is located in Afghanistan, on the Kabul River. You can see that if you look carefully in the top left it has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of the irrigation areas of the basin. And that does mean that at times some areas, including areas that would otherwise have been more plentiful with water in the western catchment, have to make sacrifices for other areas. This map, perhaps more than any others that you'll see this week, shows the overriding dependence of
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the irrigated area in the Indus Basin, and of course that's irrigated from the Eastern Rivers. Between them, the blue area in Indian-administered areas and the remainder in Pakistan comprise 98.5% of the irrigation in the Indus Basin. The remaining 1.5% is located in Afghanistan, on the Kabul River. You can see that if you look carefully in the top left it has just appeared in the extreme north-west of the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of the irrigation areas of the basin. And that does mean that at times some areas, including areas that would otherwise have been more plentiful with water in the western catchment, have to make sacrifices for other areas. This map, perhaps more than any others that you'll see this week, shows the overriding dependence of Pakistan on the free flow of the Western Rivers under
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array} $	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the irrigated area in the Indus Basin, and of course that's irrigated from the Eastern Rivers. Between them, the blue area in Indian-administered areas and the remainder in Pakistan comprise 98.5% of the irrigation in the Indus Basin. The remaining 1.5% is located in Afghanistan, on the Kabul River. You can see that if you look carefully in the top left it has just appeared in the extreme north-west of the Indus Basin.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of the irrigation areas of the basin. And that does mean that at times some areas, including areas that would otherwise have been more plentiful with water in the western catchment, have to make sacrifices for other areas. This map, perhaps more than any others that you'll see this week, shows the overriding dependence of Pakistan on the free flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty, both in the vast natural
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array} $	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the irrigated area in the Indus Basin, and of course that's irrigated from the Eastern Rivers. Between them, the blue area in Indian-administered areas and the remainder in Pakistan comprise 98.5% of the irrigation in the Indus Basin. The remaining 1.5% is located in Afghanistan, on the Kabul River. You can see that if you look carefully in the top left it has just appeared in the extreme north-west of the Indus Basin. (Slide 27) So the Indian area of irrigation is	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of the irrigation areas of the basin. And that does mean that at times some areas, including areas that would otherwise have been more plentiful with water in the western catchment, have to make sacrifices for other areas. This map, perhaps more than any others that you'll see this week, shows the overriding dependence of Pakistan on the free flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty, both in the vast natural catchment areas of the Western Rivers themselves and
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array} $	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the irrigated area in the Indus Basin, and of course that's irrigated from the Eastern Rivers. Between them, the blue area in Indian-administered areas and the remainder in Pakistan comprise 98.5% of the irrigation in the Indus Basin. The remaining 1.5% is located in Afghanistan, on the Kabul River. You can see that if you look carefully in the top left it has just appeared in the extreme north-west of the Indus Basin. (Slide 27) So the Indian area of irrigation is marked blue, and this is an area supplied exclusively by	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of the irrigation areas of the basin. And that does mean that at times some areas, including areas that would otherwise have been more plentiful with water in the western catchment, have to make sacrifices for other areas. This map, perhaps more than any others that you'll see this week, shows the overriding dependence of Pakistan on the free flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty, both in the vast natural catchment areas of the Western Rivers themselves and beyond, into the similarly vast yellow and pink areas on
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the irrigated area in the Indus Basin, and of course that's irrigated from the Eastern Rivers. Between them, the blue area in Indian-administered areas and the remainder in Pakistan comprise 98.5% of the irrigation in the Indus Basin. The remaining 1.5% is located in Afghanistan, on the Kabul River. You can see that if you look carefully in the top left it has just appeared in the extreme north-west of the Indus Basin. (Slide 27) So the Indian area of irrigation is marked blue, and this is an area supplied exclusively by the Eastern Rivers. Of course, this map does not	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of the irrigation areas of the basin. And that does mean that at times some areas, including areas that would otherwise have been more plentiful with water in the western catchment, have to make sacrifices for other areas. This map, perhaps more than any others that you'll see this week, shows the overriding dependence of Pakistan on the free flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty, both in the vast natural catchment areas of the Western Rivers themselves and beyond, into the similarly vast yellow and pink areas on this map, also irrigated by the Western Rivers today.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array} $	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the irrigated area in the Indus Basin, and of course that's irrigated from the Eastern Rivers. Between them, the blue area in Indian-administered areas and the remainder in Pakistan comprise 98.5% of the irrigation in the Indus Basin. The remaining 1.5% is located in Afghanistan, on the Kabul River. You can see that if you look carefully in the top left it has just appeared in the extreme north-west of the Indus Basin. (Slide 27) So the Indian area of irrigation is marked blue, and this is an area supplied exclusively by	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of the irrigation areas of the basin. And that does mean that at times some areas, including areas that would otherwise have been more plentiful with water in the western catchment, have to make sacrifices for other areas. This map, perhaps more than any others that you'll see this week, shows the overriding dependence of Pakistan on the free flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty, both in the vast natural catchment areas of the Western Rivers themselves and beyond, into the similarly vast yellow and pink areas on this map, also irrigated by the Western Rivers today.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	have misspoken by describing it as being in the valley. It is therefore an extension from the natural irrigation and catchment area of the Western Rivers. And that is another very significant area of agricultural land in the south of the country and the centre of the country which is irrigated now exclusively by Western Rivers water. The remaining areas of irrigation in the Indus Basin are shown on my next slide (27), if you look carefully. The blue one is easy to spot. This is the area of Indian irrigation, comprising approximately 14.3% of the irrigated area in the Indus Basin, and of course that's irrigated from the Eastern Rivers. Between them, the blue area in Indian-administered areas and the remainder in Pakistan comprise 98.5% of the irrigation in the Indus Basin. The remaining 1.5% is located in Afghanistan, on the Kabul River. You can see that if you look carefully in the top left it has just appeared in the extreme north-west of the Indus Basin. (Slide 27) So the Indian area of irrigation is marked blue, and this is an area supplied exclusively by the Eastern Rivers. Of course, this map does not	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 waters of the Western Rivers within their natural catchment, such that sometimes when the eastern area, the yellow area, is in particular demand for water, the rivers, or stretches of the rivers or canal network in the green area will run dry. So, as I'll discuss when we get to the irrigation network in more detail, this is a complex system of irrigation which is run at a national level, of course, and then a provincial level, below the national regulator, and which essentially works hard to distribute the waters as needed across the entirety of the irrigation areas of the basin. And that does mean that at times some areas, including areas that would otherwise have been more plentiful with water in the western catchment, have to make sacrifices for other areas. This map, perhaps more than any others that you'll see this week, shows the overriding dependence of Pakistan on the free flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty, both in the vast natural catchment areas of the Western Rivers themselves and beyond, into the similarly vast yellow and pink areas on this map, also irrigated by the Western Rivers today.

14:52 1	in green, yellow and pink is over 206,000 square	14:56 1	built by or under the British colonial rule between 1857
2	kilometres. It's roughly the same size almost	2	and 1947. And you can see that the connections between
3	exactly, actually, the same size as Great Britain.	3	the Western Rivers which are isolated here on the
4	And the yellow area alone at 50,548 square kilometres,	4	illustration and the Eastern Rivers, between the
5	previously irrigated by the Eastern Rivers and now	5	Western and Eastern Rivers at that time the links were
6	supplied by the Western Rivers, that yellow area alone	6	relatively rudimentary, with only a handful of barrages
7	is about 25% larger than the Netherlands. So these are	7	and link canals in operation, and no reservoirs at all
8	very large areas.	8	at this point on the Western Rivers. So that's our
9	My next set of slides takes us to the handouts	9	starting point, if you like.
10	actually. What we're going to do is chart the expansion	10	The next illustration you have, which is slide 30,
11	of the irrigation network and the major steps in that	11	and if we go again back between the 1947 and 1960, you
12	expansion since independence, and in particular since	12	will see the changes they leap out made, and you
13	1960.	13	will see the changes on the paper versions between 1947
14	It's at this point that you might want to open your	14	and 1960. Now, these were a number of expansions made,
15	folders for orientation purposes, because on the slides	15	if you like, in anticipation of the Treaty and following
16	these diagrams are harder to read, I think, than they	16	the 1948 water crisis which we've discussed before.
17	are on the paper. But when we talk about specific	17	Pakistan did not delay in starting to make its water
18	features of the network, we will zoom in on them on the	18	system, its irrigation system, more immune to
19	slides.	19	intervention that it had suffered in 1948.
20	So there are four A3 sheets in your folders, and	20	(Slide 31) A particularly significant development
21	they take snapshots of the system in 1947; in 1960, the	21	during this period between 1947 and 1960 was the
22	date, of course, of the Treaty; 1970, to coincide with	22	construction of this link canal. We've circled it in
23	the end of the transition period; and 2020, to give you	23	yellow. It's a link canal between the Marala it's
24	a reflection of the system as it stands now.	24	called the Marala-Ravi Link Canal, between the
25	I think just by comparing those and we'll get to	25	Chenab River and the Ravi. And this was built to
	Page 153		Page 155
14:54 1	the detail but by comparing those four snapshots, you	14:58 1	transport waters from the Chenab directly to the Ravi
14:54 1 2	the detail but by comparing those four snapshots, you will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its	14:58 1 2	transport waters from the Chenab directly to the Ravi upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between
14:54 1 2 3	the detail but by comparing those four snapshots, you will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and		transport waters from the Chenab directly to the Ravi upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next
2	will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its	2	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between
2 3	will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and	2 3	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next
2 3 4	will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from	2 3 4	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal.
2 3 4 5	will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of	2 3 4 5	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals
2 3 4 5 6	will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former	2 3 4 5 6	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not
2 3 4 5 6 7	will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers.	2 3 4 5 6 7	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, where there is significant irrigation in its own right. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main canals, and you see the main canals here in green on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, where there is significant irrigation in its own right. But to make them a little bit more user-friendly for you 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main canals, and you see the main canals here in green on these illustrations. But these main canals would then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 12 13 14 15	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, where there is significant irrigation in its own right. But to make them a little bit more user-friendly for you and focused, we've taken those elements out, although 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main canals, and you see the main canals here in green on these illustrations. But these main canals would then split into branch canals, and those branch canals will
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, where there is significant irrigation in its own right. But to make them a little bit more user-friendly for you and focused, we've taken those elements out, although they do appear in the version of this figure at 3.7 of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main canals, and you see the main canals here in green on these illustrations. But these main canals would then split into branch canals, and those branch canals will split into smaller distributaries, which are, if you
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, where there is significant irrigation in its own right. But to make them a little bit more user-friendly for you and focused, we've taken those elements out, although they do appear in the version of this figure at 3.7 of the Memorial. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main canals, and you see the main canals here in green on these illustrations. But these main canals would then split into branch canals, and those branch canals will split into smaller distributaries, which are, if you like, the capillaries of the system. And it's those
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ \end{array} $	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, where there is significant irrigation in its own right. But to make them a little bit more user-friendly for you and focused, we've taken those elements out, although they do appear in the version of this figure at 3.7 of the Memorial. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main canals, and you see the main canals here in green on these illustrations. But these main canals would then split into branch canals, and those branch canals will split into smaller distributaries, which are, if you like, the capillaries of the system. And it's those distributaries which distribute the water at
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, where there is significant irrigation in its own right. But to make them a little bit more user-friendly for you and focused, we've taken those elements out, although they do appear in the version of this figure at 3.7 of the Memorial. So these illustrations show the scale and the speed, as we'll see, of Pakistan's irrigation network expansion 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main canals, and you see the main canals here in green on these illustrations. But these main canals would then split into branch canals, and those branch canals will split into smaller distributaries, which are, if you like, the capillaries of the system. And it's those distributaries which distribute the water at a farm-to-farm level within Pakistan.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, where there is significant irrigation in its own right. But to make them a little bit more user-friendly for you and focused, we've taken those elements out, although they do appear in the version of this figure at 3.7 of the Memorial. So these illustrations show the scale and the speed, as we'll see, of Pakistan's irrigation network expansion during the years immediately leading up to the Treaty 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main canals, and you see the main canals here in green on these illustrations. But these main canals would then split into branch canals, and those branch canals will split into smaller distributaries, which are, if you like, the capillaries of the system. And it's those distributaries which distribute the water at a farm-to-farm level within Pakistan. So this was the first construction of a link canal
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array} $	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, where there is significant irrigation in its own right. But to make them a little bit more user-friendly for you and focused, we've taken those elements out, although they do appear in the version of this figure at 3.7 of the Memorial. So these illustrations show the scale and the speed, as we'll see, of Pakistan's irrigation network expansion during the years immediately leading up to the Treaty and following the Treaty. I don't have time today to 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main canals, and you see the main canals here in green on these illustrations. But these main canals would then split into branch canals, and those branch canals will split into smaller distributaries, which are, if you like, the capillaries of the system. And it's those distributaries which distribute the water at a farm-to-farm level within Pakistan. So this was the first construction of a link canal following partition, and in anticipation of the Treaty,
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, where there is significant irrigation in its own right. But to make them a little bit more user-friendly for you and focused, we've taken those elements out, although they do appear in the version of this figure at 3.7 of the Memorial. So these illustrations show the scale and the speed, as we'll see, of Pakistan's irrigation network expansion during the years immediately leading up to the Treaty and following the Treaty. I don't have time today to explain each and every expansion, but I am going to 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main canals, and you see the main canals here in green on these illustrations. But these main canals would then split into branch canals, and those branch canals will split into smaller distributaries, which are, if you like, the capillaries of the system. And it's those distributaries which distribute the water at a farm-to-farm level within Pakistan. So this was the first construction of a link canal following partition, and in anticipation of the Treaty, to replenish flows in the Ravi and in the Eastern Rivers
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, where there is significant irrigation in its own right. But to make them a little bit more user-friendly for you and focused, we've taken those elements out, although they do appear in the version of this figure at 3.7 of the Memorial. So these illustrations show the scale and the speed, as we'll see, of Pakistan's irrigation network expansion during the years immediately leading up to the Treaty and following the Treaty. I don't have time today to explain each and every expansion, but I am going to focus on some key elements of that expansion. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main canals, and you see the main canals here in green on these illustrations. But these main canals would then split into branch canals, and those branch canals will split into smaller distributaries, which are, if you like, the capillaries of the system. And it's those distributaries which distribute the water at a farm-to-farm level within Pakistan. So this was the first construction of a link canal following partition, and in anticipation of the Treaty, to replenish flows in the Ravi and in the Eastern Rivers basin. In fact, an interesting fact is: today, if
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, where there is significant irrigation in its own right. But to make them a little bit more user-friendly for you and focused, we've taken those elements out, although they do appear in the version of this figure at 3.7 of the Memorial. So these illustrations show the scale and the speed, as we'll see, of Pakistan's irrigation network expansion during the years immediately leading up to the Treaty and following the Treaty. I don't have time today to explain each and every expansion, but I am going to focus on some key elements of that expansion. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main canals, and you see the main canals here in green on these illustrations. But these main canals would then split into branch canals, and those branch canals will split into smaller distributaries, which are, if you like, the capillaries of the system. And it's those distributaries which distribute the water at a farm-to-farm level within Pakistan. So this was the first construction of a link canal following partition, and in anticipation of the Treaty, to replenish flows in the Ravi and in the Eastern Rivers basin. In fact, an interesting fact is: today, if you're in Lahore, and you see the River Ravi flowing in
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, where there is significant irrigation in its own right. But to make them a little bit more user-friendly for you and focused, we've taken those elements out, although they do appear in the version of this figure at 3.7 of the Memorial. So these illustrations show the scale and the speed, as we'll see, of Pakistan's irrigation network expansion during the years immediately leading up to the Treaty and following the Treaty. I don't have time today to explain each and every expansion, but I am going to focus on some key elements of that expansion. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main canals, and you see the main canals here in green on these illustrations. But these main canals would then split into branch canals, and those branch canals will split into smaller distributaries, which are, if you like, the capillaries of the system. And it's those distributaries which distribute the water at a farm-to-farm level within Pakistan. So this was the first construction of a link canal following partition, and in anticipation of the Treaty, to replenish flows in the Ravi and in the Eastern Rivers basin. In fact, an interesting fact is: today, if
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 will appreciate the huge expansion by Pakistan of its irrigation network since its independence in 1947 and since the Treaty in 1960 so as to utilise waters from the Western Rivers throughout the agricultural areas of Pakistan, and in particular throughout the former catchment of the Eastern Rivers. So these diagrams are based on figure 3.7 of Pakistan's Memorial and they're broken down over those four time windows. We've simplified them a little bit: we have removed extraneous or irrelevant aspects of the network, particularly on the Kabul and Swat Rivers, where there is significant irrigation in its own right. But to make them a little bit more user-friendly for you and focused, we've taken those elements out, although they do appear in the version of this figure at 3.7 of the Memorial. So these illustrations show the scale and the speed, as we'll see, of Pakistan's irrigation network expansion during the years immediately leading up to the Treaty and following the Treaty. I don't have time today to explain each and every expansion, but I am going to focus on some key elements of that expansion. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	upstream of Lahore, close to the Line of Control between India and Pakistan. And we've zoomed in on the next slide (32) on that link canal. Now, this was the first of a number of link canals you're going to see that have been built. These are not for irrigation themselves, because they are vast: they look like rivers, significant rivers, in their own right. They are purely for the purpose of transporting water from one river into the catchment of another for onward distribution through a network of canals. So the link canals would typically join up with main canals, and you see the main canals here in green on these illustrations. But these main canals would then split into branch canals, and those branch canals will split into smaller distributaries, which are, if you like, the capillaries of the system. And it's those distributaries which distribute the water at a farm-to-farm level within Pakistan. So this was the first construction of a link canal following partition, and in anticipation of the Treaty, to replenish flows in the Ravi and in the Eastern Rivers basin. In fact, an interesting fact is: today, if you're in Lahore, and you see the River Ravi flowing in

,			
15:00 1	MR Link Canal. So it's Western Rivers water, it's not	15:03 1	the waters, so some of that water may be diverted down
2	Eastern Rivers water.	2	a main canal, for example, where they're illustrated
3	So that's 1947 to 1960. But the period we're	3	here. And then you have syphons: there's a syphon
4	particularly interested in is the next period: between	4	there, the Mailsi syphon. That is a more basic
5	1960 and 1970. And this is, of course, the transition	5	structure to facilitate the transit of the water across
6	period under the Treaty.	6	the Sutlej riverbed there, into areas beyond, in the
7	(Slide 33) As you can see, that period saw	7	southeast of Pakistan, for irrigation.
8	an enormous expansion of irrigation works, that	8	This period, between 1960 and 1970, also saw
9	required, in the words of Article [IV], paragraph (1):	9	construction of Pakistan's first dam and reservoir on
10	" [to] accomplish the replacement, from the	10	the Jhelum at Mangla, to help regulate flows upstream of
11	Western Rivers and other sources, of water supplies for	11	the new barrages and link canals.
12	irrigation canals in Pakistan which, on	12	It's important to note that these reservoirs and
13	15th August 1947, were dependent on water supplies from	13	dams, the three of them now on the Western Rivers, their
14	the Eastern Rivers."	14	main purpose is for irrigation. They do also generate
15	So if we again just flick between those two, you can	15	electricity, but their main purpose is to assist with
16	see the difference between 1960 that's 1960 and	16	the control of flows, and to provide storage critical
17	1970: substantial development in that ten-year period.	17	storage on the system for when it's needed.
18	We can't focus on all of it, of course, but we can	18	The Chashma-Jhelum Link Canal, which I think might
19	focus on a couple of examples. It included, for	19	be on the next slide maybe it's not on a slide, that
20	example, the construction of multiple of these giant	20	one, actually that supplies additional water upstream
21	link canals between the Western Rivers and areas	21	of the Trimmu Barrage, and that's for onward
22	previously irrigated on the Eastern Rivers.	22	distribution to areas previously supplied by the Ravi
23	(Slide 34) We're going to highlight one of the main	23	and Sutlej. And that was also completed in the 1970s.
24	links there, which is a new link, which runs from the	24	I think I may have jumped actually from the 1960 to
25	Jhelum through the Chenab and the Ravi and the Sutlej.	25	1970 period. So I think this was my last slide on the
	Page 157		Page 159
	1450157		1 420 109
15:01 1	So across those four rivers, two Western supplying all	15:05 1	expansion between 1960 and 1970. So that's the most
15:01 1 2	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers.	15:05 1 2	substantial period of expansion.
	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated		substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last
2	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are	2 3 4	substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation
2 3	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated	2 3	substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made
2 3 4 5 6	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we	2 3 4	substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition
2 3 4 5 6 7	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad	2 3 4 5 6 7	substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly. These link canals were, and remain today, a mainstay	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled. Also in that period during the 1970s the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly. These link canals were, and remain today, a mainstay of the infrastructure put in place following the Treaty,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled. Also in that period during the 1970s the Chashma-Jhelum Link Canal was completed, as I say, which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly. These link canals were, and remain today, a mainstay of the infrastructure put in place following the Treaty, in order to use waters from the Jhelum and Chenab to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled. Also in that period during the 1970s the Chashma-Jhelum Link Canal was completed, as I say, which supplies additional water to the Eastern Rivers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly. These link canals were, and remain today, a mainstay of the infrastructure put in place following the Treaty, in order to use waters from the Jhelum and Chenab to irrigate agricultural areas of Pakistani Punjab that had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled. Also in that period during the 1970s the Chashma-Jhelum Link Canal was completed, as I say, which supplies additional water to the Eastern Rivers. Now, that link canal actually goes to your question,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly. These link canals were, and remain today, a mainstay of the infrastructure put in place following the Treaty, in order to use waters from the Jhelum and Chenab to irrigate agricultural areas of Pakistani Punjab that had previously been supplied by the Eastern Rivers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled. Also in that period during the 1970s the Chashma-Jhelum Link Canal was completed, as I say, which supplies additional water to the Eastern Rivers. Now, that link canal actually goes to your question, Mr Chairman, of earlier, because it was built slightly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly. These link canals were, and remain today, a mainstay of the infrastructure put in place following the Treaty, in order to use waters from the Jhelum and Chenab to irrigate agricultural areas of Pakistani Punjab that had previously been supplied by the Eastern Rivers. A similar set of link canals were constructed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled. Also in that period during the 1970s the Chashma-Jhelum Link Canal was completed, as I say, which supplies additional water to the Eastern Rivers. Now, that link canal actually goes to your question, Mr Chairman, of earlier, because it was built slightly later. And it was crucial to allow replenishment, from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly. These link canals were, and remain today, a mainstay of the infrastructure put in place following the Treaty, in order to use waters from the Jhelum and Chenab to irrigate agricultural areas of Pakistani Punjab that had previously been supplied by the Eastern Rivers. A similar set of link canals were constructed downstream I think that may be the next slide there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled. Also in that period during the 1970s the Chashma-Jhelum Link Canal was completed, as I say, which supplies additional water to the Eastern Rivers. Now, that link canal actually goes to your question, Mr Chairman, of earlier, because it was built slightly later. And it was crucial to allow replenishment, from the Indus, of waters in the Jhelum, another Western
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly. These link canals were, and remain today, a mainstay of the infrastructure put in place following the Treaty, in order to use waters from the Jhelum and Chenab to irrigate agricultural areas of Pakistani Punjab that had previously been supplied by the Eastern Rivers. A similar set of link canals were constructed downstream I think that may be the next slide there (36) between the Trimmu Barrage at the confluence of	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled. Also in that period during the 1970s the Chashma-Jhelum Link Canal was completed, as I say, which supplies additional water to the Eastern Rivers. Now, that link canal actually goes to your question, Mr Chairman, of earlier, because it was built slightly later. And it was crucial to allow replenishment, from the Indus, of waters in the Jhelum, another Western River, to compensate the Jhelum for water lost to the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly. These link canals were, and remain today, a mainstay of the infrastructure put in place following the Treaty, in order to use waters from the Jhelum and Chenab to irrigate agricultural areas of Pakistani Punjab that had previously been supplied by the Eastern Rivers. A similar set of link canals were constructed downstream I think that may be the next slide there (36) between the Trimmu Barrage at the confluence of the Jhelum and the Chenab on the Western Rivers, and the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled. Also in that period during the 1970s the Chashma-Jhelum Link Canal was completed, as I say, which supplies additional water to the Eastern Rivers. Now, that link canal actually goes to your question, Mr Chairman, of earlier, because it was built slightly later. And it was crucial to allow replenishment, from the Indus, of waters in the Jhelum, another Western River, to compensate the Jhelum for water lost to the Eastern Rivers. And as I mentioned, the pressure on
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly. These link canals were, and remain today, a mainstay of the infrastructure put in place following the Treaty, in order to use waters from the Jhelum and Chenab to irrigate agricultural areas of Pakistani Punjab that had previously been supplied by the Eastern Rivers. A similar set of link canals were constructed downstream I think that may be the next slide there (36) between the Trimmu Barrage at the confluence of the Jhelum and the Chenab on the Western Rivers, and the Sidhnai Barrage on the Ravi. This is the "TS" and "SMB"	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled. Also in that period during the 1970s the Chashma-Jhelum Link Canal was completed, as I say, which supplies additional water to the Eastern Rivers. Now, that link canal actually goes to your question, Mr Chairman, of earlier, because it was built slightly later. And it was crucial to allow replenishment, from the Indus, of waters in the Jhelum, another Western River, to compensate the Jhelum for water lost to the Eastern Rivers. And as I mentioned, the pressure on this irrigation network is such that there are times
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly. These link canals were, and remain today, a mainstay of the infrastructure put in place following the Treaty, in order to use waters from the Jhelum and Chenab to irrigate agricultural areas of Pakistani Punjab that had previously been supplied by the Eastern Rivers. A similar set of link canals were constructed downstream I think that may be the next slide there (36) between the Trimmu Barrage at the confluence of the Jhelum and the Chenab on the Western Rivers, and the Sidhnai Barrage on the Ravi. This is the "TS" and "SMB" link canals you can see there.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled. Also in that period during the 1970s the Chashma-Jhelum Link Canal was completed, as I say, which supplies additional water to the Eastern Rivers. Now, that link canal actually goes to your question, Mr Chairman, of earlier, because it was built slightly later. And it was crucial to allow replenishment, from the Indus, of waters in the Jhelum, another Western River, to compensate the Jhelum for water lost to the Eastern Rivers. And as I mentioned, the pressure on this irrigation network is such that there are times when parts of the Western Rivers run dry in order to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly. These link canals were, and remain today, a mainstay of the infrastructure put in place following the Treaty, in order to use waters from the Jhelum and Chenab to irrigate agricultural areas of Pakistani Punjab that had previously been supplied by the Eastern Rivers. A similar set of link canals were constructed downstream I think that may be the next slide there (36) between the Trimmu Barrage at the confluence of the Jhelum and the Chenab on the Western Rivers, and the Sidhnai Barrage on the Ravi. This is the "TS" and "SMB" link canals you can see there. (Slide 37) I am told that the difference between	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled. Also in that period during the 1970s the Chashma-Jhelum Link Canal was completed, as I say, which supplies additional water to the Eastern Rivers. Now, that link canal actually goes to your question, Mr Chairman, of earlier, because it was built slightly later. And it was crucial to allow replenishment, from the Indus, of waters in the Jhelum, another Western River, to compensate the Jhelum for water lost to the Eastern Rivers. And as I mentioned, the pressure on this irrigation network is such that there are times when parts of the Western Rivers run dry in order to supply the Eastern Rivers.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly. These link canals were, and remain today, a mainstay of the infrastructure put in place following the Treaty, in order to use waters from the Jhelum and Chenab to irrigate agricultural areas of Pakistani Punjab that had previously been supplied by the Eastern Rivers. A similar set of link canals were constructed downstream I think that may be the next slide there (36) between the Trimmu Barrage at the confluence of the Jhelum and the Chenab on the Western Rivers, and the Sidhnai Barrage on the Ravi. This is the "TS" and "SMB" link canals you can see there.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled. Also in that period during the 1970s the Chashma-Jhelum Link Canal was completed, as I say, which supplies additional water to the Eastern Rivers. Now, that link canal actually goes to your question, Mr Chairman, of earlier, because it was built slightly later. And it was crucial to allow replenishment, from the Indus, of waters in the Jhelum, another Western River, to compensate the Jhelum for water lost to the Eastern Rivers. And as I mentioned, the pressure on this irrigation network is such that there are times when parts of the Western Rivers run dry in order to
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	catchment areas of two Eastern Rivers. So this is a triplet of link canals and associated barrages. These barrages are new, and they are substantial of course in their own right; those barrages are critical for the control of these waters. So we have the Rasul Barrage on the Jhelum; the Qadirabad Barrage on the Chenab; the Balloki Barrage on the Ravi, just downstream of Lahore; and the Sulemanki Barrage on the Sutlej, as shown in the slide. And we zoom in on the next slide (35) so you can see those features more clearly. These link canals were, and remain today, a mainstay of the infrastructure put in place following the Treaty, in order to use waters from the Jhelum and Chenab to irrigate agricultural areas of Pakistani Punjab that had previously been supplied by the Eastern Rivers. A similar set of link canals were constructed downstream I think that may be the next slide there (36) between the Trimmu Barrage at the confluence of the Jhelum and the Chenab on the Western Rivers, and the Sidhnai Barrage on the Ravi. This is the "TS" and "SMB" link canals you can see there. (Slide 37) I am told that the difference between	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	substantial period of expansion. (Slide 38) And the fourth period, shown on my last A3 printout, takes us up to today, shows the irrigation network as at 2020. Most of those changes actually made between 1970 and 2020 are hangovers from the transition period. It's completion of infrastructure that was begun during the transition period. (Slide 39) This included the completion of the two further dams, the Tarbela and the Chashma Dams, both of which assist regulation of flows. And you see those here circled. Also in that period during the 1970s the Chashma-Jhelum Link Canal was completed, as I say, which supplies additional water to the Eastern Rivers. Now, that link canal actually goes to your question, Mr Chairman, of earlier, because it was built slightly later. And it was crucial to allow replenishment, from the Indus, of waters in the Jhelum, another Western River, to compensate the Jhelum for water lost to the Eastern Rivers. And as I mentioned, the pressure on this irrigation network is such that there are times when parts of the Western Rivers run dry in order to supply the Eastern Rivers.

15:06 1	at the 2020 snapshot, it comprises a vast network of	15:09 1	the system. They do not show the close to
2	3 major dams and reservoirs; 23 barrages or headworks,	2	2 million kilometres of branch canals and other small
3	which themselves are substantial pieces of	3	distributaries that are the lifeblood of the system.
4	infrastructure, which manage the flow of irrigated water	4	(Slide 44) Each of the canals shown here is what's
5	across the country.	5	called a "main canal": these thinner lines, which are
6	There are 12 of these major link canals facilitating	6	separate to the branch canals. And each of those main
7	the transfer of water between rivers, and hundreds of	7	canals is substantial, very substantial, which may feed
8	smaller branch canals. The branch canals alone extend	8	into the discussion about cutting off two canals, what
9	60,000 square kilometres. These branch canals which,	9	the effect of that might be.
10	if you saw them, would be substantial: they're much	10	(Slide 45) For example, the Kachhi Canal. This is
10	bigger than the canals I'm used to seeing in the UK	10	just an example which we've circled there, downstream on
11	those branch canals lead into more than 1.6 million	11	the Indus. That canal alone extends around
12	kilometres of ditches and streams, which collectively	12	500 kilometres and it supplies water to approximately
13	irrigate the 21 million hectares, or more than	13	1 million acres of agricultural land in Balochistan,
14	50 million acres, of Pakistani farmland, thereby	14	which is some distance from there.
	-	15 16	
16 17	ensuring the country's food security.	10	So these are very substantial main canal features
	But it's not just food security that this system		that you can see here, which feed into the branch canals
18	ensures: it also supplies drinking water. One of the	18 19	and the smaller parts of the network.
19	very small features which is actually vast on this		Finally on this irrigation network, I should mention the role of groundwater. Of course it does play a role
20	illustration in 2020 is circled there. We can zoom in	20	
21	at slide 42: the Karachi Urban Supply Canal. That	21	when there is a shortfall of water available in canal
22	supplies Karachi's drinking water. So it directly	22	networks. But even the country's groundwater resource
23	supplies drinking water to millions of people through	23	is reliant on sustained flows in the Western Rivers,
24 25	a channel fed by the Kotri Barrage, downstream on the Indus.	24	because as the World Bank has observed in Exhibit P-279
23	mdus.	25	at page 1, in research that it undertook, it said:
	Page 161		Page 163
15:08 1	Just a few other points on these illustrations, just	15:11 1	"Throughout the [Indus Basin Irrigation System],
2	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish	2	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread
2 3	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you	2 3	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network."
2 3 4	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go	2 3 4	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are
2 3 4 5	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey	2 3 4 5	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again
2 3 4 5 6	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder.	2 3 4 5 6	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore.
2 3 4 5 6 7	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey	2 3 4 5 6 7	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. If India were able to operate HEPs upstream so as to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. This doesn't mean to say the two zones are separate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. If India were able to operate HEPs upstream so as to restrict flows on the Western Rivers or distort the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. This doesn't mean to say the two zones are separate and independent because as needs arise, Western Rivers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. If India were able to operate HEPs upstream so as to restrict flows on the Western Rivers or distort the timing of flows on the Western Rivers, contrary to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. This doesn't mean to say the two zones are separate and independent because as needs arise, Western Rivers waters are allocated from one zone to the other, using	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. If India were able to operate HEPs upstream so as to restrict flows on the Western Rivers or distort the timing of flows on the Western Rivers, contrary to Article III of the Treaty, then, especially if this were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. This doesn't mean to say the two zones are separate and independent because as needs arise, Western Rivers waters are allocated from one zone to the other, using an intricate network of barrages and canals.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. If India were able to operate HEPs upstream so as to restrict flows on the Western Rivers or distort the timing of flows on the Western Rivers, contrary to Article III of the Treaty, then, especially if this were done during the early crop season, as happened in 1948,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. This doesn't mean to say the two zones are separate and independent because as needs arise, Western Rivers waters are allocated from one zone to the other, using an intricate network of barrages and canals. The system operates as one huge integrated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. If India were able to operate HEPs upstream so as to restrict flows on the Western Rivers or distort the timing of flows on the Western Rivers, contrary to Article III of the Treaty, then, especially if this were done during the early crop season, as happened in 1948, this would have a devastating impact on Pakistani
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. This doesn't mean to say the two zones are separate and independent because as needs arise, Western Rivers waters are allocated from one zone to the other, using an intricate network of barrages and canals. The system operates as one huge integrated structure, coordinated at national level by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. If India were able to operate HEPs upstream so as to restrict flows on the Western Rivers or distort the timing of flows on the Western Rivers, contrary to Article III of the Treaty, then, especially if this were done during the early crop season, as happened in 1948, this would have a devastating impact on Pakistani agriculture and on Pakistan as a whole.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. This doesn't mean to say the two zones are separate and independent because as needs arise, Western Rivers waters are allocated from one zone to the other, using an intricate network of barrages and canals. The system operates as one huge integrated structure, coordinated at national level by the Indus River System Authority, or IRSA. That regulates	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. If India were able to operate HEPs upstream so as to restrict flows on the Western Rivers or distort the timing of flows on the Western Rivers, contrary to Article III of the Treaty, then, especially if this were done during the early crop season, as happened in 1948, this would have a devastating impact on Pakistani agriculture and on Pakistan as a whole. (Slide 47) One way we can see that, just by way of
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. This doesn't mean to say the two zones are separate and independent because as needs arise, Western Rivers waters are allocated from one zone to the other, using an intricate network of barrages and canals. The system operates as one huge integrated structure, coordinated at national level by the Indus River System Authority, or IRSA. That regulates and monitors the distribution of water across the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. If India were able to operate HEPs upstream so as to restrict flows on the Western Rivers or distort the timing of flows on the Western Rivers, contrary to Article III of the Treaty, then, especially if this were done during the early crop season, as happened in 1948, this would have a devastating impact on Pakistani agriculture and on Pakistan as a whole. (Slide 47) One way we can see that, just by way of example, the vulnerabilities which Pakistan faces on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. This doesn't mean to say the two zones are separate and independent because as needs arise, Western Rivers waters are allocated from one zone to the other, using an intricate network of barrages and canals. The system operates as one huge integrated structure, coordinated at national level by the Indus River System Authority, or IRSA. That regulates and monitors the distribution of water across the country, and then the four provinces distribute the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. If India were able to operate HEPs upstream so as to restrict flows on the Western Rivers or distort the timing of flows on the Western Rivers, contrary to Article III of the Treaty, then, especially if this were done during the early crop season, as happened in 1948, this would have a devastating impact on Pakistani agriculture and on Pakistan as a whole. (Slide 47) One way we can see that, just by way of example, the vulnerabilities which Pakistan faces on the Chenab, circled there we zoom in on the next slide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. This doesn't mean to say the two zones are separate and independent because as needs arise, Western Rivers waters are allocated from one zone to the other, using an intricate network of barrages and canals. The system operates as one huge integrated structure, coordinated at national level by the Indus River System Authority, or IRSA. That regulates and monitors the distribution of water across the country, and then the four provinces distribute the water within their provinces accordingly.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. If India were able to operate HEPs upstream so as to restrict flows on the Western Rivers or distort the timing of flows on the Western Rivers, contrary to Article III of the Treaty, then, especially if this were done during the early crop season, as happened in 1948, this would have a devastating impact on Pakistani agriculture and on Pakistan as a whole. (Slide 47) One way we can see that, just by way of example, the vulnerabilities which Pakistan faces on the Chenab, circled there we zoom in on the next slide (48). Chenab there enters Pakistan and hits the Marala
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. This doesn't mean to say the two zones are separate and independent because as needs arise, Western Rivers waters are allocated from one zone to the other, using an intricate network of barrages and canals. The system operates as one huge integrated structure, coordinated at national level by the Indus River System Authority, or IRSA. That regulates and monitors the distribution of water across the country, and then the four provinces distribute the water within their provinces accordingly. As I mentioned, it is important to note that these	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. If India were able to operate HEPs upstream so as to restrict flows on the Western Rivers or distort the timing of flows on the Western Rivers, contrary to Article III of the Treaty, then, especially if this were done during the early crop season, as happened in 1948, this would have a devastating impact on Pakistani agriculture and on Pakistan as a whole. (Slide 47) One way we can see that, just by way of example, the vulnerabilities which Pakistan faces on the Chenab, circled there we zoom in on the next slide (48). Chenab there enters Pakistan and hits the Marala Barrage, where there is that link canal, which was one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. This doesn't mean to say the two zones are separate and independent because as needs arise, Western Rivers waters are allocated from one zone to the other, using an intricate network of barrages and canals. The system operates as one huge integrated structure, coordinated at national level by the Indus River System Authority, or IRSA. That regulates and monitors the distribution of water across the country, and then the four provinces distribute the water within their provinces accordingly.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. If India were able to operate HEPs upstream so as to restrict flows on the Western Rivers or distort the timing of flows on the Western Rivers, contrary to Article III of the Treaty, then, especially if this were done during the early crop season, as happened in 1948, this would have a devastating impact on Pakistani agriculture and on Pakistan as a whole. (Slide 47) One way we can see that, just by way of example, the vulnerabilities which Pakistan faces on the Chenab, circled there we zoom in on the next slide (48). Chenab there enters Pakistan and hits the Marala
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	so you know exactly what they show. They distinguish between two separate zones. You may have noticed as you went through them that there is a shaded area. If we go back to the 2020 version (slide 43), you see the grey area and then the remainder. The most relevant area for our purpose is the grey one, which is the Jhelum-Chenab or "JC" zone, and the rest of it is known as the "Indus main stem". The JC zone is most relevant because it regulates the bulk of the transfer of water from the Western Rivers to the Eastern Rivers, into areas previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. This doesn't mean to say the two zones are separate and independent because as needs arise, Western Rivers waters are allocated from one zone to the other, using an intricate network of barrages and canals. The system operates as one huge integrated structure, coordinated at national level by the Indus River System Authority, or IRSA. That regulates and monitors the distribution of water across the country, and then the four provinces distribute the water within their provinces accordingly. As I mentioned, it is important to note that these	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	fresh groundwater exists primarily due to widespread leakage from [the] canal network." These are not impermeable canal beds, and they are very important to supply of groundwater, including again around Lahore. Slide 46 is the diagram of the system as a whole. It shows that the timely and reliable inflow from India of the Western Rivers is critical in order to keep this irrigation system working and in order to continue the supply of water throughout this vast network to areas of Pakistan previously supplied by the Eastern Rivers. If India were able to operate HEPs upstream so as to restrict flows on the Western Rivers or distort the timing of flows on the Western Rivers, contrary to Article III of the Treaty, then, especially if this were done during the early crop season, as happened in 1948, this would have a devastating impact on Pakistani agriculture and on Pakistan as a whole. (Slide 47) One way we can see that, just by way of example, the vulnerabilities which Pakistan faces on the Chenab, circled there we zoom in on the next slide (48). Chenab there enters Pakistan and hits the Marala Barrage, where there is that link canal, which was one

15:13 1	has significant main canals running from it.	15:17 1	a clarification really.
2	Now, I mentioned earlier that the Chenab enters	2	The table is in bcm, billions of cubic metres, but
3	Pakistan on the plains. It has already descended from	3	the number you gave us for water use was
4	the mountains in Indian Administered Kashmir by that	4	104 million acre-feet. I'm not sure whether that was
5	point, and that means that it's effectively not feasible	5	a slip; we'll have to check the transcript. But I did
6	to build any reservoir or dam in that area to store	6	check the transcript, and it was acre-feet. So just for
7	water. So the flows through the link canal and the main	7	my benefit, if it's bcm, I think I can probably
8	canal there, which are very significant, and replenish	8	understand that.
9	waters in the Eastern Rivers, are directly reliant on	9	MR FIETTA: Yes, I think that's a valid observation.
10	the inflows of water and the undisturbed inflows	10	I believe the data points for those the 104
11	on the Western Rivers from Indian-controlled areas.	11	I mentioned at a different point, didn't I, of my
12	There are no link canals either, as you can see	12	presentation? is using different exhibits, which
13	here, to supply the Chenab: the topography prohibits	13	probably referred to a different source and a different
14	that too. So the entire system that flows downstream	14	point in time. But I can check that for you and come
15	from the Marala Barrage, for example, is dependent on	15	back.
16	the maintenance and reliability of flows on the	16	DR BLACKMORE: Yes, could you just do that? Because when
17	Chenab River.	17	I looked at it in the context of where I thought it
18	Without any reservoirs or incoming link canals,	18	landed, I had a little trouble rationalising it. So
19	there's nothing to mitigate, even temporarily, the	19	that's one.
20	catastrophic effect of any reduction in flows from India	20	The second point is an important point, I think,
21	on the Chenab. The net result would be catastrophe for	21	just in terms of the general discussion. And I like the
22	the network downstream.	22	way you've laid out the roll-through of the growth of
23	The position would be hardly any better on the Indus	23	the irrigation systems. But my understanding and
24	and Jhelum Rivers. There are some reservoirs on those	24	I think it's the same as your understanding, but might
25	rivers we've seen there are three but those	25	lead into what the consequences are is that there are
	Page 165		Page 167
15:15 1	reservoirs would offer only minimal protection if India	15:18 1	1.2 million groundwater bores embedded in this surface
15:15 1 2	reservoirs would offer only minimal protection if India were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows	15:18 1 2	1.2 million groundwater bores embedded in this surface water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the
2	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows	2	water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the
2 3	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers.	2 3	water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water.
2 3 4	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some	2 3 4	water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's
2 3 4 5	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course,	2 3 4 5	water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the
2 3 4 5 6	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in	2 3 4 5 6	water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage
2 3 4 5 6 7	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken	2 3 4 5 6 7	water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water.Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak.The point though is you were making a point about:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was a change in flows from the Western Rivers, that that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty in order to keep the irrigation network running. It is those full and timely flows on the Western Rivers that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was a change in flows from the Western Rivers, that that would be a significant issue. And it potentially is;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty in order to keep the irrigation network running. It is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was a change in flows from the Western Rivers, that that would be a significant issue. And it potentially is; I'm not buying into that. The question I'm asking is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty in order to keep the irrigation network running. It is those full and timely flows on the Western Rivers that India's enormous HEP programme upstream threatens to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was a change in flows from the Western Rivers, that that would be a significant issue. And it potentially is; I'm not buying into that. The question I'm asking is that you have a system with 1.2 million groundwater
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty in order to keep the irrigation network running. It is those full and timely flows on the Western Rivers that India's enormous HEP programme upstream threatens to disrupt, in violation of the Treaty.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was a change in flows from the Western Rivers, that that would be a significant issue. And it potentially is; I'm not buying into that. The question I'm asking is that you have a system with 1.2 million groundwater bores, which are independent, certainly for a period of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty in order to keep the irrigation network running. It is those full and timely flows on the Western Rivers that India's enormous HEP programme upstream threatens to disrupt, in violation of the Treaty. So that's the end of my presentation on irrigation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was a change in flows from the Western Rivers, that that would be a significant issue. And it potentially is; I'm not buying into that. The question I'm asking is that you have a system with 1.2 million groundwater bores, which are independent, certainly for a period of time three months, six months, nine months of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty in order to keep the irrigation network running. It is those full and timely flows on the Western Rivers that India's enormous HEP programme upstream threatens to disrupt, in violation of the Treaty. So that's the end of my presentation on irrigation. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was a change in flows from the Western Rivers, that that would be a significant issue. And it potentially is; I'm not buying into that. The question I'm asking is that you have a system with 1.2 million groundwater bores, which are independent, certainly for a period of time three months, six months, nine months of what's happening either with rainfall or channel flow.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty in order to keep the irrigation network running. It is those full and timely flows on the Western Rivers that India's enormous HEP programme upstream threatens to disrupt, in violation of the Treaty. So that's the end of my presentation on irrigation. I can move on now to speak about, more briefly, power generation. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was a change in flows from the Western Rivers, that that would be a significant issue. And it potentially is; I'm not buying into that. The question I'm asking is that you have a system with 1.2 million groundwater bores, which are independent, certainly for a period of time three months, six months, nine months of what's happening either with rainfall or channel flow.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty in order to keep the irrigation network running. It is those full and timely flows on the Western Rivers that India's enormous HEP programme upstream threatens to disrupt, in violation of the Treaty. So that's the end of my presentation on irrigation. I can move on now to speak about, more briefly, power generation. THE CHAIRMAN: Let me just check to be sure we have no 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was a change in flows from the Western Rivers, that that would be a significant issue. And it potentially is; I'm not buying into that. The question I'm asking is that you have a system with 1.2 million groundwater bores, which are independent, certainly for a period of time three months, six months, nine months of what's happening either with rainfall or channel flow. What's your assessment of the buffer that provides Pakistan in terms of critical water supply through a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty in order to keep the irrigation network running. It is those full and timely flows on the Western Rivers that India's enormous HEP programme upstream threatens to disrupt, in violation of the Treaty. So that's the end of my presentation on irrigation. I can move on now to speak about, more briefly, power generation. THE CHAIRMAN: Let me just check to be sure we have no questions for you on this part of your presentation. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was a change in flows from the Western Rivers, that that would be a significant issue. And it potentially is; I'm not buying into that. The question I'm asking is that you have a system with 1.2 million groundwater bores, which are independent, certainly for a period of time three months, six months, nine months of what's happening either with rainfall or channel flow. What's your assessment of the buffer that provides Pakistan in terms of critical water supply through a whether it's a climate emergency or something else?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty in order to keep the irrigation network running. It is those full and timely flows on the Western Rivers that India's enormous HEP programme upstream threatens to disrupt, in violation of the Treaty. So that's the end of my presentation on irrigation. I can move on now to speak about, more briefly, power generation. THE CHAIRMAN: Let me just check to be sure we have no questions for you on this part of your presentation. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was a change in flows from the Western Rivers, that that would be a significant issue. And it potentially is; I'm not buying into that. The question I'm asking is that you have a system with 1.2 million groundwater bores, which are independent, certainly for a period of time three months, six months, nine months of what's happening either with rainfall or channel flow. What's your assessment of the buffer that provides Pakistan in terms of critical water supply through a whether it's a climate emergency or something else? I'd just like your judgment on that, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty in order to keep the irrigation network running. It is those full and timely flows on the Western Rivers that India's enormous HEP programme upstream threatens to disrupt, in violation of the Treaty. So that's the end of my presentation on irrigation. I can move on now to speak about, more briefly, power generation. THE CHAIRMAN: Let me just check to be sure we have no questions for you on this part of your presentation. Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. (Pause) 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was a change in flows from the Western Rivers, that that would be a significant issue. And it potentially is; I'm not buying into that. The question I'm asking is that you have a system with 1.2 million groundwater bores, which are independent, certainly for a period of time three months, six months, nine months of what's happening either with rainfall or channel flow. What's your assessment of the buffer that provides Pakistan in terms of critical water supply through a whether it's a climate emergency or something else? I'd just like your judgment on that, please. MR FIETTA: Well, thank you for the question. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty in order to keep the irrigation network running. It is those full and timely flows on the Western Rivers that India's enormous HEP programme upstream threatens to disrupt, in violation of the Treaty. So that's the end of my presentation on irrigation. I can move on now to speak about, more briefly, power generation. THE CHAIRMAN: Let me just check to be sure we have no questions for you on this part of your presentation. Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. (Pause) Thank you. A very comprehensive presentation, and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was a change in flows from the Western Rivers, that that would be a significant issue. And it potentially is; I'm not buying into that. The question I'm asking is that you have a system with 1.2 million groundwater bores, which are independent, certainly for a period of time three months, six months, nine months of what's happening either with rainfall or channel flow. What's your assessment of the buffer that provides Pakistan in terms of critical water supply through a whether it's a climate emergency or something else? I'd just like your judgment on that, please. MR FIETTA: Well, thank you for the question. The groundwater is important, of course, in this basin.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 were to interfere with the flows or the timing of flows of those rivers. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, I have spent some time on the Indus Basin Irrigation System, of course, and thank you for bearing with me. I've done that in order to illustrate the enormity of the works undertaken by Pakistan, following the Treaty, in order to make up for the loss of the Eastern Rivers to India, and to illustrate the critical role of full and timely flow of the Western Rivers under Article III of the Treaty in order to keep the irrigation network running. It is those full and timely flows on the Western Rivers that India's enormous HEP programme upstream threatens to disrupt, in violation of the Treaty. So that's the end of my presentation on irrigation. I can move on now to speak about, more briefly, power generation. THE CHAIRMAN: Let me just check to be sure we have no questions for you on this part of your presentation. Dr Blackmore. DR BLACKMORE: Thank you. (Pause) Thank you. A very comprehensive presentation, and lots of numbers and the like. So just, first, 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 water system that supply, my memory is, about 50% of the surface water. Now, you've made the point, rightly, that there's only 12 bcm that comes from rainfall that recharges the groundwater, so the rest of it has to come from seepage in the surface water system. It's basically an alluvial floodplain, and they leak. The point though is you were making a point about: at the start of the irrigation season, if there was a change in flows from the Western Rivers, that that would be a significant issue. And it potentially is; I'm not buying into that. The question I'm asking is that you have a system with 1.2 million groundwater bores, which are independent, certainly for a period of time three months, six months, nine months of what's happening either with rainfall or channel flow. What's your assessment of the buffer that provides Pakistan in terms of critical water supply through a whether it's a climate emergency or something else? I'd just like your judgment on that, please. MR FIETTA: Well, thank you for the question. The groundwater is important, of course, in this basin. I think it's quite a technical question; I want to

15:20 1	go away and have a look at that, and come back to you on	15:23 1	address the decline in flow of the Western Rivers. And
2	it. Perhaps next week we'll come back to you on that	13.23 1	you're right, and it was also shown in slide 14.
3	question with a precise answer. I don't want to	3	But I can answer your central point there: no, it's
4	prejudge the specifics. Because just as you like	4	not Pakistan's case that the reduction in flows that has
5	numbers, and I want to give you numbers and I want to	5	been seen, it's not Pakistan's case that that has been
6	give you specifics, I don't have them at my fingertips.	6	caused by Indian conduct to date. It's caused by other
0 7	I will come back to you on that.	7	factors, which are debated. And it's not clear whether
8	DR BLACKMORE: Okay, thank you.	8	these are cyclical changes to the flows of the Western
9	THE CHAIRMAN: Professor Buytaert.	9	Rivers, whether they're caused by perhaps climate change
10	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you. But actually my colleague	10	and increasing evapotranspiration, different land use
10	already answered the question I was about to ask you	10	upstream, perhaps.
11	about the balance between groundwater and surface water	11	But it's not caused, certainly, by any of the
12	irrigation: the number is about 50%. Is that a number	12	conduct that we are most concerned with in this case as
13	you agree with, or any comments you can give on that	13	at this point in time. It's not as if the HEPs upstream
14	balance?	14	have declined the flows of the Western Rivers. That's
15		15	a point on which I have taken specific instruction
10	table showing the water resource, the total water	10	beforehand, and that's not the case.
17	resource. Let's have a look at that.	17	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.
13	DR BLACKMORE: Table 19?	18	-
19 20	MR FIETTA: Yes, exactly.	19 20	Then the last, hopefully quick, question: would you know the current level of stress on the Indus Basin as
20 21	I will double-check the reference to the internal	20 21	a whole; in other words, what is the percentage of total
21	Indus. This looks at the total average annual renewable	21 22	flow of the Indus main stem that is abstracted for
22	water resource in Pakistan, and as I mentioned, it	22	irrigation and other uses?
23 24	indicates that about two thirds of that total resource	23 24	MR FIETTA: Again, I may come back to that. We have 93% of
24	enters Pakistan on the Western Rivers.	24 25	the usable water resources used for irrigation and
25	eners i axistan on the western Rivers.	23	the usable water resources used for infigation and
	Page 169		Page 171
15:21 1	I think the answer to your question may relate in	15:25 1	agriculture. Whether that is comparable on the Indus
2	part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would	2	main stem, I'd have to check.
2 3	part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional	2 3	main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now.
2 3 4	part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus	2 3 4	main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause)
2 3 4 5	part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of	2 3 4 5	main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the
2 3 4 5 6	part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the	2 3 4 5 6	main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed,
2 3 4 5 6 7	part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan.	2 3 4 5 6 7	main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the groundwater recharge; it obviously doesn't show how much 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin. I've mentioned that the Western Rivers are the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the groundwater recharge; it obviously doesn't show how much of that, as I understand it, is taken out and actually 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin. I've mentioned that the Western Rivers are the lifeblood of Pakistan's agricultural sector. They are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the groundwater recharge; it obviously doesn't show how much of that, as I understand it, is taken out and actually used for groundwater. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin. I've mentioned that the Western Rivers are the lifeblood of Pakistan's agricultural sector. They are also essential for its domestic and industrial water
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the groundwater recharge; it obviously doesn't show how much of that, as I understand it, is taken out and actually used for groundwater. MR FIETTA: Yes. (Pause) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin. I've mentioned that the Western Rivers are the lifeblood of Pakistan's agricultural sector. They are also essential for its domestic and industrial water use, albeit those usages only consume about 7% of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the groundwater recharge; it obviously doesn't show how much of that, as I understand it, is taken out and actually used for groundwater. MR FIETTA: Yes. (Pause) PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Then I had another small question on 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin. I've mentioned that the Western Rivers are the lifeblood of Pakistan's agricultural sector. They are also essential for its domestic and industrial water use, albeit those usages only consume about 7% of the resource. And they are essential to Pakistan's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the groundwater recharge; it obviously doesn't show how much of that, as I understand it, is taken out and actually used for groundwater. MR FIETTA: Yes. (Pause) PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Then I had another small question on slide 14. There you show a table with the temporal 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin. I've mentioned that the Western Rivers are the lifeblood of Pakistan's agricultural sector. They are also essential for its domestic and industrial water use, albeit those usages only consume about 7% of the resource. And they are essential to Pakistan's hydroelectric power capacity. Following India's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the groundwater recharge; it obviously doesn't show how much of that, as I understand it, is taken out and actually used for groundwater. MR FIETTA: Yes. (Pause) PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Then I had another small question on slide 14. There you show a table with the temporal trend in flow, where you draw attention on the reduction 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin. I've mentioned that the Western Rivers are the lifeblood of Pakistan's agricultural sector. They are also essential for its domestic and industrial water use, albeit those usages only consume about 7% of the resource. And they are essential to Pakistan's primary
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the groundwater recharge; it obviously doesn't show how much of that, as I understand it, is taken out and actually used for groundwater. MR FIETTA: Yes. (Pause) PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Then I had another small question on slide 14. There you show a table with the temporal trend in flow, where you draw attention on the reduction of the flow of the east-flowing rivers, obviously, but 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin. I've mentioned that the Western Rivers are the lifeblood of Pakistan's agricultural sector. They are also essential for its domestic and industrial water use, albeit those usages only consume about 7% of the resource. And they are essential to Pakistan's primary source for generation of hydroelectric power is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the groundwater recharge; it obviously doesn't show how much of that, as I understand it, is taken out and actually used for groundwater. MR FIETTA: Yes. (Pause) PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Then I had another small question on slide 14. There you show a table with the temporal trend in flow, where you draw attention on the reduction of the flow of the east-flowing rivers, obviously, but also the west-flowing rivers show a decline, and 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin. Tve mentioned that the Western Rivers are the lifeblood of Pakistan's agricultural sector. They are also essential for its domestic and industrial water use, albeit those usages only consume about 7% of the resource. And they are essential to Pakistan's hydroelectric power capacity. Following India's depletion of the Eastern Rivers, Pakistan's primary source for generation of hydroelectric power is the Western Rivers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the groundwater recharge; it obviously doesn't show how much of that, as I understand it, is taken out and actually used for groundwater. MR FIETTA: Yes. (Pause) PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Then I had another small question on slide 14. There you show a table with the temporal trend in flow, where you draw attention on the reduction of the flow of the east-flowing rivers, obviously, but also the west-flowing rivers show a decline, and I wonder whether you have any opinion on the potential 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin. I've mentioned that the Western Rivers are the lifeblood of Pakistan's agricultural sector. They are also essential for its domestic and industrial water use, albeit those usages only consume about 7% of the resource. And they are essential to Pakistan's primary source for generation of hydroelectric power is the Western Rivers. By contrast, as explained in the Memorial at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the groundwater recharge; it obviously doesn't show how much of that, as I understand it, is taken out and actually used for groundwater. MR FIETTA: Yes. (Pause) PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Then I had another small question on slide 14. There you show a table with the temporal trend in flow, where you draw attention on the reduction of the flow of the east-flowing rivers, obviously, but also the west-flowing rivers show a decline, and I wonder whether you have any opinion on the potential cause for that decline. Might that be natural, or is 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin. I've mentioned that the Western Rivers are the lifeblood of Pakistan's agricultural sector. They are also essential for its domestic and industrial water use, albeit those usages only consume about 7% of the resource. And they are essential to Pakistan's primary source for generation of hydroelectric power is the Western Rivers. By contrast, as explained in the Memorial at paragraph 3.13 and map 3.3, the Eastern Rivers supply
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the groundwater recharge; it obviously doesn't show how much of that, as I understand it, is taken out and actually used for groundwater. MR FIETTA: Yes. (Pause) PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Then I had another small question on slide 14. There you show a table with the temporal trend in flow, where you draw attention on the reduction of the flow of the east-flowing rivers, obviously, but also the west-flowing rivers show a decline, and I wonder whether you have any opinion on the potential cause for that decline. Might that be natural, or is that because of increasing use by India? 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin. I've mentioned that the Western Rivers are the lifeblood of Pakistan's agricultural sector. They are also essential for its domestic and industrial water use, albeit those usages only consume about 7% of the resource. And they are essential to Pakistan's primary source for generation of hydroelectric power is the Western Rivers. By contrast, as explained in the Memorial at paragraph 3.13 and map 3.3, the Eastern Rivers supply only 4% of India's water resources. As Sir Daniel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the groundwater recharge; it obviously doesn't show how much of that, as I understand it, is taken out and actually used for groundwater. MR FIETTA: Yes. (Pause) PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Then I had another small question on slide 14. There you show a table with the temporal trend in flow, where you draw attention on the reduction of the flow of the east-flowing rivers, obviously, but also the west-flowing rivers show a decline, and I wonder whether you have any opinion on the potential cause for that decline. Might that be natural, or is 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin. I've mentioned that the Western Rivers are the lifeblood of Pakistan's agricultural sector. They are also essential for its domestic and industrial water use, albeit those usages only consume about 7% of the resource. And they are essential to Pakistan's primary source for generation of hydroelectric power is the Western Rivers. By contrast, as explained in the Memorial at paragraph 3.13 and map 3.3, the Eastern Rivers supply
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 part to the Indus internal number, the 20%, but I would need to check, because obviously there is additional water which would certainly form part of that Indus internal, which would be, for example, the product of precipitation within Pakistan which flows into the rivers within Pakistan. I think on this issue I'll need to come back to you in combination. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: I think I'd be particularly interested in the balance in water use for irrigation, groundwater versus surface water. I think this table shows the groundwater recharge; it obviously doesn't show how much of that, as I understand it, is taken out and actually used for groundwater. MR FIETTA: Yes. (Pause) PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Then I had another small question on slide 14. There you show a table with the temporal trend in flow, where you draw attention on the reduction of the flow of the east-flowing rivers, obviously, but also the west-flowing rivers show a decline, and I wonder whether you have any opinion on the potential cause for that decline. Might that be natural, or is that because of increasing use by India? 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 main stem, I'd have to check. PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Okay, thank you. That's all for now. (Pause) THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's no more questions on the first part of your presentation. So please proceed, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: Okay. We're about two thirds of the way through, or a little bit more than that. The next topic is Indian power generation and Pakistani power generation, so another form of usage, of course, on the rivers of the basin. I've mentioned that the Western Rivers are the lifeblood of Pakistan's agricultural sector. They are also essential for its domestic and industrial water use, albeit those usages only consume about 7% of the resource. And they are essential to Pakistan's primary source for generation of hydroelectric power is the Western Rivers. By contrast, as explained in the Memorial at paragraph 3.13 and map 3.3, the Eastern Rivers supply only 4% of India's water resources. As Sir Daniel

15:26 1	dams constructed or planned in India, only around 200 or	15:30 1	gave the figure of 200 yesterday as a total. If one
13:20 1	so are located on the Indus Basin. India can rely on		
	20 or more other major river basins in the country for	2	than 200: that's because Pakistan doesn't know the
3	its water and hydroelectric needs. These include the	3	
4	-	4	location of every single planned HEP, so they're not all
5	vast Ganges-Brahmaputra-Megha Basin, which accounts for	5	shown on this illustration.
6	almost 60% alone of India's water resources.	6	To the extent that these HEPs the Indian HEPs
7	A report by the Indian Ministry of Power in	7	to the extent that they violate the strict limits of
8	August 2023 estimates that the total hydroelectric	8	Annexure D, which of course is the issue before you,
9	capacity in India was 148,701 MW in 2023, of which only	9	essentially, which Pakistan fears that a significant
10	31.56% had yet been harnessed, with another 11.26% to be	10	1
11	harnessed by projects which were under construction.	11	, , ,
12	This leaves a substantial proportion, or approximately	12	e
13	85,000 MW, of India's hydroelectric capacity unutilised	13	· •
14	at this point. That's Exhibit P-579 at page 17.	14	1
15	I'm going to show you the Pakistani and Indian HEPs	15	5
16	on the Indus Rivers. My first three slides in this	16	
17	segment concern the Pakistani HEPs on the Western	17	
18	Rivers, of course.	18	
19	(Slide 49) Pakistan has 31 of those. They are	19	
20	mostly run-of-river, but of course they're not	20	
21	constrained by the Treaty. And they have a combined	21	1 5
22	generation capacity of 9,150 MW. They are the green	22	0
23	ones on this slide.	23	
24	(Slide 50) There are an additional 24 projects under	24	
25	construction. This is a slight correction to the number	25	one, with the Kabul River, of course, as well to
	Page 173		Page 175
15:28 1	given in the Memorial, which was 21. The Memorial had	15:31 1	a lesser extent.
15:28 1 2	given in the Memorial, which was 21. The Memorial had misanalysed the table of projects under construction.	15:31 1 2	a lesser extent. I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the
	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21.		I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why
2	misanalysed the table of projects under construction.	2	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the
2 3	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21.	2 3	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost
2 3 4	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani	2 3 4	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in
2 3 4 5	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the	2 3 4 5	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of
2 3 4 5 6	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red	2 3 4 5 6	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the
2 3 4 5 6 7	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are	2 3 4 5 6 7	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right under Article III to the "unrestricted use" of the waters of the Western Rivers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we would normally take a break at this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right under Article III to the "unrestricted use" of the waters of the Western Rivers. Notwithstanding Pakistan's right to unrestricted	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we would normally take a break at this point. So it may be a question of how much more time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right under Article III to the "unrestricted use" of the waters of the Western Rivers. Notwithstanding Pakistan's right to unrestricted use, India has seized upon the exception at 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we would normally take a break at this point. So it may be a question of how much more time you would like to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right under Article III to the "unrestricted use" of the waters of the Western Rivers. Notwithstanding Pakistan's right to unrestricted use, India has seized upon the exception at Article III(2)(d) and Annexure D of the Treaty to build 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we would normally take a break at this point. So it may be a question of how much more time you would like to MR FIETTA: I think I can scoot through and finish, and that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right under Article III to the "unrestricted use" of the waters of the Western Rivers. Notwithstanding Pakistan's right to unrestricted use, India has seized upon the exception at Article III(2)(d) and Annexure D of the Treaty to build or plan a staggering number of HEPs on the upstream 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we would normally take a break at this point. So it may be a question of how much more time you would like to MR FIETTA: I think I can scoot through and finish, and that way we can have a break and start afresh with Dr Morris
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right under Article III to the "unrestricted use" of the waters of the Western Rivers. Notwithstanding Pakistan's right to unrestricted use, India has seized upon the exception at Article III(2)(d) and Annexure D of the Treaty to build or plan a staggering number of HEPs on the upstream stretches, in a relatively small area of the upstream	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we would normally take a break at this point. So it may be a question of how much more time you would like to MR FIETTA: I think I can scoot through and finish, and that way we can have a break and start afresh with Dr Morris for the last session.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right under Article III to the "unrestricted use" of the waters of the Western Rivers. Notwithstanding Pakistan's right to unrestricted use, India has seized upon the exception at Article III(2)(d) and Annexure D of the Treaty to build or plan a staggering number of HEPs on the upstream stretches, in a relatively small area of the upstream stretches of the Western Rivers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we would normally take a break at this point. So it may be a question of how much more time you would like to MR FIETTA: I think I can scoot through and finish, and that way we can have a break and start afresh with Dr Morris for the last session. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's do that. Thank you, Mr Fietta.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right under Article III to the "unrestricted use" of the waters of the Western Rivers. Notwithstanding Pakistan's right to unrestricted use, India has seized upon the exception at Article III(2)(d) and Annexure D of the Treaty to build or plan a staggering number of HEPs on the upstream stretches, in a relatively small area of the upstream stretches of the Western Rivers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we would normally take a break at this point. So it may be a question of how much more time you would like to MR FIETTA: I think I can scoot through and finish, and that way we can have a break and start afresh with Dr Morris for the last session. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's do that. Thank you, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: So I'll spend the remainder of my presentation
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right under Article III to the "unrestricted use" of the waters of the Western Rivers. Notwithstanding Pakistan's right to unrestricted use, India has seized upon the exception at Article III(2)(d) and Annexure D of the Treaty to build or plan a staggering number of HEPs on the upstream stretches, in a relatively small area of the upstream stretches of the Western Rivers. My next three slides show India's HEPs on the Western Rivers, again broken down. So the first slide	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we would normally take a break at this point. So it may be a question of how much more time you would like to MR FIETTA: I think I can scoot through and finish, and that way we can have a break and start afresh with Dr Morris for the last session. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's do that. Thank you, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: So I'll spend the remainder of my presentation looking at demand-side pressures, on which I can be
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right under Article III to the "unrestricted use" of the waters of the Western Rivers. Notwithstanding Pakistan's right to unrestricted use, India has seized upon the exception at Article III(2)(d) and Annexure D of the Treaty to build or plan a staggering number of HEPs on the upstream stretches, in a relatively small area of the upstream stretches of the Western Rivers. My next three slides show India's HEPs on the Western Rivers, again broken down. So the first slide (52) shows the ones which have been constructed to date;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we would normally take a break at this point. So it may be a question of how much more time you would like to MR FIETTA: I think I can scoot through and finish, and that way we can have a break and start afresh with Dr Morris for the last session. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's do that. Thank you, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: So I'll spend the remainder of my presentation looking at demand-side pressures, on which I can be brief, because they're quite obvious, and probably
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right under Article III to the "unrestricted use" of the waters of the Western Rivers. Notwithstanding Pakistan's right to unrestricted use, India has seized upon the exception at Article III(2)(d) and Annexure D of the Treaty to build or plan a staggering number of HEPs on the upstream stretches, in a relatively small area of the upstream stretches of the Western Rivers. My next three slides show India's HEPs on the Western Rivers, again broken down. So the first slide (52) shows the ones which have been constructed to date; the second slide (53) shows those under construction, in 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we would normally take a break at this point. So it may be a question of how much more time you would like to MR FIETTA: I think I can scoot through and finish, and that way we can have a break and start afresh with Dr Morris for the last session. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's do that. Thank you, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: So I'll spend the remainder of my presentation looking at demand-side pressures, on which I can be brief, because they're quite obvious, and probably uncontested, on the Western Rivers. But they do go to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right under Article III to the "unrestricted use" of the waters of the Western Rivers. Notwithstanding Pakistan's right to unrestricted use, India has seized upon the exception at Article III(2)(d) and Annexure D of the Treaty to build or plan a staggering number of HEPs on the upstream stretches, in a relatively small area of the upstream stretches of the Western Rivers. My next three slides show India's HEPs on the Western Rivers, again broken down. So the first slide (52) shows the ones which have been constructed to date; the second slide (53) shows those under construction, in red; and the third (54) shows those that are planned.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we would normally take a break at this point. So it may be a question of how much more time you would like to MR FIETTA: I think I can scoot through and finish, and that way we can have a break and start afresh with Dr Morris for the last session. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's do that. Thank you, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: So I'll spend the remainder of my presentation looking at demand-side pressures, on which I can be brief, because they're quite obvious, and probably uncontested, on the Western Rivers. But they do go to the importance of the let-flow obligation again for
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right under Article III to the "unrestricted use" of the waters of the Western Rivers. Notwithstanding Pakistan's right to unrestricted use, India has seized upon the exception at Article III(2)(d) and Annexure D of the Treaty to build or plan a staggering number of HEPs on the upstream stretches, in a relatively small area of the upstream stretches of the Western Rivers. My next three slides show India's HEPs on the Western Rivers, again broken down. So the first slide (52) shows the ones which have been constructed to date; the second slide (53) shows those under construction, in 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we would normally take a break at this point. So it may be a question of how much more time you would like to MR FIETTA: I think I can scoot through and finish, and that way we can have a break and start afresh with Dr Morris for the last session. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's do that. Thank you, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: So I'll spend the remainder of my presentation looking at demand-side pressures, on which I can be brief, because they're quite obvious, and probably uncontested, on the Western Rivers. But they do go to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	misanalysed the table of projects under construction. There are 24, not 21. (Slide 51) And there are a further 99 Pakistani projects in the planning stage, in various parts of the planning stage. So the green ones are existing, the red ones are under construction and the purple ones are at the planning stage. Like its irrigation network, Pakistan's HEPs are directly reliant on the free flow of the Western Rivers. They are the anticipated result of Pakistan's right under Article III to the "unrestricted use" of the waters of the Western Rivers. Notwithstanding Pakistan's right to unrestricted use, India has seized upon the exception at Article III(2)(d) and Annexure D of the Treaty to build or plan a staggering number of HEPs on the upstream stretches, in a relatively small area of the upstream stretches of the Western Rivers. My next three slides show India's HEPs on the Western Rivers, again broken down. So the first slide (52) shows the ones which have been constructed to date; the second slide (53) shows those under construction, in red; and the third (54) shows those that are planned.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	I think following Dr Morris's presentation on the back of this one and this illustration, you will see why the systemic oversight of this Court is so important: in short, to ensure that India's boundless almost boundless, at least hydroelectric ambitions on the Western Rivers comply with the critical requirements of Article III and Annexure D of the Treaty. I'm going to spend the remainder of my time addressing demand- and supply-side pressures on the rivers. I think have I been going for just under an hour and a half? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we would normally take a break at this point. So it may be a question of how much more time you would like to MR FIETTA: I think I can scoot through and finish, and that way we can have a break and start afresh with Dr Morris for the last session. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's do that. Thank you, Mr Fietta. MR FIETTA: So I'll spend the remainder of my presentation looking at demand-side pressures, on which I can be brief, because they're quite obvious, and probably uncontested, on the Western Rivers. But they do go to the importance of the let-flow obligation again for

15:32 1	Now, a starting point is that Pakistan has, since	15:36 1	around Lahore, which is itself on the Ravi River, so
2	2005, been classified as "water scarce"; that is,	2	areas irrigated previously supplied by the
3	a country with water resources of less than 1,000 cubic	3	Eastern Rivers.
4	metres per capita, according to something called the	4	(Slide 56) As my previous slide showed, looking
5	Falkenmark indicator. This is one of several indicators	5	forward, Pakistan's population growth is expected to
6	commonly used to measure water scarcity, and it provides	6	continue equally rapidly over the remainder at least of
7	a relationship between available water and the human	7	the first half of this century. The UN's Population
8	population in any given country.	8	Fund has estimated a further growth of 67% to more than
9	Pakistan was downgraded to that "water scarce"	9	400 million by the year 2050.
10	status in 2005, before which it had been classed as	10	India's statistics are shown on the right-hand side
11	"water stressed", which is a less serious form of water	11	of the slide. Its population nationally has roughly
12	stress. But it's projected that Pakistan will approach	12	tripled since 1961, so a significant rate, but half of
13	the most critical category of all, namely "absolute	13	the rate that we've seen in Pakistan. The UN Population
14	water scarcity", with water resources of less than	14	Fund estimates that in future, as you'll see there, the
15	500 cubic metres per capita, as early as next year. And	15	growth is predicted to decelerate significantly, to
16	of course climate change, which I'll address shortly,	16	about 17% growth from today to 2050, compared to the 67%
17	will make the situation even harder for the people of	17	projected by the UN in Pakistan.
18	Pakistan.	18	The growing population of Pakistan has generated, of
19	India itself is not immune, of course, to these	19	course and will continue to generate substantially
20	problems, but it is in a less perilous position. The	20	higher demands on agricultural output, on energy supply
21	Indian Government has projected that per-capita water	21	and on water generally. And urbanisation has only
22	resource might drop to 1,341 cubic metres by 2025,	22	increased these pressures. A 2021 World Bank paper
23	compared to 500, as we've just heard, in Pakistan, which	23	projects that Pakistan's domestic water demand will
24	would classify India as "water stressed". But this is	24	nearly double by 2050, and that industrial water demand
25	some way from being "water scarce", which is the current	25	will potentially triple by 2050. That's Exhibit P-248.
	Page 177		Page 179
15.04 1		15 20 1	
15:34 1	classification of Pakistan, and a long way from reaching	15:38 1	Meanwhile, also on the demand side, rising
2	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And	2	temperatures due to climate change will also increase
2 3	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301.	2 3	temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This
2 3 4	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water	2 3 4	temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through
2 3 4 5	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even	2 3 4 5	temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the
2 3 4 5 6	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the	2 3 4 5 6	temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants
2 3 4 5 6 7	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea.	2 3 4 5 6 7	temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth. Since 1960, Pakistan's population has multiplied by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the story.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth. Since 1960, Pakistan's population has multiplied by approximately six times. Since the Treaty in 1960, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the story. On the supply side, we've seen, as Professor
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth. Since 1960, Pakistan's population has multiplied by approximately six times. Since the Treaty in 1960, the population is approximately six times larger: it has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the story. On the supply side, we've seen, as Professor Buytaert noted, first of all, a reduction in the amount
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth. Since 1960, Pakistan's population has multiplied by approximately six times. Since the Treaty in 1960, the population is approximately six times larger: it has grown from 43 million to around 241 million today. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the story. On the supply side, we've seen, as Professor Buytaert noted, first of all, a reduction in the amount of water flowing into Pakistan on the Western Rivers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth. Since 1960, Pakistan's population has multiplied by approximately six times. Since the Treaty in 1960, the population is approximately six times larger: it has grown from 43 million to around 241 million today. And this is shown on my next slide (55). This shows the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the story. On the supply side, we've seen, as Professor Buytaert noted, first of all, a reduction in the amount of water flowing into Pakistan on the Western Rivers. My next slide, 57, illustrates the observed downward
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth. Since 1960, Pakistan's population has multiplied by approximately six times. Since the Treaty in 1960, the population is approximately six times larger: it has grown from 43 million to around 241 million today. And this is shown on my next slide (55). This shows the growth in the population of Pakistan between 1961 and	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	 temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the story. On the supply side, we've seen, as Professor Buytaert noted, first of all, a reduction in the amount of water flowing into Pakistan on the Western Rivers. My next slide, 57, illustrates the observed downward trend. This again has been compiled by Dr Morris who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth. Since 1960, Pakistan's population has multiplied by approximately six times. Since the Treaty in 1960, the population is approximately six times larger: it has grown from 43 million to around 241 million today. And this is shown on my next slide (55). This shows the growth in the population of Pakistan between 1961 and today.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the story. On the supply side, we've seen, as Professor Buytaert noted, first of all, a reduction in the amount of water flowing into Pakistan on the Western Rivers. My next slide, 57, illustrates the observed downward trend. This again has been compiled by Dr Morris who of course will be available to you if you have detailed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 "absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth. Since 1960, Pakistan's population has multiplied by approximately six times. Since the Treaty in 1960, the population is approximately six times larger: it has grown from 43 million to around 241 million today. And this is shown on my next slide (55). This shows the growth in the population growth is disproportionately located 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the story. On the supply side, we've seen, as Professor Buytaert noted, first of all, a reduction in the amount of water flowing into Pakistan on the Western Rivers. My next slide, 57, illustrates the observed downward trend. This again has been compiled by Dr Morris who of course will be available to you if you have detailed questions on it on the basis of the gauge data which
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth. Since 1960, Pakistan's population has multiplied by approximately six times. Since the Treaty in 1960, the population is approximately six times larger: it has grown from 43 million to around 241 million today. And this is shown on my next slide (55). This shows the growth in the population of Pakistan between 1961 and today. This population growth is disproportionately located of course in the Indus Valley, where most of Pakistan's	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the story. On the supply side, we've seen, as Professor Buytaert noted, first of all, a reduction in the amount of water flowing into Pakistan on the Western Rivers. My next slide, 57, illustrates the observed downward trend. This again has been compiled by Dr Morris who of course will be available to you if you have detailed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 "absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth. Since 1960, Pakistan's population has multiplied by approximately six times. Since the Treaty in 1960, the population is approximately six times larger: it has grown from 43 million to around 241 million today. And this is shown on my next slide (55). This shows the growth in the population growth is disproportionately located 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the story. On the supply side, we've seen, as Professor Buytaert noted, first of all, a reduction in the amount of water flowing into Pakistan on the Western Rivers. My next slide, 57, illustrates the observed downward trend. This again has been compiled by Dr Morris who of course will be available to you if you have detailed questions on it on the basis of the gauge data which appears in the Memorial. And this shows that since
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth. Since 1960, Pakistan's population has multiplied by approximately six times. Since the Treaty in 1960, the population is approximately six times larger: it has grown from 43 million to around 241 million today. And this is shown on my next slide (55). This shows the growth in the population of Pakistan between 1961 and today. This population growth is disproportionately located of course in the Indus Valley, where most of Pakistan's major cities are located. And here you can see the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the story. On the supply side, we've seen, as Professor Buytaert noted, first of all, a reduction in the amount of water flowing into Pakistan on the Western Rivers. My next slide, 57, illustrates the observed downward trend. This again has been compiled by Dr Morris who of course will be available to you if you have detailed questions on it on the basis of the gauge data which appears in the Memorial. And this shows that since 1960, the annual volumes of waters flowing into Pakistan
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth. Since 1960, Pakistan's population has multiplied by approximately six times. Since the Treaty in 1960, the population is approximately six times larger: it has grown from 43 million to around 241 million today. And this is shown on my next slide (55). This shows the growth in the population of Pakistan between 1961 and today. This population growth is disproportionately located of course in the Indus Valley, where most of Pakistan's major cities are located. And here you can see the population density, which, unsurprisingly, is focused on	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the story. On the supply side, we've seen, as Professor Buytaert noted, first of all, a reduction in the amount of water flowing into Pakistan on the Western Rivers. My next slide, 57, illustrates the observed downward trend. This again has been compiled by Dr Morris who of course will be available to you if you have detailed questions on it on the basis of the gauge data which appears in the Memorial. And this shows that since 1960, the annual volumes of waters flowing into Pakistan on the Western Rivers
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth. Since 1960, Pakistan's population has multiplied by approximately six times. Since the Treaty in 1960, the population is approximately six times larger: it has grown from 43 million to around 241 million today. And this is shown on my next slide (55). This shows the growth in the population of Pakistan between 1961 and today. This population growth is disproportionately located of course in the Indus Valley, where most of Pakistan's major cities are located. And here you can see the population density, which, unsurprisingly, is focused on the rivers. But I think it's important that you note	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the story. On the supply side, we've seen, as Professor Buytaert noted, first of all, a reduction in the amount of water flowing into Pakistan on the Western Rivers. My next slide, 57, illustrates the observed downward trend. This again has been compiled by Dr Morris who of course will be available to you if you have detailed questions on it on the basis of the gauge data which appears in the Memorial. And this shows that since 1960, the annual volumes of waters flowing into Pakistan on the Western Rivers have reduced about 8%. That is the trend across this period of 60 years.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	"absolute water scarcity" under that indicator. And these details are given at Exhibits P-300 and P-301. So the Indus Basin is one of the most depleted water basins in the world, and there are times at which, even since 2010, the waters of the basin do not reach the Arabian Sea. The two main challenges to the basin on the demand side are, first, population growth, and second, climate change. I'll address the two of them briefly. First, on population growth. Since 1960, Pakistan's population has multiplied by approximately six times. Since the Treaty in 1960, the population is approximately six times larger: it has grown from 43 million to around 241 million today. And this is shown on my next slide (55). This shows the growth in the population of Pakistan between 1961 and today. This population growth is disproportionately located of course in the Indus Valley, where most of Pakistan's major cities are located. And here you can see the population density, which, unsurprisingly, is focused on the rivers. But I think it's important that you note that perhaps the most dense area of population is	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 temperatures due to climate change will also increase agricultural demand for water in the Indus Basin. This is because increased water loss through evapotranspiration so that's evaporation from the vast irrigation network and transpiration from plants will increase, as a result of which essentially more units of water will be required in the future to generate the same amount of agricultural output today. They're the demand-side pressures. But the ever-increasing demand-side pressures are only half the story. On the supply side, we've seen, as Professor Buytaert noted, first of all, a reduction in the amount of water flowing into Pakistan on the Western Rivers. My next slide, 57, illustrates the observed downward trend. This again has been compiled by Dr Morris who of course will be available to you if you have detailed questions on it on the basis of the gauge data which appears in the Memorial. And this shows that since 1960, the annual volumes of waters flowing into Pakistan on the Western Rivers have reduced about 8%. That is the trend across this period of 60 years. Now, there is a statistical reliability gauge for

,			
15:39 1	test. I'm not an expert on it, and if there are	15:43 1	glacial lake outburst floods, but will be followed by
2	questions on it, perhaps Dr Morris can answer those.	2	a reduction in the water flow. However, the future
3	But the output of that test is that this trend is 90%	3	response of the glaciers in the Indus Basin to the
4	reliable according to that test, which analyses trends	4	runoff is not very clear Any changes in
5	that increase or decrease over time and how reliable	5	precipitation and temperature in the basin are important
6	they are. This seems to be a reliable trend. The	6	parameters and must be taken into consideration
7	causes of this trend, however, are less clear, and I'm	7	Although several studies have been carried out to
8	not going to speculate on them beyond my answer to	8	project future temperature and precipitation,
9	Professor Buytaert earlier.	9	a comprehensive assessment of the current state of
10	The important point though is that climate change	10	climatic components is largely missing."
11	promises to reduce the flow of the Western Rivers	11	So in short, the reduction in size of the glaciers,
12	further over the decades ahead, at least potentially.	12	particularly in the Himalaya and Hindu Kush, is
13	Pakistan is responsible for less than 1% of the world's	13	significant. That's clear: that's going to happen. The
14	carbon footprint, but is highly vulnerable to the	14	Karakoram has a slightly different trend of glacial
15	impacts of climate change. India is responsible for	15	reduction, but the long-term is still reduction.
16	a bit more: nearly 8% of global emissions. But of	16	They're the three glacial areas that feed the rivers.
17	course climate change does not distinguish between those	17	But the impact on flows is less certain because there
18	states like India which are more responsible, perhaps,	18	are many other factors, including the precipitation, of
19	than Pakistan for climate change.	19	course.
20	The Global Climate Change Risk Index identified	20	What is very clear is that the timing of flows will
21	Pakistan as the eighth most climate-change-affected	21	become less predictable, and may be more dramatic. We
22	country in the world between 2000 and 2019. That's	22	may see more drought and more floods.
23	Exhibit P-292. India was 20th on that list. So India	23	In fact, we can make four high-level observations
24	is affected, but not quite as much.	24	which do seem to reflect the scientific consensus.
25	It's not yet possible to identify with confidence	25	The first is that surface temperatures will increase
			-
	Page 181		Page 183
15:41 1	the precise effects that climate change will have in the	15:44 1	substantially: between 1.7° and 6.3° by the end of this
15:41 1 2	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future.	15:44 1 2	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in
	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing		
2	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can	2	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at
2 3	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing	2 3	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the
2 3 4	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps	2 3 4	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at
2 3 4 5 6 7	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295,	2 3 4 5 6 7	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper	2 3 4 5 6	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those studies.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif cropping season; and the year before, there were almost
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those studies. It says that certainly the warming in the Indus	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif cropping season; and the year before, there were almost unprecedented floods. At the time of the drought last
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those studies. It says that certainly the warming in the Indus Basin, and particularly in the Upper Indus Basin, has 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif cropping season; and the year before, there were almost unprecedented floods. At the time of the drought last year, a spokesman for the Indus Rivers System Authority
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those studies. It says that certainly the warming in the Indus Basin, and particularly in the Upper Indus Basin, has been well above global averages; and there's been a loss	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif cropping season; and the year before, there were almost unprecedented floods. At the time of the drought last year, a spokesman for the Indus Rivers System Authority attributed the drought to "the dangerous impact of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those studies. It says that certainly the warming in the Indus Basin, and particularly in the Upper Indus Basin, has been well above global averages; and there's been a loss of glacier mass, which will continue for decades, even 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif cropping season; and the year before, there were almost unprecedented floods. At the time of the drought last year, a spokesman for the Indus Rivers System Authority attributed the drought to "the dangerous impact of climate change on water availability in the [Indus
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those studies. It says that certainly the warming in the Indus Basin, and particularly in the Upper Indus Basin, has been well above global averages; and there's been a loss of glacier mass, which will continue for decades, even if temperatures remain as they are today. And it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif cropping season; and the year before, there were almost unprecedented floods. At the time of the drought last year, a spokesman for the Indus Rivers System Authority attributed the drought to "the dangerous impact of climate change on water availability in the [Indus Basin] rivers". That's Exhibit P-284.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those studies. It says that certainly the warming in the Indus Basin, and particularly in the Upper Indus Basin, has been well above global averages; and there's been a loss of glacier mass, which will continue for decades, even if temperatures remain as they are today. And it continues in a passage which appears on this slide,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif cropping season; and the year before, there were almost unprecedented floods. At the time of the drought last year, a spokesman for the Indus Rivers System Authority attributed the drought to "the dangerous impact of climate change on water availability in the [Indus Basin] rivers". That's Exhibit P-284. The third high-level conclusion is that there will
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those studies. It says that certainly the warming in the Indus Basin, and particularly in the Upper Indus Basin, has been well above global averages; and there's been a loss of glacier mass, which will continue for decades, even if temperatures remain as they are today. And it continues in a passage which appears on this slide, commenting as follows:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif cropping season; and the year before, there were almost unprecedented floods. At the time of the drought last year, a spokesman for the Indus Rivers System Authority attributed the drought to "the dangerous impact of climate change on water availability in the [Indus Basin] rivers". That's Exhibit P-284. The third high-level conclusion is that there will be a significant reduction in glacial areas which supply
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those studies. It says that certainly the warming in the Indus Basin, and particularly in the Upper Indus Basin, has been well above global averages; and there's been a loss of glacier mass, which will continue for decades, even if temperatures remain as they are today. And it continues in a passage which appears on this slide, commenting as follows: "The majority of the flow comes from glaciers, so	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif cropping season; and the year before, there were almost unprecedented floods. At the time of the drought last year, a spokesman for the Indus Rivers System Authority attributed the drought to "the dangerous impact of climate change on water availability in the [Indus Basin] rivers". That's Exhibit P-284. The third high-level conclusion is that there will be a significant reduction in glacial areas which supply the vast majority of the waters of the Western Rivers
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those studies. It says that certainly the warming in the Indus Basin, and particularly in the Upper Indus Basin, has been well above global averages; and there's been a loss of glacier mass, which will continue for decades, even if temperatures remain as they are today. And it continues in a passage which appears on this slide, commenting as follows: "The majority of the flow comes from glaciers, so the Indus basin is particularly vulnerable in terms of 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif cropping season; and the year before, there were almost unprecedented floods. At the time of the drought last year, a spokesman for the Indus Rivers System Authority attributed the drought to "the dangerous impact of climate change on water availability in the [Indus Basin] rivers". That's Exhibit P-284. The third high-level conclusion is that there will be a significant reduction in glacial areas which supply the vast majority of the waters of the Western Rivers today, which will likely manifest itself in periods of
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those studies. It says that certainly the warming in the Indus Basin, and particularly in the Upper Indus Basin, has been well above global averages; and there's been a loss of glacier mass, which will continue for decades, even if temperatures remain as they are today. And it continues in a passage which appears on this slide, commenting as follows: "The majority of the flow comes from glaciers, so the Indus basin is particularly vulnerable in terms of climate change that causes higher warming trends and	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif cropping season; and the year before, there were almost unprecedented floods. At the time of the drought last year, a spokesman for the Indus Rivers System Authority attributed the drought to "the dangerous impact of climate change on water availability in the [Indus Basin] rivers". That's Exhibit P-284. The third high-level conclusion is that there will be a significant reduction in glacial areas which supply the vast majority of the waters of the Western Rivers today, which will likely manifest itself in periods of increased flows during the melting process, followed by
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those studies. It says that certainly the warming in the Indus Basin, and particularly in the Upper Indus Basin, has been well above global averages; and there's been a loss of glacier mass, which will continue for decades, even if temperatures remain as they are today. And it continues in a passage which appears on this slide, commenting as follows: "The majority of the flow comes from glaciers, so the Indus basin is particularly vulnerable in terms of climate change that causes higher warming trends and loss of glacial mass. Global warming will initially	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif cropping season; and the year before, there were almost unprecedented floods. At the time of the drought last year, a spokesman for the Indus Rivers System Authority attributed the drought to "the dangerous impact of climate change on water availability in the [Indus Basin] rivers". That's Exhibit P-284. The third high-level conclusion is that there will be a significant reduction in glacial areas which supply the vast majority of the waters of the Western Rivers today, which will likely manifest itself in periods of increased flows, especially during dry summer months,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those studies. It says that certainly the warming in the Indus Basin, and particularly in the Upper Indus Basin, has been well above global averages; and there's been a loss of glacier mass, which will continue for decades, even if temperatures remain as they are today. And it continues in a passage which appears on this slide, commenting as follows: "The majority of the flow comes from glaciers, so the Indus basin is particularly vulnerable in terms of climate change that causes higher warming trends and	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif cropping season; and the year before, there were almost unprecedented floods. At the time of the drought last year, a spokesman for the Indus Rivers System Authority attributed the drought to "the dangerous impact of climate change on water availability in the [Indus Basin] rivers". That's Exhibit P-284. The third high-level conclusion is that there will be a significant reduction in glacial areas which supply the vast majority of the waters of the Western Rivers today, which will likely manifest itself in periods of increased flows during the melting process, followed by
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	Indus Basin, whether to this point or in the future. The topic is highly complex and subject to ongoing scientific study. But some broad observations can certainly be made. One summary that I found for this purpose of perhaps the current state of the science is at Exhibit P-295, and it's on my next slide (58). Here it is. This paper cites a large number of other papers and modelling studies undertaken before it was published in 2019. So in that sense it's an agglomeration of the studies done by that date, and it summarises the takeaways of those studies. It says that certainly the warming in the Indus Basin, and particularly in the Upper Indus Basin, has been well above global averages; and there's been a loss of glacier mass, which will continue for decades, even if temperatures remain as they are today. And it continues in a passage which appears on this slide, commenting as follows: "The majority of the flow comes from glaciers, so the Indus basin is particularly vulnerable in terms of climate change that causes higher warming trends and loss of glacial mass. Global warming will initially	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	century, with the higher temperature changes expected in the Upper Basin, which is more vulnerable. In that region, temperatures are projected to increase by at least 5° by the late 21st century, as compared to the late 20th century. That's Exhibits P-294 and P-295. That's the first headline conclusion. The second is that in the short term, the Western Rivers will become less predictable and more volatile. There will be increased periods of flooding and drought. We've seen that in the past two years, in fact: there was a significant drought last year during the Kharif cropping season; and the year before, there were almost unprecedented floods. At the time of the drought last year, a spokesman for the Indus Rivers System Authority attributed the drought to "the dangerous impact of climate change on water availability in the [Indus Basin] rivers". That's Exhibit P-284. The third high-level conclusion is that there will be a significant reduction in glacial areas which supply the vast majority of the waters of the Western Rivers today, which will likely manifest itself in periods of increased flows, especially during dry summer months,

15:46 1	And the fourth high layer conclusion is that while	15:49 1	4.20 Dr Morrie I take it will be payt up in the
13.40 1	And the fourth high-level conclusion is that while the rate, timing and extent of glacier loss associated	13.49 1	4.20. Dr Morris, I take it, will be next up in the presentations. We are squeezing him rather tight, in
3	with reduction in river flows will depend on precise	3	that I do intend for us to end the day at 5.30. So my
	temperature and precipitation trends, which varies		expectation is that Dr Morris will continue over into
4		45	*
5	enormously through the basin, all scenarios do indicate		tomorrow morning, in all likelihood, and then we'll
6	serious consequences in the basin.	6	continue onward.
7	My final slide (59) is a table indicating the level	7	The good news is we have a little bit of contingency
8	of glacier loss in the Hindu Kush and Himalayas by 2100	8	time, I think, built into tomorrow, so that shouldn't
9	anticipated according to different levels of global	9	present any difficulty.
10	warming. So this is warming global-wide. As you'll be	10	SIR DANIEL: Mr Chairman, that's perfectly fine with us.
11	aware, the target is between 1.5° and 2° . In that	11	I think we are comfortable and not being squeezed unduly
12	scenario, the glacier loss in the Hindu Kush and	12	in terms of time.
13	Himalayas would be between 30% and 50%, so very	13	I did want to give you the option but you may
14	significant. But if the Paris targets are not met, then	14	have preempted it with your remarks now if you did
15	the amount of glacial loss promises to be even more	15	wish, simply because the flow was continuing beyond
16	dramatic.	16	5.30, to continue for a while, I'm sure that on our side
17	Increased evaporation from Pakistani rivers and its	17	we would be perfectly happy to accommodate that. We
18	extensive canal network and increased transpiration, or	18	don't want to use this as an opportunity to get
19	water loss, from Pakistani crops due to warmer	19	additional time, and we would be happy to have time
20	temperatures will also exacerbate the challenges of	20	docked from us tomorrow if you just wanted to continue
21	climate change. The level of Western River flows that	21	the time to keep to the schedule.
22	will be required in order to maintain, as I've said, any	22	THE CHAIRMAN: I think we would like to finish today no
23	given unit of agricultural production will increase due	23	later than 5.30. I do suggest that Dr Morris consider
24	to these evapotranspiration factors alone.	24	whether there's a particular break in his presentation:
25	So alongside the ever-growing pressures on demand	25	we don't have to go all the way to 5.30, but I don't
	D 105		D 107
	Page 185		Page 187
15.47 1	for water on the Western Rivers Pakistan faces	15.50 1	think we want to go past it. But of course we have
15:47 1	for water on the Western Rivers, Pakistan faces	15:50 1 2	think we want to go past it. But of course we have
2	substantial challenges on the supply side through the	2	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him
2 3	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable,	23	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you.
2 3 4	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century.	2 3 4	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you.
2 3 4 5	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to	2 3 4 5	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm)
2 3 4 5 6	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its	2 3 4 5 6	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break)
2 3 4 5 6 7	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its	2 3 4 5 6 7	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of the provisions of the Treaty that are designed to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on the questions you get from the members of the Court, so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of the provisions of the Treaty that are designed to safeguard Pakistan's unrestricted use of the Western	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on the questions you get from the members of the Court, so you might want to have in mind two or three possible
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of the provisions of the Treaty that are designed to safeguard Pakistan's unrestricted use of the Western Rivers, alongside India's deployment of run-of-river	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on the questions you get from the members of the Court, so you might want to have in mind two or three possible places of breaking. (Pause)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of the provisions of the Treaty that are designed to safeguard Pakistan's unrestricted use of the Western Rivers, alongside India's deployment of run-of-river HEPs upstream, within the carefully framed constraints	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on the questions you get from the members of the Court, so you might want to have in mind two or three possible places of breaking. (Pause) So please proceed with your presentation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of the provisions of the Treaty that are designed to safeguard Pakistan's unrestricted use of the Western Rivers, alongside India's deployment of run-of-river HEPs upstream, within the carefully framed constraints imposed by Annexure D.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on the questions you get from the members of the Court, so you might want to have in mind two or three possible places of breaking. (Pause) So please proceed with your presentation. (4.23 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of the provisions of the Treaty that are designed to safeguard Pakistan's unrestricted use of the Western Rivers, alongside India's deployment of run-of-river HEPs upstream, within the carefully framed constraints imposed by Annexure D. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, that concludes my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on the questions you get from the members of the Court, so you might want to have in mind two or three possible places of breaking. (Pause) So please proceed with your presentation. (4.23 pm) Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation:
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of the provisions of the Treaty that are designed to safeguard Pakistan's unrestricted use of the Western Rivers, alongside India's deployment of run-of-river HEPs upstream, within the carefully framed constraints imposed by Annexure D. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, that concludes my presentation.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on the questions you get from the members of the Court, so you might want to have in mind two or three possible places of breaking. (Pause) So please proceed with your presentation. (4.23 pm) Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of the provisions of the Treaty that are designed to safeguard Pakistan's unrestricted use of the Western Rivers, alongside India's deployment of run-of-river HEPs upstream, within the carefully framed constraints imposed by Annexure D. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, that concludes my presentation. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Fietta. (Pause)	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. (SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on the questions you get from the members of the Court, so you might want to have in mind two or three possible places of breaking. (Pause) So please proceed with your presentation. (4.23 pm) Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective DR MORRIS: Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here in front
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of the provisions of the Treaty that are designed to safeguard Pakistan's unrestricted use of the Western Rivers, alongside India's deployment of run-of-river HEPs upstream, within the carefully framed constraints imposed by Annexure D. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, that concludes my presentation. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Fietta. (Pause) Okay, I think we don't have any questions for you, 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on the questions you get from the members of the Court, so you might want to have in mind two or three possible places of breaking. (Pause) So please proceed with your presentation. (4.23 pm) Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective DR MORRIS: Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here in front of you, gentlemen. And what I would like to do to begin
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of the provisions of the Treaty that are designed to safeguard Pakistan's unrestricted use of the Western Rivers, alongside India's deployment of run-of-river HEPs upstream, within the carefully framed constraints imposed by Annexure D. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, that concludes my presentation. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Fietta. (Pause) Okay, I think we don't have any questions for you, Mr Fietta, but thank you very much for your 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	<pre>plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on the questions you get from the members of the Court, so you might want to have in mind two or three possible places of breaking. (Pause) So please proceed with your presentation. (4.23 pm) Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective DR MORRIS: Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here in front of you, gentlemen. And what I would like to do to begin with, I'd like to talk just briefly about my background</pre>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of the provisions of the Treaty that are designed to safeguard Pakistan's unrestricted use of the Western Rivers, alongside India's deployment of run-of-river HEPs upstream, within the carefully framed constraints imposed by Annexure D. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Fietta. (Pause) Okay, I think we don't have any questions for you, Mr Fietta, but thank you very much for your presentation. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on the questions you get from the members of the Court, so you might want to have in mind two or three possible places of breaking. (Pause) So please proceed with your presentation. (4.23 pm) Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective DR MORRIS: Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here in front of you, gentlemen. And what I would like to do to begin with, I'd like to talk just briefly about my background and how I come to this.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of the provisions of the Treaty that are designed to safeguard Pakistan's unrestricted use of the Western Rivers, alongside India's deployment of run-of-river HEPs upstream, within the carefully framed constraints imposed by Annexure D. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, that concludes my presentation. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Fietta. (Pause) Okay, I think we don't have any questions for you, Mr Fietta, but thank you very much for your 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	<pre>plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on the questions you get from the members of the Court, so you might want to have in mind two or three possible places of breaking. (Pause) So please proceed with your presentation. (4.23 pm) Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective DR MORRIS: Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here in front of you, gentlemen. And what I would like to do to begin with, I'd like to talk just briefly about my background</pre>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of the provisions of the Treaty that are designed to safeguard Pakistan's unrestricted use of the Western Rivers, alongside India's deployment of run-of-river HEPs upstream, within the carefully framed constraints imposed by Annexure D. Mr Chairman, members of the Court, that concludes my presentation. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Fietta. (Pause) Okay, I think we don't have any questions for you, Mr Fietta, but thank you very much for your presentation. We will now take a coffee break and come back at 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on the questions you get from the members of the Court, so you might want to have in mind two or three possible places of breaking. (Pause) So please proceed with your presentation. (4.23 pm) Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective DR MORRIS: Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here in front of you, gentlemen. And what I would like to do to begin with, I'd like to talk just briefly about my background and how I come to this. Two been working with sedimentation problems with
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 substantial challenges on the supply side through the likelihood of reduced, and certainly less predictable, flows on the Western Rivers by the end of this century. By way of conclusion, all of this adds up to critical threat to Pakistan's ability to sustain its agricultural sector, alongside other areas of its economy and even its population in the years to come. It will be more critical than ever that the remaining waters of the Western Rivers are allowed to "let flow" into Pakistan without unlawful interference upstream from Indian activity, including Indian HEPs. Thus the importance of this Court's systemic interpretations of the provisions of the Treaty that are designed to safeguard Pakistan's unrestricted use of the Western Rivers, alongside India's deployment of run-of-river HEPs upstream, within the carefully framed constraints imposed by Annexure D. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Fietta. (Pause) Okay, I think we don't have any questions for you, Mr Fietta, but thank you very much for your presentation. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	plenty of time tomorrow, I think, to pick up with him and then continue onward. Thank you. SIR DANIEL: That's fine, thank you. (3.51 pm) (A short break) (4.21 pm) THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're ready to resume our afternoon second session, and we have Dr Morris up. As indicated before we broke, hopefully, Dr Morris, you've thought through whether there's a particular point in time in your presentation where we might break for the end of the day. That might depend in part on the questions you get from the members of the Court, so you might want to have in mind two or three possible places of breaking. (Pause) So please proceed with your presentation. (4.23 pm) Himalayan Run-of-River Design and Operation: An Engineering Perspective DR MORRIS: Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here in front of you, gentlemen. And what I would like to do to begin with, I'd like to talk just briefly about my background and how I come to this.

16:23 1	reservoirs since 1974. And when I started working with	16:26 1	but those constraints don't make it impossible for India
2	this, the accepted policy, let's say, is that you design	2	to develop strategies that will work in this environment
3	a reservoir to accumulate, let's say, 100 years of	3	in addition to flushing.
4	sediment and you don't worry about the future. But	4	So I'd like to first talk a little bit about
5	that's not sustainable, and I've made it basically	5	hydrology and sediment.
6	a life quest to figure out and develop strategies that	6	The hydrology in the Himalayas throughout the
7	will work. And in that process, I wrote a very large,	7	region, so the monsoon hydrology has a very dry winter,
8	748-page handbook for McGraw Hill, together with	8	and you have most of your water coming down the river in
9	Professor Fan from China, and I worked on 60 reservoirs	9	the summer. Most of the precipitation occurs in the
10	in 20-some-odd countries.	10	winter, but that precipitation is mostly snowmelt. So
11	In the Himalayas, I've worked about eight or nine	11	you don't see the meltwater coming to you until, say,
12	reservoir designs in Nepal. I've worked with the	12	April/May, and it's a combination of snow plus glacial
13	Nurek Reservoir in Tajikistan. I've worked with several	13	melt. And as the summer progresses, you get increasing
14	reservoirs in Pakistan. We've just finished are just	14	monsoon activity and more water from rainfall.
15	finishing a multi-year, very detailed study of Warsak	15	(Slide 4) So what you end up with is having a highly
16	Reservoir flushing and modelling. I've worked pretty	16	variable flow, as you can see here in the graphic.
17	extensively with Tarbela, and we're working currently	17	Let me see if I can turn the laser pointer on. Here
18	with the Neelum-Jhelum. And of course I've done	18	we go.
19	modelling with the Kishenganga and currently working	19	And you can see the winter: it's quite low flow. Up
20	with Ratle.	20	here in the red line, the dotted line, we have the
21	So I have a little bit of familiarity with this	21	design plant capacity. And during the summer months,
22	region, plus a number of other mountain regions, ranging	22	you have, of course, the high discharges. So your plant
23	from the Philippines to Andes, et cetera.	23	runs part of the year as a baseload plant, 24/7, full
24	So with that preamble, I'll just start.	24	power; and during the winter months, it's going to
25	(Slide 2) What I want to do is outline some key	25	operate as a peaking plant. These particular data are
	Page 189		Page 191
	1 age 169		1 age 171
16:24 1	aspects of run-of-river hydro as it relates in	16:28 1	from Maalum Ihalum which you of source have seen
		10.20 1	from Neelum-Jhelum, which you of course have seen.
2	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques	10.28 1	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the
2 3	- · ·		
	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques	2	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the
3	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and	2 3	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but
3 4	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best	2 3 4	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya.
3 4 5	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types	2 3 4 5	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some
3 4 5 6	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully.	2 3 4 5 6	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand,
3 4 5 6 7	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants	2 3 4 5 6 7	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit
3 4 5 6 7 8	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment, who is downstream from you, et cetera, they can vary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb. We have sediment which we classify as "fines", which
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment, who is downstream from you, et cetera, they can vary considerably.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb. We have sediment which we classify as "fines", which is stuff that's smaller than sand. In the graphic here
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment, who is downstream from you, et cetera, they can vary considerably. You have, of course, your physical parameters: you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb. We have sediment which we classify as "fines", which is stuff that's smaller than sand. In the graphic here I have the sand shown as 0.062 millimetres, which is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment, who is downstream from you, et cetera, they can vary considerably. You have, of course, your physical parameters: you have topography, geology, hydrology, sediment load, site	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb. We have sediment which we classify as "fines", which is stuff that's smaller than sand. In the graphic here I have the sand shown as 0.062 millimetres, which is according to the Wentworth scale, which is used
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment, who is downstream from you, et cetera, they can vary considerably. You have, of course, your physical parameters: you have topography, geology, hydrology, sediment load, site access. If you have a very remote site, this will limit some of the equipment that you can bring in. You have all your social parameters: laws, in this case a treaty,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb. We have sediment which we classify as "fines", which is stuff that's smaller than sand. In the graphic here I have the sand shown as 0.062 millimetres, which is according to the Wentworth scale, which is used internationally. The Indians use 0.075, so they use a little bit larger to differentiate between fine and coarse; actually they use a fine, medium and coarse.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment, who is downstream from you, et cetera, they can vary considerably. You have, of course, your physical parameters: you have topography, geology, hydrology, sediment load, site access. If you have a very remote site, this will limit some of the equipment that you can bring in. You have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb. We have sediment which we classify as "fines", which is stuff that's smaller than sand. In the graphic here I have the sand shown as 0.062 millimetres, which is according to the Wentworth scale, which is used internationally. The Indians use 0.075, so they use a little bit larger to differentiate between fine and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment, who is downstream from you, et cetera, they can vary considerably. You have, of course, your physical parameters: you have topography, geology, hydrology, sediment load, site access. If you have a very remote site, this will limit some of the equipment that you can bring in. You have all your social parameters: laws, in this case a treaty,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb. We have sediment which we classify as "fines", which is stuff that's smaller than sand. In the graphic here I have the sand shown as 0.062 millimetres, which is according to the Wentworth scale, which is used internationally. The Indians use 0.075, so they use a little bit larger to differentiate between fine and coarse; actually they use a fine, medium and coarse.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment, who is downstream from you, et cetera, they can vary considerably. You have, of course, your physical parameters: you have topography, geology, hydrology, sediment load, site access. If you have a very remote site, this will limit some of the equipment that you can bring in. You have all your social parameters: laws, in this case a treaty, environmental protection laws. You have land	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb. We have sediment which we classify as "fines", which is stuff that's smaller than sand. In the graphic here I have the sand shown as 0.062 millimetres, which is according to the Wentworth scale, which is used internationally. The Indians use 0.075, so they use a little bit larger to differentiate between fine and coarse; actually they use a fine, medium and coarse. But these are just very general numbers to give you
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment, who is downstream from you, et cetera, they can vary considerably. You have, of course, your physical parameters: you have topography, geology, hydrology, sediment load, site access. If you have a very remote site, this will limit some of the equipment that you can bring in. You have all your social parameters: laws, in this case a treaty, environmental protection laws. You have land use/acquisition problems to deal with; downstream 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb. We have sediment which we classify as "fines", which is stuff that's smaller than sand. In the graphic here I have the sand shown as 0.062 millimetres, which is according to the Wentworth scale, which is used internationally. The Indians use 0.075, so they use a little bit larger to differentiate between fine and coarse; actually they use a fine, medium and coarse. But these are just very general numbers to give you an idea.
$ \begin{array}{c} 3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment, who is downstream from you, et cetera, they can vary considerably. You have, of course, your physical parameters: you have topography, geology, hydrology, sediment load, site access. If you have a very remote site, this will limit some of the equipment that you can bring in. You have all your social parameters: laws, in this case a treaty, environmental protection laws. You have land use/acquisition problems to deal with; downstream impacts, either existing or potential. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb. We have sediment which we classify as "fines", which is stuff that's smaller than sand. In the graphic here I have the sand shown as 0.062 millimetres, which is according to the Wentworth scale, which is used internationally. The Indians use 0.075, so they use a little bit larger to differentiate between fine and coarse; actually they use a fine, medium and coarse. But these are just very general numbers to give you an idea. The fine sediment settles very slowly. The sands
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment, who is downstream from you, et cetera, they can vary considerably. You have, of course, your physical parameters: you have topography, geology, hydrology, sediment load, site access. If you have a very remote site, this will limit some of the equipment that you can bring in. You have all your social parameters: laws, in this case a treaty, environmental protection laws. You have land use/acquisition problems to deal with; downstream impacts, either existing or potential. And of course you have the financial parameters. Not only does a project need to have a good return on investment, but you have to have an investor and you	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb. We have sediment which we classify as "fines", which is stuff that's smaller than sand. In the graphic here I have the sand shown as 0.062 millimetres, which is according to the Wentworth scale, which is used internationally. The Indians use 0.075, so they use a little bit larger to differentiate between fine and coarse; actually they use a fine, medium and coarse. But these are just very general numbers to give you an idea. The fine sediment settles very slowly. The sands are typically large enough that they can be captured, if not entirely, at least to a good percentage in a desanding sedimentation basin.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment, who is downstream from you, et cetera, they can vary considerably. You have, of course, your physical parameters: you have topography, geology, hydrology, sediment load, site access. If you have a very remote site, this will limit some of the equipment that you can bring in. You have all your social parameters: laws, in this case a treaty, environmental protection laws. You have land use/acquisition problems to deal with; downstream impacts, either existing or potential. And of course you have the financial parameters. Not only does a project need to have a good return on	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb. We have sediment which we classify as "fines", which is stuff that's smaller than sand. In the graphic here I have the sand shown as 0.062 millimetres, which is according to the Wentworth scale, which is used internationally. The Indians use 0.075, so they use a little bit larger to differentiate between fine and coarse; actually they use a fine, medium and coarse. But these are just very general numbers to give you an idea. The fine sediment settles very slowly. The sands are typically large enough that they can be captured, if not entirely, at least to a good percentage in
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment, who is downstream from you, et cetera, they can vary considerably. You have, of course, your physical parameters: you have topography, geology, hydrology, sediment load, site access. If you have a very remote site, this will limit some of the equipment that you can bring in. You have all your social parameters: laws, in this case a treaty, environmental protection laws. You have land use/acquisition problems to deal with; downstream impacts, either existing or potential. And of course you have the financial parameters. Not only does a project need to have a good return on investment, but you have to have an investor and you	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb. We have sediment which we classify as "fines", which is stuff that's smaller than sand. In the graphic here I have the sand shown as 0.062 millimetres, which is according to the Wentworth scale, which is used internationally. The Indians use 0.075, so they use a little bit larger to differentiate between fine and coarse; actually they use a fine, medium and coarse. But these are just very general numbers to give you an idea. The fine sediment settles very slowly. The sands are typically large enough that they can be captured, if not entirely, at least to a good percentage in a desanding sedimentation basin.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	particular to the Himalaya, and a variety of techniques that can be used to successfully manage sediment and sustain power production. There is no single best answer, so I'm going to look at several different types of strategies that have all been used successfully. What I also want to emphasise is that hydro plants do not operate in a void. As an engineer, we always have constraints. And those constraints, depending on which country you're in, what regulatory environment, who is downstream from you, et cetera, they can vary considerably. You have, of course, your physical parameters: you have topography, geology, hydrology, sediment load, site access. If you have a very remote site, this will limit some of the equipment that you can bring in. You have all your social parameters: laws, in this case a treaty, environmental protection laws. You have land use/acquisition problems to deal with; downstream impacts, either existing or potential. And of course you have the financial parameters. Not only does a project need to have a good return on investment, but you have to have an investor and you have to have a financial line of credit available.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	(Slide 5) The sediment sizes we deal with in the Himalaya cover a very large range. We have clays, but clays do not dominate the sediments in the Himalaya. Clays are typically a small fraction: maybe 15%; in some places, significantly less. It's mostly silt and sand, in approximately a 60:40 ratio. It varies a little bit from river to river: some rivers are skewed more in one direction than the other. But as a general rule, that's a pretty good general rule of thumb. We have sediment which we classify as "fines", which is stuff that's smaller than sand. In the graphic here I have the sand shown as 0.062 millimetres, which is according to the Wentworth scale, which is used internationally. The Indians use 0.075, so they use a little bit larger to differentiate between fine and coarse; actually they use a fine, medium and coarse. But these are just very general numbers to give you an idea. The fine sediment settles very slowly. The sands are typically large enough that they can be captured, if not entirely, at least to a good percentage in a desanding sedimentation basin. We also deal with cobbles and boulders. If you're

16:30 1	a glacial lake outburst flood; or a LLOF, which is	16:33 1	of sand in the Andes and it's very anoular. It's
16:30 1	a gracial lake outburst flood; or a LLOF, which is a landslide lake outburst flood, where a landslide comes	16:33 1	of sand in the Andes, and it's very angular. It's angular because it's recently weathered from the parent
2	down the mountain, blocks the river, the river fills the	2	rock. And typically you'll see parent rock for
4	area behind the landslide, overtops, erodes, and it's	4	instance, if you look at granite, you'll see it looks
5	just like a dam break.	5	like salt and pepper, and all these little crystals.
6	So these events, high in the mountains, you can be	6	And as the rock weathers, the quartz in particular will
7	mobilising boulder-sized material. But down lower,	7	separate from the matrix, and you'll have these angular
8	where most of the reservoirs are and particularly the	8	particles.
9	reservoirs that have any significant storage capacity	9	Quartz is the most resistant of all minerals to
10	you're talking about sediment that's typically	10	solution. So that's why you go to Florida, and you have
11	cobble-sized on the bed. Maybe boulders have come down	11	sand beaches that are all quartz, because that's what's
12	off of the mountainside and are sitting there, but	12	left after the Appalachian mountains in the eastern
13	they're usually not mobile. And so we're looking at	13	United States eroded tens of millions of years ago: what
14	cobbles and smaller.	14	remains is the quartz.
15	The bed material in the Himalaya is surprisingly	15	So quartz is also very problematic for turbines
16	stable. This is something that is a little bit	16	because it's very hard. You'll see here on the diagram
17	different from the traditional way of approaching	17	it says the mhos scale for hardness: talc is 1,
18	things. There's no way to actually measure bed-load	18	a diamond is 10. The turbine steel, steel used for
19	transport.	19	turbines, is about 4.8. And sand has a mhos value of 7.
20	Let me go to the next slide (6), and this will show	20	So sand is much harder than this turbine steel.
21	the difference here.	21	There are different types of steel, of course, and
22	You can see that you have the suspended sediment	22	turbine steel is selected for a combination of its
23	load, which is basically particles that remain suspended	23	capacity to be worked and its capacity to absorb what
24	as a result of turbulence in the river. The bed load is	24	you call the working of the pressures back and forth.
25	material which is lifted off of the bed material. You	25	It's not a brittle steel. You can have brittle steels
	Page 193		Page 195
16.21 1		16.05 1	
16:31 1	see how the bed material is a material that's	16:35 1	which are much harder. But for turbines, this is a type
2	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed	2	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard
2 3	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic	2 3	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand.
2 3 4	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load.	2 3 4	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you
2 3 4 5	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of	2 3 4 5	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at
2 3 4 5 6	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or	2 3 4 5 6	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela
2 3 4 5 6 7	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases	2 3 4 5 6 7	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is very large, this same amount of bed load now becomes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal, where you also see the sand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is very large, this same amount of bed load now becomes small as a percentage basis.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal, where you also see the sand deposits. And what happens is that the monsoon comes,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is very large, this same amount of bed load now becomes small as a percentage basis. So there tends to be a tendency to overestimate bed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal, where you also see the sand deposits. And what happens is that the monsoon comes, the river level rises, it transports large amounts of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is very large, this same amount of bed load now becomes small as a percentage basis. So there tends to be a tendency to overestimate bed load in the Himalaya. And we've seen this in work I've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal, where you also see the sand deposits. And what happens is that the monsoon comes, the river level rises, it transports large amounts of sand. And as the water levels drop down, then the sand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is very large, this same amount of bed load now becomes small as a percentage basis. So there tends to be a tendency to overestimate bed load in the Himalaya. And we've seen this in work I've done in Nepal at Kali Gandaki: a reservoir that was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal, where you also see the sand deposits. And what happens is that the monsoon comes, the river level rises, it transports large amounts of sand. And as the water levels drop down, then the sand gets deposited. So you basically have a bimodal system:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is very large, this same amount of bed load now becomes small as a percentage basis. So there tends to be a tendency to overestimate bed load in the Himalaya. And we've seen this in work I've done in Nepal at Kali Gandaki: a reservoir that was predicted to fill completely with gravel within	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal, where you also see the sand deposits. And what happens is that the monsoon comes, the river level rises, it transports large amounts of sand. And as the water levels drop down, then the sand gets deposited. So you basically have a bimodal system: you have a lot of sand being transported, sand and silt;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is very large, this same amount of bed load now becomes small as a percentage basis. So there tends to be a tendency to overestimate bed load in the Himalaya. And we've seen this in work I've done in Nepal at Kali Gandaki: a reservoir that was predicted to fill completely with gravel within ten years. And after ten years, there's a lot of sand,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal, where you also see the sand deposits. And what happens is that the monsoon comes, the river level rises, it transports large amounts of sand. And as the water levels drop down, then the sand gets deposited. So you basically have a bimodal system: you have a lot of sand being transported, sand and silt; and then you have a bed material which is much larger
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is very large, this same amount of bed load now becomes small as a percentage basis. So there tends to be a tendency to overestimate bed load in the Himalaya. And we've seen this in work I've done in Nepal at Kali Gandaki: a reservoir that was predicted to fill completely with gravel within ten years. And after ten years, there's a lot of sand, but there's hardly any gravel at all because we don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal, where you also see the sand deposits. And what happens is that the monsoon comes, the river level rises, it transports large amounts of sand. And as the water levels drop down, then the sand gets deposited. So you basically have a bimodal system: you have a lot of sand being transported, sand and silt; and then you have a bed material which is much larger material, which is relatively immobile compared to the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is very large, this same amount of bed load now becomes small as a percentage basis. So there tends to be a tendency to overestimate bed load in the Himalaya. And we've seen this in work I've done in Nepal at Kali Gandaki: a reservoir that was predicted to fill completely with gravel within ten years. And after ten years, there's a lot of sand, but there's hardly any gravel at all because we don't have the bed load transport. So these are actual things	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal, where you also see the sand deposits. And what happens is that the monsoon comes, the river level rises, it transports large amounts of sand. And as the water levels drop down, then the sand gets deposited. So you basically have a bimodal system: you have a lot of sand being transported, sand and silt; and then you have a bed material which is much larger material, which is relatively immobile compared to the amount of sediment transported in suspension.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is very large, this same amount of bed load now becomes small as a percentage basis. So there tends to be a tendency to overestimate bed load in the Himalaya. And we've seen this in work I've done in Nepal at Kali Gandaki: a reservoir that was predicted to fill completely with gravel within ten years. And after ten years, there's a lot of sand, but there's hardly any gravel at all because we don't have the bed load transport. So these are actual things that I have observed and we have studied in the field.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal, where you also see the sand deposits. And what happens is that the monsoon comes, the river level rises, it transports large amounts of sand. And as the water levels drop down, then the sand gets deposited. So you basically have a bimodal system: you have a lot of sand being transported, sand and silt; and then you have a bed material which is much larger material, which is relatively immobile compared to the amount of sediment transported in suspension. (Slide 10) The sedimentation process in reservoirs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is very large, this same amount of bed load now becomes small as a percentage basis. So there tends to be a tendency to overestimate bed load in the Himalaya. And we've seen this in work I've done in Nepal at Kali Gandaki: a reservoir that was predicted to fill completely with gravel within ten years. And after ten years, there's a lot of sand, but there's hardly any gravel at all because we don't have the bed load transport. So these are actual things that I have observed and we have studied in the field. (Slide 7) Himalayan sand is quite angular. But this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal, where you also see the sand deposits. And what happens is that the monsoon comes, the river level rises, it transports large amounts of sand. And as the water levels drop down, then the sand gets deposited. So you basically have a bimodal system: you have a lot of sand being transported, sand and silt; and then you have a bed material which is much larger material, which is relatively immobile compared to the amount of sediment transported in suspension. (Slide 10) The sedimentation process in reservoirs is pretty consistent throughout the world. You
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is very large, this same amount of bed load now becomes small as a percentage basis. So there tends to be a tendency to overestimate bed load in the Himalaya. And we've seen this in work I've done in Nepal at Kali Gandaki: a reservoir that was predicted to fill completely with gravel within ten years. And after ten years, there's a lot of sand, but there's hardly any gravel at all because we don't have the bed load transport. So these are actual things that I have observed and we have studied in the field. (Slide 7) Himalayan sand is quite angular. But this is common to sands of mountain areas, at least 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal, where you also see the sand deposits. And what happens is that the monsoon comes, the river level rises, it transports large amounts of sand. And as the water levels drop down, then the sand gets deposited. So you basically have a bimodal system: you have a lot of sand being transported, sand and silt; and then you have a bed material which is much larger material, which is relatively immobile compared to the amount of sediment transported in suspension. (Slide 10) The sedimentation process in reservoirs is pretty consistent throughout the world. You typically have a deposition of coarse sediment upstream,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is very large, this same amount of bed load now becomes small as a percentage basis. So there tends to be a tendency to overestimate bed load in the Himalaya. And we've seen this in work I've done in Nepal at Kali Gandaki: a reservoir that was predicted to fill completely with gravel within ten years. And after ten years, there's a lot of sand, but there's hardly any gravel at all because we don't have the bed load transport. So these are actual things that I have observed and we have studied in the field. (Slide 7) Himalayan sand is quite angular. But this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal, where you also see the sand deposits. And what happens is that the monsoon comes, the river level rises, it transports large amounts of sand. And as the water levels drop down, then the sand gets deposited. So you basically have a bimodal system: you have a lot of sand being transported, sand and silt; and then you have a bed material which is much larger material, which is relatively immobile compared to the amount of sediment transported in suspension. (Slide 10) The sedimentation process in reservoirs is pretty consistent throughout the world. You
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 predominant on the bed. And the material on the bed which is lifted and moved along the bed by hydraulic action, that's your bed load. There is a variety of different estimates of typically making bed load: some people say it's 20% or 30% or 15%. But those estimates were in many cases basically, the original work was derived from work in the western United States, where the suspended load is not nearly as large as it is in the Himalaya. So if you have a bed load against a not so large suspended load, the percentage is large. But if the suspended load is very large, this same amount of bed load now becomes small as a percentage basis. So there tends to be a tendency to overestimate bed load in the Himalaya. And we've seen this in work I've done in Nepal at Kali Gandaki: a reservoir that was predicted to fill completely with gravel within ten years. And after ten years, there's a lot of sand, but there's hardly any gravel at all because we don't have the bed load transport. So these are actual things that I have observed and we have studied in the field. (Slide 7) Himalayan sand is quite angular. But this is common to sands of mountain areas, at least 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	of steel which works, and it is significantly less hard than sand. (Slide 8) The bed material in the Himalaya, as you will see here on the picture on the left, that's at Besham Qila. This gauge station is upstream of Tarbela Dam. You will notice that there are some people in the figure, and that gives you an idea of the size: these are boulders and cobbles in the bed, largely boulders. And you will also notice there's sand deposits: the arrows point to the sand deposits. And if you look at the right-hand photo, that's the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal, where you also see the sand deposits. And what happens is that the monsoon comes, the river level rises, it transports large amounts of sand. And as the water levels drop down, then the sand gets deposited. So you basically have a bimodal system: you have a lot of sand being transported, sand and silt; and then you have a bed material which is much larger material, which is relatively immobile compared to the amount of sediment transported in suspension. (Slide 10) The sedimentation process in reservoirs is pretty consistent throughout the world. You typically have a deposition of coarse sediment upstream,

16:36	1	and you have a fine sediment deposit that proceeds	16:40 1	hydropower.
	2	beyond the delta.	2	(Slide 13) I know you've seen this before. But
	3	So imagine a river is carrying sand and clay and	3	basically, you start with a reservoir. You see we've
	4	silt, and maybe a little bit of gravel during a flood	4	got the reservoir, you've got the delta and the fine
	5	event. And this material enters a reservoir, which is	5	sediment. You've got the intake.
	6	water which is standing, and immediately the coarse	6	Typically, you will have a desander. This is the
	7	material settles to the bottom. And the finer material,	7	traditional way of dealing with sediment in
	8	which is sustained in suspension, continues downstream,	8	a run-of-river hydropower plant. You may have seen from
	9	and then gets deposited further downstream and closer to	9	the Kishenganga case that India was alleging that the
	10	the dam, but beyond the delta.	10	flushing of sediment is a new technology. It has been
	11	And it's interesting because this delta phase is	11	around for many years, but has been very infrequently
	12	actually, in many reservoirs, quite a distinct change in	12	used in the past because your hydropower plants, the
	13	topography. In Tarbela, for instance, it's quite	13	run-of-river plants, use desanders. So there are many
	14	distinct. And that's what we would expect to see and	14	plants in many parts of the world that rely on, use
	15	what we do see in any of the deeper reservoirs.	15	desanders, and you saw the desander at the
	16	At the bottom we have the configuration of where	16	Neelum-Jhelum.
	17	this thing ends up after a number of years, and you'll	17	From the desander, you go to the headrace tunnel,
	18	notice that the delta has moved towards and reached the	18	the surge tank, and into the powerhouse.
	19	dam, in this particular example. So what happens is	19	Now, one of the things that we will talk about later
	20	that when you reach an equilibrium between the sediment	20	is: notice that the turbine is placed underneath the
	21	inflow and sediment outflow, you will have the delta	21	generator. And the traditional design for power plants
	22	deposits that reach the dam.	22	is for the Francis turbine to be removed by lifting it
	23	Delta deposits are problematic for hydropower	23	up. So to get the Francis turbine out to repair it or
	24	because they contain sand. The fine sediment is not so	24	do any maintenance, you have to take the generator out.
	25	problematic. It can, of course, produce erosion,	25	And that's very complicated.
		Page 197		Page 199
16:38	1	produce abrasion of your equipment, but it's not	16:41 1	At Neelum-Jhelum they have actually made it so that
16:38	2	anywhere near as damaging as sand.	2	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the
16:38	2 3	anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both	2 3	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's
16:38	2 3 4	anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is	2 3 4	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to
16:38	2 3 4 5	anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're	2 3 4 5	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to
16:38	2 3 4 5 6	anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the	2 3 4 5 6	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more
16:38	2 3 4 5 6 7	anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment	2 3 4 5 6 7	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily.
16:38	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the reservoir during a flood, and it will plunge, go 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways. At Neelum-Jhelum you saw that there was a main
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the reservoir during a flood, and it will plunge, go underneath, and flow along the bottom. And if it 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways. At Neelum-Jhelum you saw that there was a main spillway, which was an orifice spillway, but there was
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the reservoir during a flood, and it will plunge, go underneath, and flow along the bottom. And if it reaches the dam sometimes it does, sometimes it 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways. At Neelum-Jhelum you saw that there was a main spillway, which was an orifice spillway, but there was also a top-level spillway. These are provided in some
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the reservoir during a flood, and it will plunge, go underneath, and flow along the bottom. And if it reaches the dam sometimes it does, sometimes it doesn't; it depends a lot on your site conditions you 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways. At Neelum-Jhelum you saw that there was a main spillway, which was an orifice spillway, but there was also a top-level spillway. These are provided in some cases as a safety valve, but more typically to release
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the reservoir during a flood, and it will plunge, go underneath, and flow along the bottom. And if it reaches the dam sometimes it does, sometimes it doesn't; it depends a lot on your site conditions you can pass it through turbines, or you can discharge it 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways. At Neelum-Jhelum you saw that there was a main spillway, which was an orifice spillway, but there was also a top-level spillway. These are provided in some cases as a safety valve, but more typically to release floating debris, because you want to be able to release
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the reservoir during a flood, and it will plunge, go underneath, and flow along the bottom. And if it reaches the dam sometimes it does, sometimes it doesn't; it depends a lot on your site conditions you can pass it through turbines, or you can discharge it over the top of the dam. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways. At Neelum-Jhelum you saw that there was a main spillway, which was an orifice spillway, but there was also a top-level spillway. These are provided in some cases as a safety valve, but more typically to release floating debris, because you want to be able to release logs and other stuff that comes floating into the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the reservoir during a flood, and it will plunge, go underneath, and flow along the bottom. And if it reaches the dam sometimes it does, sometimes it doesn't; it depends a lot on your site conditions you can pass it through turbines, or you can discharge it over the top of the dam. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways. At Neelum-Jhelum you saw that there was a main spillway, which was an orifice spillway, but there was also a top-level spillway. These are provided in some cases as a safety valve, but more typically to release floating debris, because you want to be able to release logs and other stuff that comes floating into the reservoir.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the reservoir during a flood, and it will plunge, go underneath, and flow along the bottom. And if it reaches the dam sometimes it does, sometimes it doesn't; it depends a lot on your site conditions you can pass it through turbines, or you can discharge it over the top of the dam. And this is one way that you can reduce the accumulation of fine sediment in a reservoir, which 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways. At Neelum-Jhelum you saw that there was a main spillway, which was an orifice spillway, but there was also a top-level spillway. These are provided in some cases as a safety valve, but more typically to release floating debris, because you want to be able to release logs and other stuff that comes floating into the reservoir. The definition of freeboard on the far left of the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the reservoir during a flood, and it will plunge, go underneath, and flow along the bottom. And if it reaches the dam sometimes it does, sometimes it doesn't; it depends a lot on your site conditions you can pass it through turbines, or you can discharge it over the top of the dam. And this is one way that you can reduce the accumulation of fine sediment in a reservoir, which leaves more volume available to capture the sand, the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways. At Neelum-Jhelum you saw that there was a main spillway, which was an orifice spillway, but there was also a top-level spillway. These are provided in some cases as a safety valve, but more typically to release floating debris, because you want to be able to release logs and other stuff that comes floating into the reservoir. The definition of freeboard on the far left of the diagram shows an ungated spillway. When you are going
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the reservoir during a flood, and it will plunge, go underneath, and flow along the bottom. And if it reaches the dam sometimes it does, sometimes it doesn't; it depends a lot on your site conditions you can pass it through turbines, or you can discharge it over the top of the dam. And this is one way that you can reduce the accumulation of fine sediment in a reservoir, which leaves more volume available to capture the sand, the delta. And that will retard the arrival of the delta, 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	 you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways. At Neelum-Jhelum you saw that there was a main spillway, which was an orifice spillway, but there was also a top-level spillway. These are provided in some cases as a safety valve, but more typically to release floating debris, because you want to be able to release logs and other stuff that comes floating into the reservoir. The definition of freeboard on the far left of the diagram shows an ungated spillway. When you are going to release your flood, flood will not flow over
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the reservoir during a flood, and it will plunge, go underneath, and flow along the bottom. And if it reaches the dam sometimes it does, sometimes it doesn't; it depends a lot on your site conditions you can pass it through turbines, or you can discharge it over the top of the dam. And this is one way that you can reduce the accumulation of fine sediment in a reservoir, which leaves more volume available to capture the sand, the delta. And that will retard the arrival of the delta, because the delta results in more difficult management 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways. At Neelum-Jhelum you saw that there was a main spillway, which was an orifice spillway, but there was also a top-level spillway. These are provided in some cases as a safety valve, but more typically to release floating debris, because you want to be able to release logs and other stuff that comes floating into the reservoir. The definition of freeboard on the far left of the diagram shows an ungated spillway. When you are going to release your flood, flood will not flow over a spillway unless you start raising water level over the
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \end{array}$	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the reservoir during a flood, and it will plunge, go underneath, and flow along the bottom. And if it reaches the dam sometimes it does, sometimes it doesn't; it depends a lot on your site conditions you can pass it through turbines, or you can discharge it over the top of the dam. And this is one way that you can reduce the accumulation of fine sediment in a reservoir, which leaves more volume available to capture the sand, the delta. And that will retard the arrival of the delta, because the delta results in more difficult management problems. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways. At Neelum-Jhelum you saw that there was a main spillway, which was an orifice spillway, but there was also a top-level spillway. These are provided in some cases as a safety valve, but more typically to release floating debris, because you want to be able to release logs and other stuff that comes floating into the reservoir. The definition of freeboard on the far left of the diagram shows an ungated spillway. When you are going to release your flood, flood will not flow over a spillway unless you start raising water level over the top of the spillway. So your design flood, you will
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the reservoir during a flood, and it will plunge, go underneath, and flow along the bottom. And if it reaches the dam sometimes it does, sometimes it doesn't; it depends a lot on your site conditions you can pass it through turbines, or you can discharge it over the top of the dam. And this is one way that you can reduce the accumulation of fine sediment in a reservoir, which leaves more volume available to capture the sand, the delta. And that will retard the arrival of the delta, because the delta results in more difficult management 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways. At Neelum-Jhelum you saw that there was a main spillway, which was an orifice spillway, but there was also a top-level spillway. These are provided in some cases as a safety valve, but more typically to release floating debris, because you want to be able to release logs and other stuff that comes floating into the reservoir. The definition of freeboard on the far left of the diagram shows an ungated spillway. When you are going to release your flood, flood will not flow over a spillway unless you start raising water level over the
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \end{array}$	 anywhere near as damaging as sand. And what we're trying to do at reservoirs, both storage reservoirs as well as hydropower reservoirs, is change the concept of reservoir operation [from] "We're going to store sediment" to "We're going to move to the point at which sediment inflow matches sediment outflow", and we're trying to reach this equilibrium profile at the same time that we're preserving storage capacity and other benefits. (Slide 11) We also have turbid density currents which can occur. This is muddy water that enters the reservoir during a flood, and it will plunge, go underneath, and flow along the bottom. And if it reaches the dam sometimes it does, sometimes it doesn't; it depends a lot on your site conditions you can pass it through turbines, or you can discharge it over the top of the dam. And this is one way that you can reduce the accumulation of fine sediment in a reservoir, which leaves more volume available to capture the sand, the delta. And that will retard the arrival of the delta, because the delta results in more difficult management problems. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 you can drop the runner from the turbine and pull the runner out without touching the generator. And that's just one of the types of modifications that you do to your design to accommodate sediment, because you want to be able to access and repair your equipment much more easily. (Slide 14) Spillways. You always have to have a spillway: you always have to be able to deal with the floods. And different spillway configurations are available, and a single dam will frequently have multiple spillways. At Neelum-Jhelum you saw that there was a main spillway, which was an orifice spillway, but there was also a top-level spillway. These are provided in some cases as a safety valve, but more typically to release floating debris, because you want to be able to release logs and other stuff that comes floating into the reservoir. The definition of freeboard on the far left of the diagram shows an ungated spillway. When you are going to release your flood, flood will not flow over a spillway unless you start raising water level over the top of the spillway. So your design flood, you will

16:43 1	spillway.	16:46 1	flow of water.
2	And typically what's done is that you place	2	(Slide 16) The elevation capacity curve this is
3	a gate as shown in the middle diagram, letter (b)	3	a generic curve, but they all look pretty similar to
4	you place a gate which can be closed to maintain	4	this is a curve showing the elevation of water in the
5	a normal pool level, or a full pool level during normal	5	reservoir against the capacity.
6	conditions, and then you open the gate to release the	6	At the very left, you see that the elevation goes up
7	floods. This is a very common perhaps the most	7	quite a bit with very little increase in capacity. And
8	common configuration that you see on dams.	8	this occurs because if you look at a reservoir, you can
9	And the freeboard is considerably less because now	9	think of it like being triangular-shaped: at the bottom
10	you have released the flood by opening a gate instead of	10	it's very small, and you go up higher and higher in the
11	having it raise up above the crest elevation. It's the	11	valley and it widens out.
12	same level, but in one case you have uncontrollable	12	And the other thing is that the distance from the
13	storage, in letter (a), and controllable storage in	13	dam if you have a dam and you only fill it 5 metres
14	letter (b).	14	deep, the pool is not going to go very far upstream; but
15	Letter (c) is the orifice spillway. And again, the	15	as you fill it higher, the pool gets longer. So as you
16	design flood will be established according to the	16	get higher in elevation, your reservoir surface gets
17	capacity of the gates, and you will again have freeboard	17	wider and longer, and this means that each additional
18	above that level.	18	increment in elevation gives you more than
19	(Slide 15) Now, the "freeboard" concept is different	19	a corresponding increase in capacity. So that's why
20	from the concept of "controllable storage", which we	20	this curve flattens out towards the right: because you
21	will go to next. Controllable storage is that storage	21	keep increasing the elevation, and the surface area gets
22	volume that you can actually control by the manipulation	22	bigger and bigger.
23	of gates. "Freeboard" is defined in the Treaty;	23	What this implies and that's shown here in red,
24	"controllable storage" is not. But controllable storage	24	the red dotted line is that the capacity of the
25	is a fact of life.	25	reservoir is very sensitive to the top elevation. So if
			·
	Page 201		Page 203
16:44 1	So on the left-hand side, you have freeboard again	16:48 1	you can increment the elevation a couple of metres, you
16:44 1 2	So on the left-hand side, you have freeboard again defined, but you also have controllable storage, which	16:48 1 2	you can increment the elevation a couple of metres, you have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each
2	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which	2	have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each
2 3	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the		have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and
2 3 4	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable	2 3	have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water.
2 3 4 5	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two	2 3 4 5	have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of
2 3 4 5 6	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram.	2 3 4	have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise
2 3 4 5 6 7	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your	2 3 4 5 6 7	have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will	2 3 4 5 6 7	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't have a crest spillway of some sort installed there, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows, and the top portion of this graphic shows one year, from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't have a crest spillway of some sort installed there, you can simply close your gate and raise the water level,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows, and the top portion of this graphic shows one year, from January to December. A typical characteristic of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't have a crest spillway of some sort installed there, you can simply close your gate and raise the water level, and therefore convert freeboard into controllable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows, and the top portion of this graphic shows one year, from January to December. A typical characteristic of run-of-river plants in a monsoon-type environment, where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't have a crest spillway of some sort installed there, you can simply close your gate and raise the water level, and therefore convert freeboard into controllable storage. You could fill it and empty it as you wish to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows, and the top portion of this graphic shows one year, from January to December. A typical characteristic of run-of-river plants in a monsoon-type environment, where you have a dry season in the winter, and that dry season
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't have a crest spillway of some sort installed there, you can simply close your gate and raise the water level, and therefore convert freeboard into controllable storage. You could fill it and empty it as you wish to just by operating the gates.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows, and the top portion of this graphic shows one year, from January to December. A typical characteristic of run-of-river plants in a monsoon-type environment, where you have a dry season in the winter, and that dry season is used for power peaking. You don't have enough water
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't have a crest spillway of some sort installed there, you can simply close your gate and raise the water level, and therefore convert freeboard into controllable storage. You could fill it and empty it as you wish to just by operating the gates. The second aspect of this is the placement of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows, and the top portion of this graphic shows one year, from January to December. A typical characteristic of run-of-river plants in a monsoon-type environment, where you have a dry season in the winter, and that dry season is used for power peaking. You don't have enough water to run the plant 24/7 at full power.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't have a crest spillway of some sort installed there, you can simply close your gate and raise the water level, and therefore convert freeboard into controllable storage. You could fill it and empty it as you wish to just by operating the gates. The second aspect of this is the placement of the spillway. If you have a deep spillway, of course this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows, and the top portion of this graphic shows one year, from January to December. A typical characteristic of run-of-river plants in a monsoon-type environment, where you have a dry season in the winter, and that dry season is used for power peaking. You don't have enough water to run the plant 24/7 at full power. So what you do is during part of the day, let's say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't have a crest spillway of some sort installed there, you can simply close your gate and raise the water level, and therefore convert freeboard into controllable storage. You could fill it and empty it as you wish to just by operating the gates. The second aspect of this is the placement of the spillway. If you have a deep spillway, of course this will increase the controllable volume, the deeper you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows, and the top portion of this graphic shows one year, from January to December. A typical characteristic of run-of-river plants in a monsoon-type environment, where you have a dry season in the winter, and that dry season is used for power peaking. You don't have enough water to run the plant 24/7 at full power. So what you do is during part of the day, let's say overnight, you accumulate water; and then during the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't have a crest spillway of some sort installed there, you can simply close your gate and raise the water level, and therefore convert freeboard into controllable storage. You could fill it and empty it as you wish to just by operating the gates. The second aspect of this is the placement of the spillway. If you have a deep spillway, of course this will increase the controllable volume, the deeper you put the spillway. So anything that drives your spillway	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows, and the top portion of this graphic shows one year, from January to December. A typical characteristic of run-of-river plants in a monsoon-type environment, where you have a dry season in the winter, and that dry season is used for power peaking. You don't have enough water to run the plant 24/7 at full power. So what you do is during part of the day, let's say overnight, you accumulate water; and then during the morning or evening peak, you turn the turbines on it
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't have a crest spillway of some sort installed there, you can simply close your gate and raise the water level, and therefore convert freeboard into controllable storage. You could fill it and empty it as you wish to just by operating the gates. The second aspect of this is the placement of the spillway. If you have a deep spillway, of course this will increase the controllable volume, the deeper you put the spillway. So anything that drives your spillway depth down lower into the reservoir, you are again	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows, and the top portion of this graphic shows one year, from January to December. A typical characteristic of run-of-river plants in a monsoon-type environment, where you have a dry season in the winter, and that dry season is used for power peaking. You don't have enough water to run the plant 24/7 at full power. So what you do is during part of the day, let's say overnight, you accumulate water; and then during the morning or evening peak, you turn the turbines on it would typically be, say, full power and run them for
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't have a crest spillway of some sort installed there, you can simply close your gate and raise the water level, and therefore convert freeboard into controllable storage. You could fill it and empty it as you wish to just by operating the gates. The second aspect of this is the placement of the spillway. If you have a deep spillway, of course this will increase the controllable volume, the deeper you put the spillway. So anything that drives your spillway depth down lower into the reservoir, you are again increasing controllable storage.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows, and the top portion of this graphic shows one year, from January to December. A typical characteristic of run-of-river plants in a monsoon-type environment, where you have a dry season in the winter, and that dry season is used for power peaking. You don't have enough water to run the plant 24/7 at full power. So what you do is during part of the day, let's say overnight, you accumulate water; and then during the morning or evening peak, you turn the turbines on it would typically be, say, full power and run them for a certain number of hours to release that water and
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't have a crest spillway of some sort installed there, you can simply close your gate and raise the water level, and therefore convert freeboard into controllable storage. You could fill it and empty it as you wish to just by operating the gates. The second aspect of this is the placement of the spillway. If you have a deep spillway, of course this will increase the controllable volume, the deeper you put the spillway. So anything that drives your spillway depth down lower into the reservoir, you are again increasing controllable storage.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows, and the top portion of this graphic shows one year, from January to December. A typical characteristic of run-of-river plants in a monsoon-type environment, where you have a dry season in the winter, and that dry season is used for power peaking. You don't have enough water to run the plant 24/7 at full power. So what you do is during part of the day, let's say overnight, you accumulate water; and then during the morning or evening peak, you turn the turbines on it would typically be, say, full power and run them for a certain number of hours to release that water and produce power during the peak hours. Because it doesn't
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't have a crest spillway of some sort installed there, you can simply close your gate and raise the water level, and therefore convert freeboard into controllable storage. You could fill it and empty it as you wish to just by operating the gates. The second aspect of this is the placement of the spillway. If you have a deep spillway, of course this will increase the controllable volume, the deeper you put the spillway. So anything that drives your spillway depth down lower into the reservoir, you are again increasing controllable storage. And controllable storage, from the standpoint of Pakistan, is quite a problem because it allows the obviously in the dams you have more capacity to control	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows, and the top portion of this graphic shows one year, from January to December. A typical characteristic of run-of-river plants in a monsoon-type environment, where you have a dry season in the winter, and that dry season is used for power peaking. You don't have enough water to run the plant 24/7 at full power. So what you do is during part of the day, let's say overnight, you accumulate water; and then during the morning or evening peak, you turn the turbines on it would typically be, say, full power and run them for a certain number of hours to release that water and produce power during the peak hours. Because it doesn't make any sense to release power overnight, when the demand is low.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	defined, but you also have controllable storage, which is everything above that crest outlet. On the right-hand side, you have a definition for controllable storage for an orifice spillway. And there are two differences between the left and the right diagram. On the left-hand side diagram, you'll see that your freeboard on top of the gate, that is uncontrollable. You can't lift the water into that zone because it will just flow over the top of the gate. But on the right-hand side, with the orifice spillway, if you don't have a crest spillway of some sort installed there, you can simply close your gate and raise the water level, and therefore convert freeboard into controllable storage. You could fill it and empty it as you wish to just by operating the gates. The second aspect of this is the placement of the spillway. If you have a deep spillway, of course this will increase the controllable volume, the deeper you put the spillway. So anything that drives your spillway depth down lower into the reservoir, you are again increasing controllable storage. And controllable storage, from the standpoint of Pakistan, is quite a problem because it allows the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 have produced a lot of additional capacity, because each incremental metre means that you have a bigger and bigger area against which you're filling up with water. So that's just to put into context the importance of limiting the top elevation at which you can raise a pool. Now, on slide 17, let's talk about the annual operating cycle. The bottom graph here is the graph which we saw a few slides ago about the seasonality of the inflows, and the top portion of this graphic shows one year, from January to December. A typical characteristic of run-of-river plants in a monsoon-type environment, where you have a dry season in the winter, and that dry season is used for power peaking. You don't have enough water to run the plant 24/7 at full power. So what you do is during part of the day, let's say overnight, you accumulate water; and then during the morning or evening peak, you turn the turbines on it would typically be, say, full power and run them for a certain number of hours to release that water and produce power during the peak hours. Because it doesn't make any sense to release power overnight, when the

16:49 1	Hydropower plants are pretty unique in the context	16:53 1	The Pelton, on the right-hand side, operates at
2	of the overall energy system because they can turn on	2	atmospheric pressure. Here is a top picture it's
3	and off very quickly. You can bring a hydropower plant	3	a small Pelton plant. That one's in Colombia. But it's
4	to power within a couple of minutes. A thermal plant,	4	a good picture showing you that the enclosure on the
5	you have to if it's a gas turbine, which is like	5	buckets is just to keep the water from spraying out and
6	a jet engine, they can also ramp up very quickly. But	6	around. The nozzle down here sprays water against the
7	conventional plants, like a coal power plant or	7	buckets and causes them to rotate. This shows with
8	oil-fired plant, they need to heat up, you have boilers,	8	a single nozzle; you can have Pelton plants with up to
9	and it takes time to do this. In a nuclear plant,	9	six nozzles.
10	you're talking a couple of days to get going.	10	So the Pelton plant, which is not operating under
11	So these power plants, the hydropower plants, are	11	pressure, is very easy to take off. If you get good at
12	very good for power peaking. They can come in if	12	it, you can replace the Pelton runner in 24 hours. So
13	you're having a cloudy afternoon and your solar is being	13	it's a plant that's easier to maintain and do repairs
14	reduced, you can say, "Well, we need some more power, so	14	on. And that may be an important consideration if you
15	we'll put the peaking plant online".	15	have sediment: that you want something that you can
16	And typically, the grid operator will operate the	16	replace rather frequently.
17	hydropower plant to use as much of its power as	17	Peltons are used typically over about 350 metres.
18	possible. Because when a grid operator brings units	18	You can use them at a little bit less. But if you get
19	online, they're bringing on the cheapest unit first, and	19	to high heads, it's a Pelton plant that you're going to
20	hydropower has zero fuel cost. It's all sunk cost; zero	20	be running.
21	fuel cost. So your grid operator will bring on	21	(Slide 19) The sediment impacts run-of-river hydro
22	hydropower and use that to its maximum capability.	22	plants, there's two basic types of problems that occur:
23	So that is your power peak. And of course during	23	you can have abrasion damage to your runners and
24	the wet season it will be continuously operating, 24/7,	24	ancillary hydromechanical equipment, the wickets or
25	as a baseload plant. It will run alongside a nuclear	25	guide vanes, and you have stay vanes, and your shaft
	Page 205		Page 207
16:51 1	plant or a coal plant.	16:54 1	bearings can be subject to abrasion.
16:51 1 2	plant or a coal plant. So two types of operation: a peaking plant and	16:54 1 2	bearings can be subject to abrasion. You can also have problems with the cooling system.
	plant or a coal plant. So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration.		You can also have problems with the cooling system.
2	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and	2	
2 3	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration.	2 3	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use
2 3 4	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan	2 3 4	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot
2 3 4 5	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty	2 3 4 5	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like
2 3 4 5 6	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode	2 3 4 5 6	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to
2 3 4 5 6 7	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water.	2 3 4 5 6 7	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically talking about: the Francis turbine on the left. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to begin with, so you don't have to try and redo it later.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically talking about: the Francis turbine on the left. The Francis turbine is typically used in the 50-350-metre	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to begin with, so you don't have to try and redo it later. You can also have structural components in the dams.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically talking about: the Francis turbine on the left. The Francis turbine is typically used in the 50-350-metre range of head. I mean, there are plants that run at higher heads. But one of the characteristics of the Francis unit is you'll see it has what's called	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to begin with, so you don't have to try and redo it later. You can also have structural components in the dams. Part of the concrete near the gates can be abraded by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically talking about: the Francis turbine on the left. The Francis turbine is typically used in the 50-350-metre range of head. I mean, there are plants that run at higher heads. But one of the characteristics of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to begin with, so you don't have to try and redo it later. You can also have structural components in the dams. Part of the concrete near the gates can be abraded by sediment.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically talking about: the Francis turbine on the left. The Francis turbine is typically used in the 50-350-metre range of head. I mean, there are plants that run at higher heads. But one of the characteristics of the Francis unit is you'll see it has what's called	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to begin with, so you don't have to try and redo it later. You can also have structural components in the dams. Part of the concrete near the gates can be abraded by sediment. Now, in the reservoir, the problem is you lose
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically talking about: the Francis turbine on the left. The Francis turbine is typically used in the 50-350-metre range of head. I mean, there are plants that run at higher heads. But one of the characteristics of the Francis unit is you'll see it has what's called a "scroll case" here the scroll case is up here	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to begin with, so you don't have to try and redo it later. You can also have structural components in the dams. Part of the concrete near the gates can be abraded by sediment. Now, in the reservoir, the problem is you lose storage capacity. And along with the storage capacity
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically talking about: the Francis turbine on the left. The Francis turbine is typically used in the 50-350-metre range of head. I mean, there are plants that run at higher heads. But one of the characteristics of the Francis unit is you'll see it has what's called a "scroll case" here the scroll case is up here (indicating) and it's got a draft tube, and these are all under pressure. So it's a pressurised system, which is one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to begin with, so you don't have to try and redo it later. You can also have structural components in the dams. Part of the concrete near the gates can be abraded by sediment. Now, in the reservoir, the problem is you lose storage capacity. And along with the storage capacity is the delta advances down to the area of the dam and to the intake. One of the things that you need to avoid, and one of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically talking about: the Francis turbine on the left. The Francis turbine is typically used in the 50-350-metre range of head. I mean, there are plants that run at higher heads. But one of the characteristics of the Francis unit is you'll see it has what's called a "scroll case" here the scroll case is up here (indicating) and it's got a draft tube, and these are all under pressure. So it's a pressurised system, which is one of the reasons why they have traditionally not taken the runner	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to begin with, so you don't have to try and redo it later. You can also have structural components in the dams. Part of the concrete near the gates can be abraded by sediment. Now, in the reservoir, the problem is you lose storage capacity. And along with the storage capacity is the delta advances down to the area of the dam and to the intake. One of the things that you need to avoid, and one of the things that has caused a little bit with difficulty
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically talking about: the Francis turbine on the left. The Francis turbine is typically used in the 50-350-metre range of head. I mean, there are plants that run at higher heads. But one of the characteristics of the Francis unit is you'll see it has what's called a "scroll case" here the scroll case is up here (indicating) and it's got a draft tube, and these are all under pressure. So it's a pressurised system, which is one of the reasons why they have traditionally not taken the runner out from below. But at Neelum-Jhelum, right around	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to begin with, so you don't have to try and redo it later. You can also have structural components in the dams. Part of the concrete near the gates can be abraded by sediment. Now, in the reservoir, the problem is you lose storage capacity. And along with the storage capacity is the delta advances down to the area of the dam and to the intake. One of the things that you need to avoid, and one of the things that has caused a little bit with difficulty in the industry, is that many plants have been designed
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically talking about: the Francis turbine on the left. The Francis turbine is typically used in the 50-350-metre range of head. I mean, there are plants that run at higher heads. But one of the characteristics of the Francis unit is you'll see it has what's called a "scroll case" here the scroll case is up here (indicating) and it's got a draft tube, and these are all under pressure. So it's a pressurised system, which is one of the reasons why they have traditionally not taken the runner out from below. But at Neelum-Jhelum, right around where the red dot is, in that area they have a gap in	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to begin with, so you don't have to try and redo it later. You can also have structural components in the dams. Part of the concrete near the gates can be abraded by sediment. Now, in the reservoir, the problem is you lose storage capacity. And along with the storage capacity is the delta advances down to the area of the dam and to the intake. One of the things that you need to avoid, and one of the things that has caused a little bit with difficulty in the industry, is that many plants have been designed as if the sediment is going to not be a problem, or not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically talking about: the Francis turbine on the left. The Francis turbine is typically used in the 50-350-metre range of head. I mean, there are plants that run at higher heads. But one of the characteristics of the Francis unit is you'll see it has what's called a "scroll case" here the scroll case is up here (indicating) and it's got a draft tube, and these are all under pressure. So it's a pressurised system, which is one of the reasons why they have traditionally not taken the runner out from below. But at Neelum-Jhelum, right around where the red dot is, in that area they have a gap in the draft tube where it's bolted together, large bolts	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to begin with, so you don't have to try and redo it later. You can also have structural components in the dams. Part of the concrete near the gates can be abraded by sediment. Now, in the reservoir, the problem is you lose storage capacity. And along with the storage capacity is the delta advances down to the area of the dam and to the intake. One of the things that you need to avoid, and one of the things that has caused a little bit with difficulty in the industry, is that many plants have been designed as if the sediment is going to not be a problem, or not going to be a problem, say, in my lifetime, or my design
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically talking about: the Francis turbine on the left. The Francis turbine is typically used in the 50-350-metre range of head. I mean, there are plants that run at higher heads. But one of the characteristics of the Francis unit is you'll see it has what's called a "scroll case" here the scroll case is up here (indicating) and it's got a draft tube, and these are all under pressure. So it's a pressurised system, which is one of the reasons why they have traditionally not taken the runner out from below. But at Neelum-Jhelum, right around where the red dot is, in that area they have a gap in the draft tube where it's bolted together, large bolts all the way round, and they can take that apart, drop	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to begin with, so you don't have to try and redo it later. You can also have structural components in the dams. Part of the concrete near the gates can be abraded by sediment. Now, in the reservoir, the problem is you lose storage capacity. And along with the storage capacity is the delta advances down to the area of the dam and to the intake. One of the things that you need to avoid, and one of the things that has caused a little bit with difficulty in the industry, is that many plants have been designed as if the sediment is going to not be a problem, or not going to be a problem, say, in my lifetime, or my design lifetime. So there are plants that have been designed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically talking about: the Francis turbine on the left. The Francis turbine is typically used in the 50-350-metre range of head. I mean, there are plants that run at higher heads. But one of the characteristics of the Francis unit is you'll see it has what's called a "scroll case" here the scroll case is up here (indicating) and it's got a draft tube, and these are all under pressure. So it's a pressurised system, which is one of the reasons why they have traditionally not taken the runner out from below. But at Neelum-Jhelum, right around where the red dot is, in that area they have a gap in the draft tube where it's bolted together, large bolts	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to begin with, so you don't have to try and redo it later. You can also have structural components in the dams. Part of the concrete near the gates can be abraded by sediment. Now, in the reservoir, the problem is you lose storage capacity. And along with the storage capacity is the delta advances down to the area of the dam and to the intake. One of the things that you need to avoid, and one of the things that has caused a little bit with difficulty in the industry, is that many plants have been designed as if the sediment is going to not be a problem, or not going to be a problem, say, in my lifetime, or my design
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	So two types of operation: a peaking plant and a baseload configuration. And the other interesting thing about the Himalayan hydrology: you will notice that there is a pretty dramatic and rapid transition from the baseload mode down to a power-peaking mode, with not very much water. The transition occurs pretty quickly, so it's not a very gradual thing. (Slide 18) Two types of turbines we are typically talking about: the Francis turbine on the left. The Francis turbine is typically used in the 50-350-metre range of head. I mean, there are plants that run at higher heads. But one of the characteristics of the Francis unit is you'll see it has what's called a "scroll case" here the scroll case is up here (indicating) and it's got a draft tube, and these are all under pressure. So it's a pressurised system, which is one of the reasons why they have traditionally not taken the runner out from below. But at Neelum-Jhelum, right around where the red dot is, in that area they have a gap in the draft tube where it's bolted together, large bolts all the way round, and they can take that apart, drop	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	You can also have problems with the cooling system. The generator uses a cooling system, and if you use water directly from the river and the river gets a lot of sediment, your cooling system will clog. It's like putting sand into your radiator in your car, so to speak. But to get around that, you simply use a closed-cycle cooling system, where you have clean water that recycles through it. So that has a workaround. Hopefully you designed it properly to begin with, so you don't have to try and redo it later. You can also have structural components in the dams. Part of the concrete near the gates can be abraded by sediment. Now, in the reservoir, the problem is you lose storage capacity. And along with the storage capacity is the delta advances down to the area of the dam and to the intake. One of the things that you need to avoid, and one of the things that has caused a little bit with difficulty in the industry, is that many plants have been designed as if the sediment is going to not be a problem, or not going to be a problem, say, in my lifetime, or my design lifetime. So there are plants that have been designed

		1	
16:56 1	100 years. And we're dealing with those issues now.	17:00 1	reservoir for sedimentation. This is basically the type
2	The Warsak project in Pakistan is one such problem,	2	of strategy that India prefers to use now. And there
3	where we're looking at a plant that was designed in the	3	are a couple of different ways to do this, and I've
4	1950s and has had very substantial sediment challenges,	4	actually designed plants in Nepal that operate both
5	and the idea is how to best make it work better. It	5	ways.
6	works, it produces power, but the operator is always	6	The top one shows a sediment bypass tunnel. This is
7	looking for a way to make things work better.	7	appropriate for, let's say, a small reservoir, a steep
8	You have a sediment-challenged environment, and you	8	river. And what you're doing is you're taking the water
8 9	will have wear on certain components of your system.		that comes into the reservoir, and you only want to run
		9	
10	The runner and the equipment that would run for 50 years	10	a certain amount of water through your turbine.
11	in a sediment-free environment, you may need to replace	11	Let's assume that your turbine takes 100 metres per
12	it: bring it out and repair it on an annual cycle.	12	second of flow rate. But if I have 300 metres a second
13	I worked on a small plant in Peru in a sediment-free	13	entering my reservoir, I don't want 300 metres a second
14	environment. The plant was built in 1914, more than	14	going through my reservoir and bringing all that
15	100 years ago. They've changed the runner once in	15	sediment into it. So I can divert 200 metres around my
16	100 years. But that's a very special case. So you do	16	head pond, which is shown here (indicating) it shows
17	have that end of the spectrum, and then you have the	17	here a little head pond I can divert 200 metres
18	other end of the spectrum. So you cannot approach	18	a second around that, and the remaining 100 metres
19	a sediment-challenged environment without taking into	19	a second goes to the turbine. So I've converted this
20	context all of the mitigation measures that you can	20	into a big sedimentation basin.
21	manage.	21	Of course, bypass tunnels cost money, but they're
22	So what are these mitigation measures? Let's go to	22	typically not quite as expensive as desanders.
23	slide 21. In general, the little graphic on the left	23	The other graphic below that shows the option of
24	outlines some of the different places where you can	24	flushing. If you have a larger reservoir, you may not
25	influence the sediment that affects your equipment.	25	need the bypass tunnel. The bypass tunnel in a larger
	Page 209		Page 211
	1 460 200		1 "
16:58 1	You're not going to affect the shape of the sediment;	17:01 1	reservoir may be quite long. At current, the longest
2	that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the	17:01 1 2	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres.
2 3	that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology.	2 3	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would
2	that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the	2 3 4	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres.
2 3	that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology.But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines.	2 3	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can
2 3 4	that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology.But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines.You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do	2 3 4	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea
2 3 4 5	that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology.But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines.You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation	2 3 4 5	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release
2 3 4 5 6	that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology.But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines.You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design	2 3 4 5 6	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty
2 3 4 5 6 7	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. 	2 3 4 5 6 7	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that in a minute. You can modify the hardness: you can increase the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have to empty the reservoir, you will be not producing power
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that in a minute. You can modify the hardness: you can increase the hardness of your turbine by using a protective coating, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that in a minute. You can modify the hardness: you can increase the hardness of your turbine by using a protective coating, a ceramic coating instead of steel. You can select 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have to empty the reservoir, you will be not producing power for however long the flushing takes, and you will be releasing potentially very high concentrations
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that in a minute. You can modify the hardness: you can increase the hardness of your turbine by using a protective coating, a ceramic coating instead of steel. You can select an appropriate turbine design that is less sensitive to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have to empty the reservoir, you will be not producing power for however long the flushing takes, and you will be releasing potentially very high concentrations downstream. And we're talking about more than
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that in a minute. You can modify the hardness: you can increase the hardness of your turbine by using a protective coating, a ceramic coating instead of steel. You can select an appropriate turbine design that is less sensitive to sediment damage. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have to empty the reservoir, you will be not producing power for however long the flushing takes, and you will be releasing potentially very high concentrations downstream. And we're talking about more than 100,000 milligrams per litre of sediment concentration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that in a minute. You can modify the hardness: you can increase the hardness of your turbine by using a protective coating, a ceramic coating instead of steel. You can select an appropriate turbine design that is less sensitive to sediment damage. And you can select your site. If you have a real 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have to empty the reservoir, you will be not producing power for however long the flushing takes, and you will be releasing potentially very high concentrations downstream. And we're talking about more than 100,000 milligrams per litre of sediment concentration. To mitigate that and there have been plants that
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that in a minute. You can modify the hardness: you can increase the hardness of your turbine by using a protective coating, a ceramic coating instead of steel. You can select an appropriate turbine design that is less sensitive to sediment damage. And you can select your site. If you have a real sediment problem, and you said, "Well, I want to put 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have to empty the reservoir, you will be not producing power for however long the flushing takes, and you will be releasing potentially very high concentrations downstream. And we're talking about more than 100,000 milligrams per litre of sediment concentration. To mitigate that and there have been plants that have released multiple hundreds of thousands of
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that in a minute. You can modify the hardness: you can increase the hardness of your turbine by using a protective coating, a ceramic coating instead of steel. You can select an appropriate turbine design that is less sensitive to sediment damage. And you can select your site. If you have a real sediment problem, and you said, "Well, I want to put a plant with 1,000 metres of head", maybe that's not the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have to empty the reservoir, you will be not producing power for however long the flushing takes, and you will be releasing potentially very high concentrations downstream. And we're talking about more than 100,000 milligrams per litre of sediment concentration. To mitigate that and there have been plants that have released multiple hundreds of thousands of milligrams per litre downstream. To mitigate against
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that in a minute. You can modify the hardness: you can increase the hardness of your turbine by using a protective coating, a ceramic coating instead of steel. You can select an appropriate turbine design that is less sensitive to sediment damage. And you can select your site. If you have a real sediment problem, and you said, "Well, I want to put a plant with 1,000 metres of head", maybe that's not the best idea, because a Pelton plant operating with 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have to empty the reservoir, you will be not producing power for however long the flushing takes, and you will be releasing potentially very high concentrations downstream. And we're talking about more than 100,000 milligrams per litre of sediment concentration. To mitigate that and there have been plants that have released multiple hundreds of thousands of milligrams per litre downstream. To mitigate against that, you draw your reservoir down much more slowly,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that in a minute. You can modify the hardness: you can increase the hardness of your turbine by using a protective coating, a ceramic coating instead of steel. You can select an appropriate turbine design that is less sensitive to sediment damage. And you can select your site. If you have a real sediment problem, and you said, "Well, I want to put a plant with 1,000 metres of head", maybe that's not the best idea, because a Pelton plant operating with 1,000 metres of head, you can destroy the needle valves 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have to empty the reservoir, you will be not producing power for however long the flushing takes, and you will be releasing potentially very high concentrations downstream. And we're talking about more than 100,000 milligrams per litre of sediment concentration. To mitigate that and there have been plants that have released multiple hundreds of thousands of milligrams per litre downstream. To mitigate against that, you draw your reservoir down much more slowly, which prolongs your flushing period, which prolongs the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that in a minute. You can modify the hardness: you can increase the hardness of your turbine by using a protective coating, a ceramic coating instead of steel. You can select an appropriate turbine design that is less sensitive to sediment damage. And you can select your site. If you have a real sediment problem, and you said, "Well, I want to put a plant with 1,000 metres of head", maybe that's not the best idea, because a Pelton plant operating with 1,000 metres of head, you can destroy the needle valves in 24 hours. And I've seen it happen at a client's 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have to empty the reservoir, you will be not producing power for however long the flushing takes, and you will be releasing potentially very high concentrations downstream. And we're talking about more than 100,000 milligrams per litre of sediment concentration. To mitigate that and there have been plants that have released multiple hundreds of thousands of milligrams per litre downstream. To mitigate against that, you draw your reservoir down much more slowly, which prolongs your flushing period, which prolongs the period at which the power plant is not operating.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that in a minute. You can modify the hardness: you can increase the hardness of your turbine by using a protective coating, a ceramic coating instead of steel. You can select an appropriate turbine design that is less sensitive to sediment problem, and you said, "Well, I want to put a plant with 1,000 metres of head", maybe that's not the best idea, because a Pelton plant operating with 1,000 metres of head, you can destroy the needle valves in 24 hours. And I've seen it happen at a client's plant. So these things can happen. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have to empty the reservoir, you will be not producing power for however long the flushing takes, and you will be releasing potentially very high concentrations downstream. And we're talking about more than 100,000 milligrams per litre of sediment concentration. To mitigate that and there have been plants that have released multiple hundreds of thousands of milligrams per litre downstream. To mitigate against that, you draw your reservoir down much more slowly, which prolongs your flushing period, which prolongs the period at which the power plant is not operating. You can configure your intake to reduce the sediment
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that in a minute. You can modify the hardness: you can increase the hardness of your turbine by using a protective coating, a ceramic coating instead of steel. You can select an appropriate turbine design that is less sensitive to sediment damage. And you can select your site. If you have a real sediment problem, and you said, "Well, I want to put a plant with 1,000 metres of head", maybe that's not the best idea, because a Pelton plant operating with 1,000 metres of head, you can destroy the needle valves in 24 hours. And I've seen it happen at a client's 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have to empty the reservoir, you will be not producing power for however long the flushing takes, and you will be releasing potentially very high concentrations downstream. And we're talking about more than 100,000 milligrams per litre of sediment concentration. To mitigate that and there have been plants that have released multiple hundreds of thousands of milligrams per litre downstream. To mitigate against that, you draw your reservoir down much more slowly, which prolongs your flushing period, which prolongs the period at which the power plant is not operating.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 that's given by geology. You're not going to affect the hardness of the sediment; that's also given by geology. But you can influence the size and concentration of the sediment that reaches your machines. You have pre-treatment sedimentation. You can do sedimentation in the reservoir; you can do sedimentation in your sedimentation tank. And you can also design your intake to minimise the entrainment of sediment. We'll talk about each of those. And you can do what we call sediment-guided operation, and we'll mention that in a minute. You can modify the hardness: you can increase the hardness of your turbine by using a protective coating, a ceramic coating instead of steel. You can select an appropriate turbine design that is less sensitive to sediment problem, and you said, "Well, I want to put a plant with 1,000 metres of head", maybe that's not the best idea, because a Pelton plant operating with 1,000 metres of head, you can destroy the needle valves in 24 hours. And I've seen it happen at a client's plant. So these things can happen. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	bypass tunnel in the world is less than 5 kilometres. We are currently looking at one in Colombia which would be 17 kilometres. But the bottom graphic shows flushing which you can undertake with or without a bypass tunnel. And the idea here is that you empty the reservoir, and you release the sediment by passing the river through the empty reservoir, and it scours it out, and then you refill it. This has certain advantages and disadvantages which we'll go into later. Of course, one of the problems is that you do have to empty the reservoir, you will be not producing power for however long the flushing takes, and you will be releasing potentially very high concentrations downstream. And we're talking about more than 100,000 milligrams per litre of sediment concentration. To mitigate that and there have been plants that have released multiple hundreds of thousands of milligrams per litre downstream. To mitigate against that, you draw your reservoir down much more slowly, which prolongs your flushing period, which prolongs the period at which the power plant is not operating. You can configure your intake to reduce the sediment

17.031the surface of the water, or you go down close to the borrom, the concentration of clay and small alfs will the surface of the water, or you go down close to the borrom, the concentration of clay and small alfs will the water concentration on top, high concentration at the borrom.17.071the desander or sedimentation basin.100010Now, a desander ideality works the water is surgered by the water column. If you have a big the prostile in the water column. If you have a big the sposible in the water column. If you have a big the sposible in the water column. If you have a big the sposible in the water column. If you have a big the sposible in the water column. If you have a big the devanter may are guidly — blows will be other the devanter may are guidly — blows will be other the devanter may are guidly — blows will be other the devanter may are guidly — blows will be other the devanter may are guidly — blows will be other the devanter may are big and the devanter and				
2bottom, the concentration of thigh outcontration at lifeNow, a desander ideally work the way it's shown in3be wiftom, because is stellax very showly. But sund,44low concentration on top, high concentration at the55So what you typically want to do on a run-of-river77index is yu want to draw the water from as high as9possible in the water column. If you have a big9reservoir, a deep reservoir or a storage plant, it10doesn't really matter brame br.11of downstream water quality - those will be other12plant, the sediment is going to be the primary factor13glithe ith save a column. If you have reave of it. And just its work you go around the14minimum operating level - MOL' in the diagram new; you run and work work on the side of the basin15(Silke 23) So you have two options. On the16left-hand, I have a deep intake, which is basically17reservoir. That mather, we'll we'll'18reservoir. The diagram new; you run and work we'll'19reservoir. The trash rack can be left of the basin20or with we'll was real depth,21or was water sear tanke, we're you at a basing22And on the surface intake on the right, what we're23or we'ne're was merume, but we're24askimming wall that is in from of the intake, so that25lefter locations. And you would probably have36or we're was task and pth27reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of </td <td>17.03 1</td> <td>the surface of the water, or you go down close to the</td> <td>17.07 1</td> <td>the desander or sedimentation basin</td>	17.03 1	the surface of the water, or you go down close to the	17.07 1	the desander or sedimentation basin
 be uniform, because if settles very slowly. But sund, like diagram bere: you have wetter at comes in, and the for one of the sum of river for one of the water column. If you have a big generating in the water column. If you have a big generating in the water column. If you have a big generating in the water column. If you have a big generating in the water column. If you have a big generating in the water column. If you have a big generating in the water column. If you have a big generating in the water column. If will matter because downstram water quilly - these will be other generating in the side of the primary factor file days downstram water quilly - these will be other generating in the right of the side of the primary factor file days downstram water quilly - these will be other generating in the right of the diagram - will file days downstram water device in the diagram - will generating in the right of the diagram - will generating on the inske configuration, et cetran. done: we have the same tunnel, but we've put a barrier, a kinaming wall dut is in from the linke, to the done: we have the same tunnel, but we've put a barrier, a dasander located between the simming wall and the the configuration of the reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would probably have a desander coated by a prosoil he in the generating the days and the day on would probably have a desander coated at a structure in a score of the days. And you con a site widt a couple of days. Water you a score of the days. And you con a day on the inske configurations and the days. For instance, and the is a struct in a days o				
 low concentration on top, high concentration at the bottom. So what you typically want to do on a run-of-river intake is you want to draw the water from as high as possible in the water combum. If you have a high as possible in the water combum. If you have a high as possible in the water combum. If you have the water four as high as possible in the water combum. If you have the water four as high as possible in the water combust the possible in the water and water. If you can all you kink you and to a moder of the possible in the water and water four as high as possible in the water and water water is a storage plant. It was a four the diagram – will easing which is a matrix-rook water sear (adding the water is the left side of the car. the same fulling plant, the ediment is going to be the primary factor is you're transing to the right, you gat then basin and you get this big eccitable of the havin and you get this big eccitable of the havin and you get this big eccitable of the havin and you get this big eccitable of the havin and you get this big eccitable of the havin and you get this big eccitable of the havin and you get this big eccitable of the havin and you get this big eccitable of the havin and you get this big eccitable of the havin and you get this big eccitable of the havin and you get this big eccitable of the havin and you get this big eccitable of the havin and you get this big eccitable of the havin and you get this big eccitable of the havin and you get this big eccitable. For get a good you can also have water the entries, to the the dent econter have the same turnel, but we've put a harrier, a starting what have and the theorem the definition water have and the theorem the definition water have and the theorem the definition on the theorem the definition on the have and the definition on the have and the theorem the definition on the have and the definition on the have and		-		
 bottom. bottom. So what you typically want to do on a run-of-river infake is you want to do on a run-of-river infake is you want to do on a run-of-river infake is you want to do on a run-of-river infake is you want to do on a run-of-river infake is you want to do on a run-of-river infake is you want to do on a run-of-river infake is you want to do on a run-of-river infake is you want to do on a run-of-river infake is you want to do on a run-of-river infake is you want to do on a run-of-river infake is you want to run you infake is you want to do on a run-of-river infake is you want to do on a run-of-river infake is you want to run you gate is the stability is the theorem is your are and you kind of like get information. (Silde 23) So you have two options. On the if the this is you had the configuration is the diagram - will estability, below that, an anti-vortex water sed depth. (Silde 23) So you have two options. On the if the diagram - will estability, below that, an anti-vortex water sed depth. (Silde 23) So you have two options. On the if the diagram - will estability, below that, an anti-vortex water sed depth. (Silde 23) So you have two options. On the if the diagram - will estability, below that, an anti-vortex water sed depth. (Silde 24) The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would prohabily have a a dimming wall mark is in from or the inske, so that is you that use of the marke, so that is you that user and wall go a possible in the Page 213 (Silde 24) The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would prohabily have a a set you had the intake, by our sout it is you intake is original a possible in the Page 213 (Silde 24) The trash rack can be located at a couple of the inthe you sea, the desander, and after the desander cannet the desander is not shown here, but this is you and the intake is original a possible				
6So what you typically want to due as run-of-river intake is you want to draw the water from as high as possible in the water column. If you have a big reservoir, a deep reservoir a storage plant, it doesn't really matter that much. It will matter because it multiple sites in multiple site				
7intake is you want to draw the water from as high as possible in the water command possible in the water command possible in the water command. This structure is in multiple countries, is that - and well go here to side 25. This compares the theoretical path to an observed flow path. It doesn't radiu path to an observed flow path. It doesn't radiu path to an observed flow path. It is a curve on it, And just files when you go around the is as a curve on it. And just file when you go around the to be a curve and you kind of like get thrown to the left side of the car, the same thing here the momentum curries the water to be left side of the basin and you get take which is basically extending my headnese tunnel to the reservoir. And the minimum operating like that, an anti-vortex water scal depth. typically mayle 23 merters, something like that. 22 And on the surface intake on the right, what we've doesn't real and the vortex of an a depth. typically mayle 23 merters, something like that. 24 the submit headnese tunnel.97 reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of a desender located between the skinning wall dute the torung the desander - about, say, a third of the set or for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and the desander - about, say, a third of the set or particular disc, had you go a cartain the configuration of the instake, no had the intake, so that you want to avoid eddies. If you look at frow a had the desander rane the entrane to the humel.17.08 state in the dargarm the water to pile up cating the yous as the beam hole. you can set in the you you had the intake, so that you want to avoid eddies. If you look at frowing water - and water i always in water you way any do is put it throw, that is a directly observe the different configuration. And you water the configuration of				
 8 possible in the water column. If you have a big reservoir, a deep reservoir or a storage plan, if doesn't really matter that much. It will matter because doesn't really matter that much. It will matter because distance in the storage reservoir. And got want design. 10 doesn't really matter that much. It will matter because distance in the storage reservoir. And got want design. 11 Si de 23) So you have two options. On the left-hand, I have a deep instake, which is basically a transmitting level MOL. 'in the diagram - will store the reservoir. And got want is a matter storage depth, typically maybe 2-3 metres, something like that, a mati vortex water seal depth, typically maybe 2-3 metres, something like that, and in vortex water seal depth, typically maybe 2-3 metres, something like that, and it vortex water seal depth, typically maybe 2-3 metres, something like that, and it vortex water seal depth, typically maybe 2-3 metres, something like that, and it vortex water seal depth, typically maybe 2-3 metres, something like that, and on the strice intake on the right, what we're part a barrier, a done, we have the same turneel, but we're part a barrier, a desmader located between the skinning wall and the matter to desauder cannet the matter to desauder cannet the matter to desauder cannet the endigramidon of the reservoir or mathers, but this is something is not show have the same turnee, but this is something is not show have that be adapt a set is but show have trave to base were the skinning wall and the matter to desauder cannet the sinute is on finance. Much as the something water is not show have the show it indices. Something the desauder, and there the sinutes is onterimeth water to reave the skinning wall and the reavaes were were were matter to desauder cannet the reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you conta it matke, so that is the contage is not show have the sametims have the sinutes is that water the sinutes. S				
9reservoir, a deep reservoir or a strange plant, if doew't really mater heat much. It will mater because of downstream water gality – those will be other 12 constraints – but not sediment. But at a nu-of-river plant, the sadiment is going to be the primary factor (Side 23). Soyn how two options. On the left-hand, I have a deep intake, which is basically extending my headnes tunnel to the reservoir. And the minimum operating level – "MOU." In the diagram – will establish, below that, an anti-vortex water scal depth, typically maybe 2-3 metres, something like that, a distance tunnel to the risk vortex water scal depth, typically maybe 2-3 metres, something like that, a skinning wall that is in fort of the intake, so that I can withdraw water from as high a possible in the Page 2139that - and well give to is boilt the the the strate in the diagram – will and you get the desarder – about saw, a third of the part and you get a barrier, something and the prizonal eddy from as ite visa a couple of distance to the same tunnel, but we've gut a barrier, a skinning wall that is in front of the intake, so that t rename to the tunnel.9that - and well give to solution is you pri tweeks ago in Pen, if you're intersted in seeing that. So that you do in this type of statution is you pri the configuration of the entake, on the right, wath we've didistance to the desander is not shown here, but this is submits the sediment entrainement by progred design of the intake, so furth you want to avoid eddiss. If you look at frowing water - and you avant to avoid eddis. If you look at frowing water - and well water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. If may not flow as rapidy as the rive, this frowing, and the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainement by progred design of the intake, so frage water water to ple up a little				
10desart really matter that much. It will matter because of downstream water quality — those will be other constraints - but not sediment. But at a ran-of-river plant, the sediment is going to be the primary factor that will control your design.10111111by — in this particular case, the inlet to the busin has a curve on it. And just like when you go around the corner in your car and you kind of like get thrown to if is (Silde 23) So you have two options. On the left-hand, Have a deep intake, which is basically costending my headrace tunnel to the reservoir. And the minimum operating level — "MOL" in the diagram – will establish, below that, an anti-over water seal depth, 201111This shows a recirculating eddy. the right you get thrown to the left side of the car, the same thing here; the momentum carries the water to he left side of the basin and you get this big recirculating eddy.21a distimity and has a matri-over water seal depth, or subsish, below that is in frost of the intake, of mer, it have a vertical dath to now if you noiced it, but a skinning wall has in frost of the intake, of the intake, so that a desander located between the skinning wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this a desander located between the skinning wall and the erron tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this a vanif definent locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skinning wall and the erron tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is subsically a strategy to work with the the configuration there, but its more of the instake, to make its just basically a strategy to work with the the configuration there, but its more of the instake, to also want to avoid eddies. If you look at if you also want to		· · ·		• • •
11of downstream water quality those will be other12constraints but not sediment. But at nun-of-river13plant, the sediment is going to be the primary factor14that will control your design.15(Silde 23) Soy to have two options. On the16left-hand, I have a deep intake, which is basically17establish, below that, an anti-vortex water sed depth,19establish, below that, an anti-vortex water sed depth,20depending on the intake configuration, et cetera.21depending on the starde intake on the right, what we've22And on the surface intake, on the right, what we've23door: we have the same turnel, but we've put a barrier,24a skinming wall that is in fort of the intake, so that25I can withdraw water from as high as possible in the26 $Page 213$ 17/05reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of21different locations. And you would probably have23ohrain barding and you age at low on size of the same trank, but it is is34a desander located between the skimming wall and the35what you saw at Neelum-Thelum: you had the desander, and after the desander is not shown here, but this is34out had desander, and after the desander cane the35what you saw at Neelum-Thelum: you had the desander, and after the desander cane the36out had desander, and after the desander cane the37The tarse you can get these dedies with will38So that is just basically as trategy to work wi		· · · ·	10	
12constraints - but not sediment. But at a nu-of-river inta will control your design.121212121313plant, the sediment is going to be the primary factor that will control your design.13has a curve on it. And just like when you go around the corner in your car and you kind of like get thrown to of 1- if youre turning to the right, you get thrown to the lef side of the car, the same tunnel, to the reservoir. And the minimum operating level - "MOL." in the diagram - will establish, helow that, an anti-ornex water seal depth 2013off - if youre turning to the lef side of the basin and you get this big recirculating eddy. You can also have vertical eddies. It was the same tunnel, but we ve put a barrier, a skinming wall that is in front of the intake, so that 23141424a skinming wall that is in front of the intake, so that 2425Work and the horizontal eddies occur at Neelum-Jhelum. I don't know if you noticed it, but there was a vertical eddy. And you go a certain 242517:051reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of 2distance - and the water comes up, and then you see, 112617:051reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of 2distance - and the water comes up, and then you see, 1217:051reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of 2distance - and the water comes up, and then you see, 1317:051reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of 2distance - and the water comes up, and then you see, 1417:051reservoir minimis the 3so what you as wat Neelum-Ihel	11			
13plant, the sediment is going to be the primary factor131313a a curve on it. And yis like when you go around the14that will control your design.14comer in your car and you kind of like get thrown to15(Silde 23) So you have two options. On the14comer in your car and you kind of like get thrown to16left-hand, I have a deep intake, which is basicallyoff - if you're turning to the right, you get thrown to17restending my headnece turnet to the reservoir. And the1618minimum operating level - "MOL" in the diagram - will1819establish, below that, an anti-vortex water sed deph,1920typically maybe 2.3 metres, something like that,2021depending on the intake configuration, et cetra,2123And on the surface intake on the right, what we've2424a skinning wall that is in front of the intake, so that2525I can withdraw water from as high as possible in the2526different locations. And you would probably have43a desander is not shown here, but this is53what you saw at Neelum-Helum: you had the intake,54so that is just charace you or and the social of the startegy to work with4the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the53so that sizelly a strategy to work with4the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the55so that sizelly as trategy to work with7the configuration of the r	12			
14 that will control your design. 14 corner in your car and you kind of like get thrown to 15 (Slide 23) So you have two options. On the 15 off if you're turning to the right, this to issically 18 extending my headrace tunnel to the reservoir. And the 16 ibele - will 19 establish, below that, an anti-vortex water seal depth, 17 momentum carries the water to the left side of the car, the same thing here: the 21 depending on the intake, conting rink to that sin for the intake, so the right, what we've 23 Mou can also have vertical eddis. Ive got a good 22 And on the surface intake on the right, what we've 24 as simming wall that is in front of the intake, so the intake, sond water from as high as possible in the 18 14 corner in your car and you kind of like secure at 23 I can withdraw water from as high as possible in the 12 Wou can also have vertical eddy. You ay ou you do the water you so at a work out you do you got erration 24 a desander located between the skimming wall and the 12 Wou can see ii, but if you're yus the you water wat you as and after the desander came the 15 2 fifterent locating at a couple of weeks ago in Pen., if you're intake 3 3 a desander located between the skimming wall and the	13	plant, the sediment is going to be the primary factor	13	
16 left-hand, I have a deep intake, which is basically 16 the left side of the car, the same thing here: the momentum carries the water to the left side of the basin momentum carries the water to the left side of the basin and you get this big recirculating eddy. 19 establish, below that, an anti-vortex water seal depth, typically maybe 2-3 metres, something like that, 10 20 typically maybe 2-3 metres, something like that, 20 21 depending on the same tunnel, but we've pt a barrier, a skimming wall that is in front of the intake, so that 21 23 dom: we have the same tunnel, but we've pt a barrier, a skimming wall that is in front of the intake, so that 23 24 a skimming wall that is in front of the intake, so that 24 there was a vertical eddy. And you go a certain 25 I can withdraw water from as high as possible in the 25 Bitstance – and the water comes up, and then you see, 2 three was a vertical eddy. And you go a certain 25 there was a vertical eddy. And you go a certain 2 reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of distance – and the water comes up, and then you see, 2 the trash as a vertical eddy. And you go a certain 3 you can ase i, but if youre just looking at it, you 3 you can se i, but if youre just looking at it, you may not notic	14		14	
 extending my headrace tunnel to the reservoir. And the minimum operating level = "MOL" in the diagram - will a stabilish, below that, an ant-vortex water sade depth, typically maybe 2-3 metres, something like that, and on the strake configuration, et cetera. And on the surface intake on the right, what we've done: we have the same tunnel, but we've put a barrier, a skimming wall that is in front of the intake, so that 2 may not form a sing has possible in the Page 213 17:05 1 reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, so that tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, so that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. You had was flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it is noving. And if your in their so result is oriented to reservoir. The trash rack gain and you work with the configurations. And you work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water - and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it is noving. And if your intake is oriented the desting in the set structure inself. (Silde 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is 2 place, but their operation is quite poor from the 17:08 1 reservoir the different configurations. And you can a catually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the source the different configurations. And you can a catually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydran	15	(Slide 23) So you have two options. On the	15	off if you're turning to the right, you get thrown to
18 minimum operating level - "MOL" in the diagram - will 18 and you get this big recirculating eddy. 19 establish, below that, an anti-vortex water seid depth, 19 You can also have vertical eddies. It's got a good 20 typically maybe 2-3 meres, something like that, 19 You can also have vertical eddies. It's got a good 21 depending on the intake configuration, et cetera. 20 video of a horizontal eddy, from a site vist a couple of 23 one: we have the same turnel, but we've put a barrier, a skimming wall that is in front of the intake, so that 21 24 a withdraw water from as high as possible in the Page 213 Page 215 17:05 1 reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would probably have 3 a desander located between the skimming wall and the then you see, like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, 4 turnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is so what you saw at Neelum-Thelum; you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the turnel. 8 So that is just basically a strategy to work with made put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is 10 the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the so	16	left-hand, I have a deep intake, which is basically	16	the left side of the car, the same thing here: the
 establish, below that, an anti-vortex water seal depth, typically maybe 2-3 metres, something like that, depending on the intake confliguration, et creat. And on the surface intake on the right, what we've done: we have the same tunnel, but we've put a barrier, a skimming wall that is in front of the intake, so that I can withdraw water from as high as possible in the Page 213 17:05 1 reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jheding at it, you can see it, but if your's just looking at it, you and put a series of the samel, so that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sodiment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at the vertice of the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sodiment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at the water starts to flowing water - and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the twords, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment of the bottom. This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which will instement of the bottom. This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which will instement of the bottom. This is typically analysed using, and y any you can actually modify the gometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself. (Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is 	17	extending my headrace tunnel to the reservoir. And the	17	momentum carries the water to the left side of the basin
 typically maybe 2-3 metres, something like that, depending on the intake configuration, et cetera. And on the surface intake on the right, what we've done: we have the same tunnel, but we've put a barrier, a skimming wall that is in front of the intake, so that I can withdraw water from as high as possible in the Page 213 Page 213 Page 215 17:05 1 reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the the desander - about, say, a third of the page 215 17:05 1 reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the so diment entrainment by proper design of the intake, You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water - and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the tirver, but its moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom. reservoir might be 50.40, 05 metres long, and you use the a mysical scale model, which is, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, an physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model - these physical scale model, which is, say, an physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, and pous as attally modify the gometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself. (Sitide 24) The next ste	18	minimum operating level "MOL" in the diagram will	18	and you get this big recirculating eddy.
 depending on the intake configuration, et cetera. And on the surface intake on the right, what we've done: we have the same tunnel, but we've put a barrier, a skimming wall that is in front of the intake, so that I can withdraw water from as high as possible in the Page 213 reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the you had the desander came the sediment entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entraneen to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entraneen to he tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entraneen to the tunnel. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at 11 You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at 12 flowing water - and water is always flowing in 13 a arun-of-river, plant. It may not flow as rapily as the triver, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented to drift be otom. This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the 21 these physical scale models to simulate and directly 22 observe the different configurations. And you use these physical scale models to simulate and directly 22 observe the different configurations. And you use these physical scale models to simulate and directly 23 collar (Side 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is 25 (Side 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is 25 (Side 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is 	19	establish, below that, an anti-vortex water seal depth,	19	You can also have vertical eddies. I've got a good
 And on the surface intake on the right, what we've done: we have the same tunnel, but we've put a barrier, askinning wall that is in from of the intake, so that is can withdraw water from as high as possible in the Page 213 I can withdraw water from as high as possible in the Page 213 I can withdraw outer from as high as possible in the Page 213 I reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. The desander came the terrance the tunnel. The desander came the terrance the tunnel. The desander is not poor design of the intake. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the softment entrainment by proper design of the intake. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the softment entrainment by proper design of the intake. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the softment entrainment by proper design of the intake. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the softment entrainment by proper design of the intake. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the to offiguration of the reservoir to minimise the softment industry. For instance, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. This is a trangel the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if they and the soft one moving. And the as a reservoir to minimise the soft offic the other starts to pile up, creating head loss. The water there and the coly is a the soft offic the other starts to pile up, creating head	20	typically maybe 2-3 metres, something like that,	20	video of a horizontal eddy from a site visit a couple of
 done: we have the same tunnel, but we've put a barrier, a skimming wall that is in front of the intake, so that I can withdraw water from as high as possible in the Page 213 17:05 1 reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. 8 So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. 17 This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, an oddi- the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the dam might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use these physical scale model, which it impacts the actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're very, very particular on optimising the performance of their settling basins. This is upically and see thow it impacts the plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're very, very particular on optimisin	21	depending on the intake configuration, et cetera.	21	weeks ago in Peru, if you're interested in seeing that.
24 a skimming wall that is in front of the intake, so that I can withdraw water from as high as possible in the Page 213 24 there was a vertical eddy. And you go a certain distance into the desander about, say, a third of the Page 213 17.05 1 reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. 17:08 1 distance and the water comes up, and then you see, like, water hoiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. 8 So that is just basically a strategy to work with 9 16 what the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. 10 So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made - for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe abou 10 centimetres of head loss. 11 You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at fiver, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom. 13 if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that through a perforated wall of some sort, and tha	22	And on the surface intake on the right, what we've	22	But both the vertical and the horizontal eddies occur at
25 I can withdraw water from as high as possible in the 25 distance into the desander - about, say, a third of the 17:05 1 reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of 1 distance - and the water comes up, and then you see, 1 1 reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of 1 distance - and the water comes up, and then you see, 2 different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the 3 4 tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, 5 6 you had the desander, and after the desander came the 6 what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake. 7 sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. 7 basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically 8 So that is just basically a strategy to work with 8 arun-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the 11 Tow also want to avoid eddies. If you look at 7 basin a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the 12 flowing water - and water is always flowing in 13 a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the 13 a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the	23	done: we have the same tunnel, but we've put a barrier,	23	Neelum-Jhelum. I don't know if you noticed it, but
Page 213Page 21517:051reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall ad the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you and the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel.17:081distance and the water comes up, and then you see, like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss.17This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model- the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use these physical scale models to simulate and directly observe the different configurations. And you can actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulies of the intake structure itself.17:0812(Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is2if distance and the water comes up, and the their operation is quite poor from the	24	a skimming wall that is in front of the intake, so that	24	there was a vertical eddy. And you go a certain
17:051reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you and the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel.17:081distance and the water comes up, and then you see, like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies.8So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at 10 as wart to avoid eddies. If you look at 11 flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but if smoving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom.17:081distance and the water comes up, and then you see, like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if the bottom.17This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the conserve the different configurations. And you can actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the in	25	I can withdraw water from as high as possible in the	25	distance into the desander about, say, a third of the
17:051reservoir. The trash rack can be located at a couple of different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you and the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel.17:081distance and the water comes up, and then you see, like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies.8So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at 10 as wart to avoid eddies. If you look at 11 flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but if smoving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom.17:081distance and the water comes up, and then you see, like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if the bottom.17This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the conserve the different configurations. And you can actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the in		Page 213		Page 215
2different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander came the entrance to the tunnel.2like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a 'tranquilliser' at the entrance to the two dain this type of situation is you put what they call a 'tranquilliser' at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. I10sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. IY ou also want to avoid eddies. If you look at river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom.1112flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment to fif the bottom.1213model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the coservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use the se physical scale models to simulate and directly observe the different configurations. And you can a actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself.2like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, wou do in the hydro		1 age 215		1 age 215
2different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander came the entrance to the tunnel.2like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a 'tranquilliser' at the entrance to the 				
 a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom. This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model- the eam might be this tall (indicating), and the these physical scale models to simulate and directly observe the different configurations. And you can actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself. (Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is 				
4tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is4may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies.5what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel.may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies.6you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel.5So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically and put a series of these angle iron, and put a series of these angle iron, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss.11You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water - and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the triver, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment for the bottom.1213ar un-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the triver, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment for the bottom.1314river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the 201620reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use these physical scale models to simulate and directly observe the different configurations. And you can actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulies of the intake structure itself.2323actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulies of the intake st	17:05 1	*	17:08 1	· ·
5what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel.5So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically and put a series of these angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake.5So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss.10You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at 1210basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss.11You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at 1311Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that through a perforated wall of some sort, and that through a perforated wall of some sort, and that through a perforated wall of some sort, and thet the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more evenly.16off the bottom.11This is typically analysed using, say, a physical the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the to physical scale models to simulate and directly observe the different configurations. And you can a actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the	2	different locations. And you would probably have	2	like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for,
6you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel.6what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss.10So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake.9and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss.11You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at 1210the water starts to13a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the off the bottom.13if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that through a perforated wall of some sort, and that through a perforated wall of some sort, and that15wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom.16the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more evenly.18model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be 400, 50 metres long, and you use 2118This is a strategy that's used throughout the water treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're very, very particular on optimising the performance of 2223actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself.23typically not done in the hydropower industry. So frequently we see that the desanders have been put in place, b	2 3	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the	2 3	like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you
7entrance to the tunnel.7basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically8So that is just basically a strategy to work with9the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the9and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is10sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake.9and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is11You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at10the water starts to12flowing water and water is always flowing in12pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So13a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the13if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it14river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented14through a perforated wall of some sort, and that15wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment15friction or that head loss created by the wall causes16the bottom.16the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more17This is typically analysed using, say, a physical17evenly.18model, a physical scale models to simulate and directly20plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're20observe the different configurations. And you can23actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the23hydraulics of the intake structure itself.24frequently we see that the desanders have been put in25(Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is25place, but their operation is quite poor from the <td>2 3 4</td> <td>different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is</td> <td>2 3 4</td> <td>like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies.</td>	2 3 4	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is	2 3 4	like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies.
8So that is just basically a strategy to work with8made for instance, you can use like an angle iron,9the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the9and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is10sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake.9and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is11You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at10centimetres of head loss.12flowing water and water is always flowing in12pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So13a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the13if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it14river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented14through a perforated wall of some sort, and that15wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment16the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more17This is typically analysed using, say, a physical16the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more18model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model18This is a strategy that's used throughout the water19the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the20plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're21very, very particular on optimising the performance of21very, very particular on optimising the performance of22observe the different configurations. And you can23typically not done in the hydropower industry. So23(Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is24f	2 3 4 5	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake,	2 3 4 5	like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put
9the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake.9and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss.11You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at 1210to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss.12flowing water and water is always flowing in 13a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented off the bottom.11Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So13a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented off the bottom.13if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that friction or that head loss created by the wall causes the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more evenly.17This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the co reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use 21 these physical scale models to simulate and directly cobserve the different configurations. And you can 2318This is a strategy that's used throughout the water treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're very, very particular on optimising the performance of their settling basins. This is something which is 2323actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself. 2425jplace, but th	2 3 4 5 6	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the	2 3 4 5 6	like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the
10sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake.11You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at12flowing water and water is always flowing in13a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the14river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented15wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment16off the bottom.17This is typically analysed using, say, a physical18model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model19the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the20reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use21these physical scale models to simulate and directly22observe the different configurations. And you can23actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the24hydraulics of the intake structure itself.25(Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is	2 3 4 5 6 7	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel.	2 3 4 5 6 7	like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies.So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically
11You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at11Because what happens is that if the water starts to12flowing water and water is always flowing in11Because what happens is that if the water starts to13a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the12pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So14river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented13if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it15wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment15friction or that head loss created by the wall causes16off the bottom.16the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more17This is typically analysed using, say, a physical17evenly.18model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model18This is a strategy that's used throughout the water19the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the20plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're20observe the different configurations. And you can21very, very particular on optimising the performance of23actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the23typically not done in the hydropower industry. So24hydraulics of the intake structure itself.25(Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is25(Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is25place, but their operation is quite poor from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron,
12flowing water and water is always flowing in12pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So13a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the13if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it14river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented14through a perforated wall of some sort, and that15wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment15friction or that head loss created by the wall causes16off the bottom.16the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more17This is typically analysed using, say, a physical17evenly.18model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model18This is a strategy that's used throughout the water19the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the19treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration20reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use20plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're21these physical scale models to simulate and directly21very, very particular on optimising the performance of23actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the23typically not done in the hydropower industry. So24hydraulics of the intake structure itself.24frequently we see that the desanders have been put in25(Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is25place, but their operation is quite poor from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is
13a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented 1513if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that through a perforated wall of some sort, and that friction or that head loss created by the wall causes 1616off the bottom.16the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more17This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model 1918This is a strategy that's used throughout the water treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration 2020reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use 2120plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're 2122observe the different configurations. And you can 23actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself.23typically not done in the hydropower industry. So 2425(Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is25place, but their operation is quite poor from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss.
14river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented14through a perforated wall of some sort, and that15wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment14through a perforated wall of some sort, and that16off the bottom.15friction or that head loss created by the wall causes17This is typically analysed using, say, a physical16the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more18model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model18This is a strategy that's used throughout the water19the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the19treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration20reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use20plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're21these physical scale models to simulate and directly21very, very particular on optimising the performance of23actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the23typically not done in the hydropower industry. So24hydraulics of the intake structure itself.24frequently we see that the desanders have been put in25(Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is25place, but their operation is quite poor from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to
 15 wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment 16 off the bottom. 17 This is typically analysed using, say, a physical 18 model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model 19 the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the 19 reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use 20 reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use 21 these physical scale models to simulate and directly 22 observe the different configurations. And you can 23 actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the 24 hydraulics of the intake structure itself. 25 (Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is 26 the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more 16 the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more 17 evenly. 18 This is a strategy that's used throughout the water 19 treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration 20 plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're 21 very, very particular on optimising the performance of 22 their settling basins. This is something which is 23 typically not done in the hydropower industry. So 24 frequently we see that the desanders have been put in 25 place, but their operation is quite poor from the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So
16off the bottom.16the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more17This is typically analysed using, say, a physical16the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more18model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model18This is a strategy that's used throughout the water19the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the19treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration20reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use20plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're21these physical scale models to simulate and directly21very, very particular on optimising the performance of22observe the different configurations. And you can22their settling basins. This is something which is23actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the23typically not done in the hydropower industry. So24hydraulics of the intake structure itself.24frequently we see that the desanders have been put in25(Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is25place, but their operation is quite poor from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it
17This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the 2017evenly.18model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use these physical scale models to simulate and directly observe the different configurations. And you can actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself.17evenly.23actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself.17evenly.24Side 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is25place, but their operation is quite poor from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that
18model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model18This is a strategy that's used throughout the water19the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the19treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration20reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use20plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're21these physical scale models to simulate and directly21very, very particular on optimising the performance of22observe the different configurations. And you can22their settling basins. This is something which is23actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the23typically not done in the hydropower industry. So24hydraulics of the intake structure itself.24frequently we see that the desanders have been put in25(Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is25place, but their operation is quite poor from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that friction or that head loss created by the wall causes
19the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the19treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration20reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use20plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're21these physical scale models to simulate and directly20plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're22observe the different configurations. And you can22their settling basins. This is something which is23actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the23typically not done in the hydropower industry. So24hydraulics of the intake structure itself.24frequently we see that the desanders have been put in25(Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is25place, but their operation is quite poor from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that friction or that head loss created by the wall causes the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more
 reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use these physical scale models to simulate and directly observe the different configurations. And you can actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself. (Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom. This is typically analysed using, say, a physical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that friction or that head loss created by the wall causes the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more evenly.
21these physical scale models to simulate and directly observe the different configurations. And you can actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself.21very, very particular on optimising the performance of their settling basins. This is something which is typically not done in the hydropower industry. So frequently we see that the desanders have been put in place, but their operation is quite poor from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom. This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that friction or that head loss created by the wall causes the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more evenly. This is a strategy that's used throughout the water
 observe the different configurations. And you can actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself. (Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is 25 (Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is 22 their settling basins. This is something which is typically not done in the hydropower industry. So frequently we see that the desanders have been put in place, but their operation is quite poor from the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom. This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that friction or that head loss created by the wall causes the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more evenly. This is a strategy that's used throughout the water treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration
23actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself.23typically not done in the hydropower industry. So24hydraulics of the intake structure itself.24frequently we see that the desanders have been put in25(Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is25place, but their operation is quite poor from the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom. This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that friction or that head loss created by the wall causes the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more evenly. This is a strategy that's used throughout the water treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're
24hydraulics of the intake structure itself.24frequently we see that the desanders have been put in25(Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is24frequently we see that the desanders have been put in25place, but their operation is quite poor from the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom. This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use these physical scale models to simulate and directly	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that friction or that head loss created by the wall causes the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more evenly. This is a strategy that's used throughout the water treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're very, very particular on optimising the performance of
25 (Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is 25 place, but their operation is quite poor from the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom. This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use these physical scale models to simulate and directly observe the different configurations. And you can	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that friction or that head loss created by the wall causes the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more evenly. This is a strategy that's used throughout the water treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're very, very particular on optimising the performance of their settling basins. This is something which is
	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom. This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use these physical scale models to simulate and directly observe the different configurations. And you can actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that friction or that head loss created by the wall causes the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more evenly. This is a strategy that's used throughout the water treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're very, very particular on optimising the performance of their settling basins. This is something which is typically not done in the hydropower industry. So
Page 214 Page 216	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom. This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use these physical scale models to simulate and directly observe the different configurations. And you can actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that friction or that head loss created by the wall causes the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more evenly. This is a strategy that's used throughout the water treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're very, very particular on optimising the performance of their settling basins. This is something which is typically not done in the hydropower industry. So frequently we see that the desanders have been put in
	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	different locations. And you would probably have a desander located between the skimming wall and the tunnel. The desander is not shown here, but this is what you saw at Neelum-Jhelum: you had the intake, you had the desander, and after the desander came the entrance to the tunnel. So that is just basically a strategy to work with the configuration of the reservoir to minimise the sediment entrainment by proper design of the intake. You also want to avoid eddies. If you look at flowing water and water is always flowing in a run-of-river plant. It may not flow as rapidly as the river, but it's moving. And if your intake is oriented wrong, you can get these eddies which will lift sediment off the bottom. This is typically analysed using, say, a physical model, a physical scale model, which is, say, a model the dam might be this tall (indicating), and the reservoir might be 30, 40, 50 metres long, and you use these physical scale models to simulate and directly observe the different configurations. And you can actually modify the geometry and see how it impacts the hydraulics of the intake structure itself. (Slide 24) The next step in eliminating sediment is	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	like, water boiling up. Once you know what to look for, you can see it, but if you're just looking at it, you may not notice it. But you see these types of eddies. So what you do in this type of situation is you put what they call a "tranquilliser" at the entrance to the basin, which is basically a barrier. They are typically made for instance, you can use like an angle iron, and put a series of these angle irons, and the idea is to produce maybe about 10 centimetres of head loss. Because what happens is that if the water starts to pile up, creating head loss, it tends to even out. So if you have a jet of water, what you do is put it through a perforated wall of some sort, and that friction or that head loss created by the wall causes the water to pile up a little bit and spread out more evenly. This is a strategy that's used throughout the water treatment industry. For instance, a water filtration plant, the floc is very difficult to settle, so they're very, very particular on optimising the performance of their settling basins. This is something which is typically not done in the hydropower industry. So frequently we see that the desanders have been put in place, but their operation is quite poor from the

17:10 1	hydraulic standpoint.	17:14 1	a new design which allowed greater space and allowed the
2	Another thing that you do is at the outlet you want	2	robot to go in and then apply coatings, and that was
3	to make sure that your overflow isn't too strong, you	3	very effective.
4	don't have too much overflow per linear metre of weir	4	The duration that a coating will last, it depends,
5	length. And you can use finger weirs. There's a couple	5	but typically we can think it will last several years.
6	of different strategies you can use, again, to optimise	6	So a plant that would have a let's call it
7	a basin. (Pause)	7	an unacceptable amount of abrasion in one year can run
8	(Slide 26) At the powerhouse, there are several	8	for several years.
9	things that you can do.	9	The shaft seals are another place where you get
10	You can, as I had mentioned, configure the draft	10	abrasion. You can provide pressurised clean water to
10	tube for the rapid removal or to facilitate the removal	10	prevent the sediment from getting into those.
11	of the runner. This is a cut-away from the	11	You would want to, typically, reduce the submergence
12	Neelum-Jhelum plant which you've seen previously, and	12	of your turbine to reduce cavitation potential.
13	the arrow points to the segment of the draft tube that	13	Cavitation occurs when you have a, let's say
14	can be opened up to allow the runner to drop down and	14	for instance, let's use the example of a propeller on
15	then be taken out horizontally.	15	a submarine. The propeller goes through the water, and
10	You can select a low-velocity turbine of more robust	10	when you look at a propeller behind a speedboat, you
18	construction. If you have a very rapid turbine, high	18	have these little bubbles that come out from the
10	velocity, the sediment impinging at the high velocity	10	propeller. And those bubbles will then collapse, and
20	will generate more abrasion than the same particle	20	that's cavitation.
20	impinging at a lower velocity.	20	So what happens is when they collapse, it's like
21	Also if you have turbines which are a little bit	21	a small explosion, and that damages the steel. If you
22	more robust, in terms of being thicker on the	22	have sediment plus cavitation, they both act
23 24	construction, the sediment erosion will take more time	23	synergistically to damage the steel. So you really want
25	to do a significant amount of damage that requires	25	to be careful about doing what you can in your design to
-0			
	Page 217		Page 219
17.12 1	rankacement. The more robust turbines can be a little	17.15 1	minimise the potential for cavitation
17:12 1	replacement. The more robust turbines can be a little	17:15 1	minimise the potential for cavitation.
2	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but	2	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate
2 3	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus	2 3	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load
2 3 4	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost.	2 3 4	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion.
2 3 4 5	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my	2 3	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already
2 3 4 5 6	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to	2 3 4 5 6	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned.
2 3 4 5 6 7	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the	2 3 4 5 6 7	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine blades.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the coatings can be quite effective.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine blades. If you're going to apply the protective coating,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the coatings can be quite effective. (Slide 28) Sediment-guided operation. Now, what you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine blades. If you're going to apply the protective coating, that coating can be applied by hand or it can be applied	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the coatings can be quite effective. (Slide 28) Sediment-guided operation. Now, what you do with sediment-guided operation is you turn your plant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine blades. If you're going to apply the protective coating, that coating can be applied by hand or it can be applied by robot. This is a high-temperature, oxygen-fed nozzle	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the coatings can be quite effective. (Slide 28) Sediment-guided operation. Now, what you do with sediment-guided operation is you turn your plant on, off, or you reduce your power, depending on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine blades. If you're going to apply the protective coating, that coating can be applied by hand or it can be applied by robot. This is a high-temperature, oxygen-fed nozzle that sprays this material on to the steel. And if you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the coatings can be quite effective. (Slide 28) Sediment-guided operation. Now, what you do with sediment-guided operation is you turn your plant on, off, or you reduce your power, depending on the sediment concentration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine blades. If you're going to apply the protective coating, that coating can be applied by hand or it can be applied by robot. This is a high-temperature, oxygen-fed nozzle that sprays this material on to the steel. And if you do it by robot, it's going to be good, and if you do it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the coatings can be quite effective. (Slide 28) Sediment-guided operation. Now, what you do with sediment-guided operation is you turn your plant on, off, or you reduce your power, depending on the sediment concentration. For instance, you look at the sediment concentration
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine blades. If you're going to apply the protective coating, that coating can be applied by hand or it can be applied by robot. This is a high-temperature, oxygen-fed nozzle that sprays this material on to the steel. And if you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the coatings can be quite effective. (Slide 28) Sediment-guided operation. Now, what you do with sediment-guided operation is you turn your plant on, off, or you reduce your power, depending on the sediment concentration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine blades. If you're going to apply the protective coating, that coating can be applied by hand or it can be applied by robot. This is a high-temperature, oxygen-fed nozzle that sprays this material on to the steel. And if you do it by robot, it's going to be good, and if you do it by hand, it's much more tricky. So the preferred method	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the coatings can be quite effective. (Slide 28) Sediment-guided operation. Now, what you do with sediment-guided operation is you turn your plant on, off, or you reduce your power, depending on the sediment concentration. For instance, you look at the sediment concentration data from a number of rivers and you see that there are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine blades. If you're going to apply the protective coating, that coating can be applied by hand or it can be applied by robot. This is a high-temperature, oxygen-fed nozzle that sprays this material on to the steel. And if you do it by robot, it's going to be good, and if you do it by hand, it's much more tricky. So the preferred method is to apply by robot, but the robot needs a certain	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the coatings can be quite effective. (Slide 28) Sediment-guided operation. Now, what you do with sediment-guided operation is you turn your plant on, off, or you reduce your power, depending on the sediment concentration. For instance, you look at the sediment concentration data from a number of rivers and you see that there are certain days of the year that had a very high
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine blades. If you're going to apply the protective coating, that coating can be applied by hand or it can be applied by robot. This is a high-temperature, oxygen-fed nozzle that sprays this material on to the steel. And if you do it by robot, it's going to be good, and if you do it by hand, it's much more tricky. So the preferred method is to apply by robot, but the robot needs a certain space between the blades to actually get in and coat the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the coatings can be quite effective. (Slide 28) Sediment-guided operation. Now, what you do with sediment-guided operation is you turn your plant on, off, or you reduce your power, depending on the sediment concentration. For instance, you look at the sediment concentration data from a number of rivers and you see that there are certain days of the year that had a very high concentration, and those high concentration days
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine blades. If you're going to apply the protective coating, that coating can be applied by hand or it can be applied by robot. This is a high-temperature, oxygen-fed nozzle that sprays this material on to the steel. And if you do it by robot, it's going to be good, and if you do it by hand, it's much more tricky. So the preferred method is to apply by robot, but the robot needs a certain space between the blades to actually get in and coat the entire blade.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the coatings can be quite effective. (Slide 28) Sediment-guided operation. Now, what you do with sediment-guided operation. Now, what you do with sediment-guided operation is you turn your plant on, off, or you reduce your power, depending on the sediment concentration. For instance, you look at the sediment concentration data from a number of rivers and you see that there are certain days of the year that had a very high concentration, and those high concentration days contribute to a disproportionate part of the load of
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine blades. If you're going to apply the protective coating, that coating can be applied by hand or it can be applied by robot. This is a high-temperature, oxygen-fed nozzle that sprays this material on to the steel. And if you do it by robot, it's going to be good, and if you do it by hand, it's much more tricky. So the preferred method is to apply by robot, but the robot needs a certain space between the blades to actually get in and coat the entire blade. So you need to select your runner based on the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the coatings can be quite effective. (Slide 28) Sediment-guided operation. Now, what you do with sediment-guided operation is you turn your plant on, off, or you reduce your power, depending on the sediment concentration. For instance, you look at the sediment concentration data from a number of rivers and you see that there are certain days of the year that had a very high concentration, and those high concentration days contribute to a disproportionate part of the load of sediment on the turbines, and thus the abrasion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine blades. If you're going to apply the protective coating, that coating can be applied by hand or it can be applied by robot. This is a high-temperature, oxygen-fed nozzle that sprays this material on to the steel. And if you do it by robot, it's going to be good, and if you do it by hand, it's much more tricky. So the preferred method is to apply by robot, but the robot needs a certain space between the blades to actually get in and coat the entire blade. So you need to select your runner based on the maintenance that you expect that you're going to do it.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the coatings can be quite effective. (Slide 28) Sediment-guided operation. Now, what you do with sediment-guided operation is you turn your plant on, off, or you reduce your power, depending on the sediment concentration. For instance, you look at the sediment concentration data from a number of rivers and you see that there are certain days of the year that had a very high concentration, and those high concentration days contribute to a disproportionate part of the load of sediment on the turbines, and thus the abrasion. For instance, we've seen this in Pakistan: we've
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	bit bigger, they're going to cost a little bit more, but it's a case of taking a cost of initial cost versus maintenance/repair cost. There is, I believe, a tendency at least from my experience that I've seen that the designer wants to have a low-cost project, initial construction, and the long-term operational cost is maybe a little bit more secondary, because it's the initial project cost that you have to overcome to get it built. You need to put wider spacing between the turbine blades. If you're going to apply the protective coating, that coating can be applied by hand or it can be applied by robot. This is a high-temperature, oxygen-fed nozzle that sprays this material on to the steel. And if you do it by robot, it's going to be good, and if you do it by hand, it's much more tricky. So the preferred method is to apply by robot, but the robot needs a certain space between the blades to actually get in and coat the entire blade. So you need to select your runner based on the maintenance that you expect that you're going to do it. Some of the plants that had severe abrasion to the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	You want to avoid low-load operation: you operate your turbines at or near full power, because low-load operation tends to increase your abrasion. Closed-circuit cooling for generators we've already mentioned. So there's a variety of things that you can do in the power plant. (Slide 27) This is the runner at Neelum-Jhelum I'm showing, after about five years, the difference between coated and uncoated. So you see that the coatings can be quite effective. (Slide 28) Sediment-guided operation. Now, what you do with sediment-guided operation is you turn your plant on, off, or you reduce your power, depending on the sediment concentration. For instance, you look at the sediment concentration data from a number of rivers and you see that there are certain days of the year that had a very high concentration, and those high concentration days contribute to a disproportionate part of the load of sediment on the turbines, and thus the abrasion. For instance, we've seen this in Pakistan: we've looked at it both at Warsak and Neelum-Jhelum. At

17:17 1	one third of the load of sediment on turbines. So if	17:20 1	job back.
2	you were to take out 1.5 times 365, it's like 5 days	2	So there are all these little things that come into
3	a year. If you turn them off for 5 days a year, you've	3	play. You have to have good operator training; you have
4	just eliminated a third of your abrasion problem. And	4	to take data, you have to look at the data, you have to
5	those days account for 3% of your total energy. So	5	analyse the data. And all these come in to being part
6	you're going to pay a little bit of energy, but you're	6	of how you operate a plant under challenging conditions.
0 7	going to have a much, much reduced abrasion problem.	7	It's like if you're driving on a Sunday morning,
8	Now, you don't necessarily have to turn the turbine	8	there's no one on the highway, and it's a clear sky, you
9	off either, because if you have a desander, desanders	9	can just breeze down the highway, no problem. But if
10	work based on hydraulic load. So you have the flow	10	it's Friday night, and it's raining and thunder and
10	coming into the desander, and you have a certain	10	lightning and it's windy, you're going to be more alert
11	residence time that the water takes to go from the	11	because the conditions are different. And it's exactly
12	beginning to the end of the desander. So if you drop	12	the same with a hydro plant: if you have challenging
13	the hydraulic load on that desander by 50%, the water is	13	conditions, you have to be alert, you have to be on to
		14	
15	going to take twice as long and you're going to get more	15	what's going on.
16 17	sediment that's going to settle out.		And the final point and I think we'll finish with
17	So you can have high-sediment days where you'll say that: well, today, because we have a very high sediment	17	this slide (29), to make it a good transition for
18		18	tomorrow morning is the concept that runners are
19	load, we had a flood in the watershed, it's coming down	19	actually expendable.
20	really bad, we are going to operate at half-power. So	20	If you've been operating plants that have very
21	there are ways that you can operate your plant to,	21	little sediment problems for decades, you have the
22	again, minimise the sediment management.	22	expectation your runner is going to last forever. But
23	Now, another problem that I've seen is that people	23	runners are expendable. And there are plants that take
24	at power plants take data. I saw this at one of the	24	out their runners and replace them, refurbish them, on
25	plants in Nepal. They take a lot of data. They have	25	an annual basis, and can refurbish them multiple times.
	Page 221		Page 223
17:19 1	a sediment laboratory on site. They write all the	17:22 1	You take the welding rods and you place more steel on to
2	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they	2	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the
2 3	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at	2 3	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before
2 3 4	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it.	2 3 4	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the
2 3	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said,	2 3	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one.
2 3 4	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in	2 3 4	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On
2 3 4 5	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment	2 3 4 5	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one.But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure	2 3 4 5 6	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one.But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something
2 3 4 5 6 7	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will	2 3 4 5 6 7	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one.But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one.But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy a new set of tyres, it's going to cost like \$800. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the desander is what's going to hit your turbine. So you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy a new set of tyres, it's going to cost like \$800. It works out about 2%, more or less.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the desander is what's going to hit your turbine. So you can pick it up at the turbine, you can pick it up at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy a new set of tyres, it's going to cost like \$800. It works out about 2%, more or less. The wearing components, the runner and the valve,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the desander is what's going to hit your turbine. So you can pick it up at the turbine, you can pick it up at the exit from the desander.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy a new set of tyres, it's going to cost like \$800. It works out about 2%, more or less. The wearing components, the runner and the valve, the blades and the wicket on a hydro plant is not 2%:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the desander is what's going to hit your turbine. So you can pick it up at the turbine, you can pick it up at the exit from the desander. But in this case, they were picking it up at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy a new set of tyres, it's going to cost like \$800. It works out about 2%, more or less. The wearing components, the runner and the valve, the blades and the wicket on a hydro plant is not 2%: it's more like a half of 1%. So the concept that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the desander is what's going to hit your turbine. So you can pick it up at the turbine, you can pick it up at the exit from the desander. But in this case, they were picking it up at the turbine from the draft tube, and you saw that all of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy a new set of tyres, it's going to cost like \$800. It works out about 2%, more or less. The wearing components, the runner and the valve, the blades and the wicket on a hydro plant is not 2%: it's more like a half of 1%. So the concept that we must, must, must protect our runners at all cost is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the desander is what's going to hit your turbine. So you can pick it up at the turbine, you can pick it up at the exit from the desander. But in this case, they were picking it up at the turbine from the draft tube, and you saw that all of a sudden there was a lot more sediment getting into the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy a new set of tyres, it's going to cost like \$800. It works out about 2%, more or less. The wearing components, the runner and the valve, the blades and the wicket on a hydro plant is not 2%: it's more like a half of 1%. So the concept that we must, must, must protect our runners at all cost is something of a misnomer.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the desander is what's going to hit your turbine. So you can pick it up at the turbine, you can pick it up at the exit from the desander. But in this case, they were picking it up at the turbine from the draft tube, and you saw that all of a sudden there was a lot more sediment getting into the turbine. And I worked with this plant over a period of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy a new set of tyres, it's going to cost like \$800. It works out about 2%, more or less. The wearing components, the runner and the valve, the blades and the wicket on a hydro plant is not 2%: it's more like a half of 1%. So the concept that we must, must, must protect our runners at all cost is something of a misnomer. Now, engineers I have dealt with who are from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the desander is what's going to hit your turbine. So you can pick it up at the turbine, you can pick it up at the exit from the desander. But in this case, they were picking it up at the turbine from the draft tube, and you saw that all of a sudden there was a lot more sediment getting into the turbine. And I worked with this plant over a period of several years, back and forth, different trips, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy a new set of tyres, it's going to cost like \$800. It works out about 2%, more or less. The wearing components, the runner and the valve, the blades and the wicket on a hydro plant is not 2%: it's more like a half of 1%. So the concept that we must, must, must protect our runners at all cost is something of a misnomer. Now, engineers I have dealt with who are from the mechanical side, they work with the equipment, they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the desander is what's going to hit your turbine. So you can pick it up at the turbine, you can pick it up at the exit from the desander. But in this case, they were picking it up at the turbine from the draft tube, and you saw that all of a sudden there was a lot more sediment getting into the turbine. And I worked with this plant over a period of several years, back and forth, different trips, and I got to know both the operators: the old operator, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy a new set of tyres, it's going to cost like \$800. It works out about 2%, more or less. The wearing components, the runner and the valve, the blades and the wicket on a hydro plant is not 2%: it's more like a half of 1%. So the concept that we must, must, must protect our runners at all cost is something of a misnomer. Now, engineers I have dealt with who are from the mechanical side, they work with the equipment, they don't want to see any damage to their runners. But in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the desander is what's going to hit your turbine. So you can pick it up at the turbine, you can pick it up at the exit from the desander. But in this case, they were picking it up at the turbine from the draft tube, and you saw that all of a sudden there was a lot more sediment getting into the turbine. And I worked with this plant over a period of several years, back and forth, different trips, and I got to know both the operators: the old operator, the new operator. And it's a funny story because it	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy a new set of tyres, it's going to cost like \$800. It works out about 2%, more or less. The wearing components, the runner and the valve, the blades and the wicket on a hydro plant is not 2%: it's more like a half of 1%. So the concept that we must, must, must protect our runners at all cost is something of a misnomer. Now, engineers I have dealt with who are from the mechanical side, they work with the equipment, they don't want to see any damage to their runners. But in truth, the runner is a component which, if you're in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the desander is what's going to hit your turbine. So you can pick it up at the turbine, you can pick it up at the exit from the desander. But in this case, they were picking it up at the turbine from the draft tube, and you saw that all of a sudden there was a lot more sediment getting into the turbine. And I worked with this plant over a period of several years, back and forth, different trips, and I got to know both the operators: the old operator, the new operator. And it's a funny story because it wasn't very funny really. But the old operator didn't	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy a new set of tyres, it's going to cost like \$800. It works out about 2%, more or less. The wearing components, the runner and the valve, the blades and the wicket on a hydro plant is not 2%: it's more like a half of 1%. So the concept that we must, must, must protect our runners at all cost is something of a misnomer. Now, engineers I have dealt with who are from the mechanical side, they work with the equipment, they don't want to see any damage to their runners. But in truth, the runner is a component which, if you're in a challenging environment, it will experience wear. You
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the desander is what's going to hit your turbine. So you can pick it up at the turbine, you can pick it up at the exit from the desander. But in this case, they were picking it up at the turbine from the draft tube, and you saw that all of a sudden there was a lot more sediment getting into the turbine. And I worked with this plant over a period of several years, back and forth, different trips, and I got to know both the operators: the old operator, the new operator. And it's a funny story because it wasn't very funny really. But the old operator didn't like getting moved to Kathmandu, so he didn't train the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy a new set of tyres, it's going to cost like \$800. It works out about 2%, more or less. The wearing components, the runner and the valve, the blades and the wicket on a hydro plant is not 2%: it's more like a half of 1%. So the concept that we must, must, must protect our runners at all cost is something of a misnomer. Now, engineers I have dealt with who are from the mechanical side, they work with the equipment, they don't want to see any damage to their runners. But in truth, the runner is a component which, if you're in a challenging environment, it will experience wear. You have to minimise that wear, but don't expect that it's
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	numbers down, they put them in spreadsheets and they send it off. Never gets graphed. No one ever looks at it. So I took the data and I looked at it, and I said, "Wow! All of a sudden, in this particular point in time, the units are starting to have a lot more sediment at the turbines". Because you will typically measure the concentration sediment in the river, you will typically measure it after it comes out of the desander or at the turbine, because what comes out of the desander is what's going to hit your turbine. So you can pick it up at the turbine, you can pick it up at the exit from the desander. But in this case, they were picking it up at the turbine from the draft tube, and you saw that all of a sudden there was a lot more sediment getting into the turbine. And I worked with this plant over a period of several years, back and forth, different trips, and I got to know both the operators: the old operator, the new operator. And it's a funny story because it wasn't very funny really. But the old operator didn't like getting moved to Kathmandu, so he didn't train the new operator. And he told me, "The new operator doesn't	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	the runners, you reshape it, you put it back in the plant. And you can do that half a dozen times before you actually get rid of the runner and replace it with a new one. But let's compare to an automobile. On an automobile, the tyres are expendable: they wear out. And the tyres on a new automobile represent something like 2% of the cost. So you go buy a new car, you're going to pay, what, \$35,000; and you're going to buy a new set of tyres, it's going to cost like \$800. It works out about 2%, more or less. The wearing components, the runner and the valve, the blades and the wicket on a hydro plant is not 2%: it's more like a half of 1%. So the concept that we must, must, must protect our runners at all cost is something of a misnomer. Now, engineers I have dealt with who are from the mechanical side, they work with the equipment, they don't want to see any damage to their runners. But in truth, the runner is a component which, if you're in a challenging environment, it will experience wear. You have to minimise that wear, but don't expect that it's going to last forever.

17:23 1	becomes reduced due to abrasion and deformation	17:27 1	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr Morris. Before we conclude
2	runners are designed for perfect hydraulic conditions.	2	though, I'm just going to check to see if there are some
3	So when a runner begins to erode, you lose that shape	3	questions that anyone on the Court has.
4	and you start to lose efficiency. A brand new	4	Professor Buytaert?
5	well-designed Francis runner, design capacity will run	5	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you very much, Dr Morris, for
6	about 94% efficiency. This is from water to mechanical	6	a very clear presentation.
7	energy. So that 94% efficiency is going to drop and	7	At the very start, you mentioned density current
8	drop and drop and drop. But if you're in a monsoon	8	flushing, and that requires quite specific hydraulic
9	climate and you have a lot of water available, you just	9	conditions to be able to do that. From your experience,
10	put more water through it.	10	how commonly are those conditions met at a certain site?
11	This is what we saw at the Warsak plant. Their	11	DR MORRIS: They are not a site will typically have the
12	runners are very substantially abraded, they're eroded.	12	conditions or not have the conditions. Let me give you
13	They run for five and a half years before replacement.	13	a couple of examples from Colombia, because I've done
14	They have six machines: one runner gets replaced every	14	work on a couple of plants there that were very
15	year. Take it out, refurbish it, weld on new steel, and	15	interesting.
16	they take it out and put a replacement in. These	16	One of the plants has density currents: we observed
17	six-year repair cycles, because they have six units, so	17	them, they enter the reservoir. Nothing reaches the
18	they repair the runner and the generator at the same	18	dam, and it's only 3 kilometres away. Nothing. It's
19	time: it's a major overhaul. So on the six-year repair	19	heavy material, it's a lot of sand; it drops right to
20	cycle.	20	the bottom, deposits on the delta. Another plant,
21	But when I got the data on the power produced by	21	Guavio, which was a large plant, 1,000 MW, and it has
22	each of the units, it's the same: the runner that has	22	density currents that have a very substantial
23	been in operation for five years is producing the same	23	accumulation in front of the dam.
24	amount of energy as a brand new runner. How does that	24	So it depends on the project site. It's rather
25	happen? It happens because they just put more water	25	difficult to predict what they're going to be like.
	Page 225		Page 227
	1 460 225		1 460 227
17:25 1	through it. They've got the water available. Lower	17:28 1	Because, for instance, most of the data that's available
17:25 1 2	through it. They've got the water available. Lower efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same	17:28 1 2	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines,
2	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon	2	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage?
2 3	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't	2 3	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If
2 3 4	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water.	2 3 4	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical
2 3 4 5	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive	2 3 4 5 6 7	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to
2 3 4 5 6	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not
2 3 4 5 6 7	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So	2 3 4 5 6 7	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run through some of the options, some of the many options	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute. So even here, if we had the tools, we don't have the data.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run through some of the options, some of the many options that are available that would be applied, and totally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute. So even here, if we had the tools, we don't have the data. We've got a project I'm designing right now and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run through some of the options, some of the many options that are available that would be applied, and totally applied as a group of integrated procedures. You would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute. So even here, if we had the tools, we don't have the data. We've got a project I'm designing right now and I've just put in a density current release mechanism.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run through some of the options, some of the many options that are available that would be applied, and totally applied as a group of integrated procedures. You would apply all of these together to help manage your sediment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute. So even here, if we had the tools, we don't have the data. We've got a project I'm designing right now and I've just put in a density current release mechanism. It's a storage project. And we're anticipating it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run through some of the options, some of the many options that are available that would be applied, and totally applied as a group of integrated procedures. You would apply all of these together to help manage your sediment at a run-of-river plant.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute. So even here, if we had the tools, we don't have the data. We've got a project I'm designing right now and I've just put in a density current release mechanism. It's a storage project. And we're anticipating it's going to release maybe 15% of the total sediment load.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run through some of the options, some of the many options that are available that would be applied, and totally applied as a group of integrated procedures. You would apply all of these together to help manage your sediment at a run-of-river plant. And what happens is that, on one hand, you have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute. So even here, if we had the tools, we don't have the data. We've got a project I'm designing right now and I've just put in a density current release mechanism. It's a storage project. And we're anticipating it's going to release maybe 15% of the total sediment load. But the prevalence of density currents is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run through some of the options, some of the many options that are available that would be applied, and totally applied as a group of integrated procedures. You would apply all of these together to help manage your sediment at a run-of-river plant. And what happens is that, on one hand, you have the strategy of using a larger reservoir, sedimentation in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute. So even here, if we had the tools, we don't have the data. We've got a project I'm designing right now and I've just put in a density current release mechanism. It's a storage project. And we're anticipating it's going to release maybe 15% of the total sediment load. But the prevalence of density currents is significant. I know it does happen in the Himalayan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run through some of the options, some of the many options that are available that would be applied, and totally applied as a group of integrated procedures. You would apply all of these together to help manage your sediment at a run-of-river plant. And what happens is that, on one hand, you have the strategy of using a larger reservoir, sedimentation in the reservoir and flushing, versus managing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute. So even here, if we had the tools, we don't have the data. We've got a project I'm designing right now and I've just put in a density current release mechanism. It's a storage project. And we're anticipating it's going to release maybe 15% of the total sediment load. But the prevalence of density currents is significant. I know it does happen in the Himalayan area in different reservoirs. Nurek, for instance, has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run through some of the options, some of the many options that are available that would be applied, and totally applied as a group of integrated procedures. You would apply all of these together to help manage your sediment at a run-of-river plant. And what happens is that, on one hand, you have the strategy of using a larger reservoir, sedimentation in the reservoir and flushing, versus managing sedimentation in the desanders and not flushing. And	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute. So even here, if we had the tools, we don't have the data. We've got a project I'm designing right now and I've just put in a density current release mechanism. It's a storage project. And we're anticipating it's going to release maybe 15% of the total sediment load. But the prevalence of density currents is significant. I know it does happen in the Himalayan area in different reservoirs. Nurek, for instance, has very significant density currents. Tarbela does not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run through some of the options, some of the many options that are available that would be applied, and totally applied as a group of integrated procedures. You would apply all of these together to help manage your sediment at a run-of-river plant. And what happens is that, on one hand, you have the strategy of using a larger reservoir, sedimentation in the reservoir and flushing, versus managing sedimentation in the desanders and not flushing. And those two cases have implications in terms of the amount	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute. So even here, if we had the tools, we don't have the data. We've got a project I'm designing right now and I've just put in a density current release mechanism. It's a storage project. And we're anticipating it's going to release maybe 15% of the total sediment load. But the prevalence of density currents is significant. I know it does happen in the Himalayan area in different reservoirs. Nurek, for instance, has very significant density currents. Tarbela does not. Tarbela doesn't because the slope is too low, not deep
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run through some of the options, some of the many options that are available that would be applied, and totally applied as a group of integrated procedures. You would apply all of these together to help manage your sediment at a run-of-river plant. And what happens is that, on one hand, you have the strategy of using a larger reservoir, sedimentation in the reservoir and flushing, versus managing sedimentation in the desanders and not flushing. And those two cases have implications in terms of the amount of controllable storage and downstream consequences of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute. So even here, if we had the tools, we don't have the data. We've got a project I'm designing right now and I've just put in a density current release mechanism. It's a storage project. And we're anticipating it's going to release maybe 15% of the total sediment load. But the prevalence of density currents is significant. I know it does happen in the Himalayan area in different reservoirs. Nurek, for instance, has very significant density currents. Tarbela does not. Tarbela doesn't because the slope is too low, not deep enough, not steep enough. But upstream, where they're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run through some of the options, some of the many options that are available that would be applied, and totally applied as a group of integrated procedures. You would apply all of these together to help manage your sediment at a run-of-river plant. And what happens is that, on one hand, you have the strategy of using a larger reservoir, sedimentation in the reservoir and flushing, versus managing sedimentation in the desanders and not flushing. And those two cases have implications in terms of the amount of controllable storage and downstream consequences of sediment release.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute. So even here, if we had the tools, we don't have the data. We've got a project I'm designing right now and I've just put in a density current release mechanism. It's a storage project. And we're anticipating it's going to release maybe 15% of the total sediment load. But the prevalence of density currents is significant. I know it does happen in the Himalayan area in different reservoirs. Nurek, for instance, has very significant density currents. Tarbela does not. Tarbela doesn't because the slope is too low, not deep enough, not steep enough. But upstream, where they're building new projects, I totally expect density
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run through some of the options, some of the many options that are available that would be applied, and totally applied as a group of integrated procedures. You would apply all of these together to help manage your sediment at a run-of-river plant. And what happens is that, on one hand, you have the strategy of using a larger reservoir, sedimentation in the reservoir and flushing, versus managing sedimentation in the desanders and not flushing. And those two cases have implications in terms of the amount of controllable storage and downstream consequences of sediment release. So I think with that I will close. It is, I think,	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute. So even here, if we had the tools, we don't have the data. We've got a project I'm designing right now and I've just put in a density current release mechanism. It's a storage project. And we're anticipating it's going to release maybe 15% of the total sediment load. But the prevalence of density currents is significant. I know it does happen in the Himalayan area in different reservoirs. Nurek, for instance, has very significant density currents. Tarbela does not. Tarbela doesn't because the slope is too low, not deep enough, not steep enough. But upstream, where they're building new projects, I totally expect density currents.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	efficiency, it takes more water to produce the same amount of power. So just because it's abraded doesn't mean you're going to lose power in a monsoon environment, where you have most of your energy produced during the wet season when there's a lot of extra water. Now, of course, high-head plants are very sensitive to sediment, much more sensitive than low-head plants and can, of course, experience catastrophic damage. So again, this is not a case of one rule applies to everybody. But I just hope to have been able to run through some of the options, some of the many options that are available that would be applied, and totally applied as a group of integrated procedures. You would apply all of these together to help manage your sediment at a run-of-river plant. And what happens is that, on one hand, you have the strategy of using a larger reservoir, sedimentation in the reservoir and flushing, versus managing sedimentation in the desanders and not flushing. And those two cases have implications in terms of the amount of controllable storage and downstream consequences of sediment release.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in the Himalaya, it grades your sediment into fines, medium and coarse. What is that fines: is it all silt, all clay, some percentage? What is your sand? What's your gradation? If I have that medium sand goes from in the typical range used like, for instance, in India it's 0.075 to 0.2 millimetres. Now, at 0.2 millimetres you're not going to get density currents; it can drop pretty quickly. But 0.075, yes, that can contribute. So even here, if we had the tools, we don't have the data. We've got a project I'm designing right now and I've just put in a density current release mechanism. It's a storage project. And we're anticipating it's going to release maybe 15% of the total sediment load. But the prevalence of density currents is significant. I know it does happen in the Himalayan area in different reservoirs. Nurek, for instance, has very significant density currents. Tarbela does not. Tarbela doesn't because the slope is too low, not deep enough, not steep enough. But upstream, where they're building new projects, I totally expect density

17.20 1		
17:30 1	the estimate of how frequent it occurs, and say 10%,	
2	20%, any rough estimate?	
3	DR MORRIS: When you have okay, let me try and use in	
4	context maybe something like Nurek. And I'm expecting	
5	there that maybe, just in very, very round numbers,	
6	maybe 20% to 35% of the inflow would produce density	
7	current.	
8	PROFESSOR BUYTAERT: Thank you.	
9	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we have no further questions	
10	for you, Dr Morris. So we'll end the day here, but look	
11	forward to seeing you tomorrow morning at 9.30.	
12	DR MORRIS: Perfect, thank you.	
13	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.	
14	(5.31 pm)	
15	(The hearing adjourned until 9.30 am the following day)	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	Page 229	

A	accommodate 11:10	10:19,22 11:6 12:8	222:10	alert 223:11,14	219:7 225:24 226:3
ABDULLAH 2:12	187:17 200:5	14:17 15:3,14,21,23	afternoon 24:2 123:12	Ali 2:4 34:4	226:21
ability 54:13 62:9	accomplish 148:12	16:5,20,21 19:2	124:14 188:8	alia 115:7	amounts 132:7 196:15
	157:10	21:7 24:15 45:19	205:13	align 90:8	analogies 90:5
85:20 132:21 134:5	accordance 55:7	71:18 74:16 75:14	again 8:14 21:5 29:25	aligned 41:18	analogous 119:2
186:6	76:21 95:14 104:15	75:23 84:23 111:17	36:1 45:6 57:5	alive 29:1	analogue 80:19 82:8
able 8:10 18:16 106:3	135:20	111:17 114:23	58:25 60:14 89:4	allay 31:14	analogy 115:17,25
128:24 136:1	according 77:14	118:1,21 124:16	100:7 101:1 110:12	alleging 199:9	analyse 223:5
164:13 200:6,9,17	133:19 145:9 177:4	125:11 126:20,23	115:2 119:14	allocated 31:9 56:6	analysed 142:24
226:11 227:9	181:4 185:9 192:14	127:22 128:1	120:20 124:15	129:4 162:16	214:17
228:25	201:16	151:22 171:1	143:2 155:11	allocates 92:14	analyses 181:4
about 2:4 4:9 8:14	accordingly 95:20	177:16 178:10	157:15 164:5	allocation 24:16 27:9	analysis 2:13 6:1,7,8,9
12:2,6 17:5,10	162:23	addressed 1:24 11:17	171:24 174:21	90:2 91:22 116:8	7:18 8:4 65:7 75:7
27:15 34:8 46:16	account 64:7,13,21	12:25 13:14 14:8	176:24 180:17	allow 8:10 160:18	82:12 108:12
56:12 57:11 59:12	65:19 78:5 88:23	17:17 19:10 33:16	201:15,17 202:1,21	217:15	111:23 112:20
60:13 62:10 64:4	101:16 103:11	62:3,6,13 76:6	217:6 221:22	allowable 8:12 59:8	143:1
69:9 73:15 79:3,18	108:19 119:5,17	78:25 106:14 112:3	226:10	allowed 123:20 186:10	ancient 133:16
89:1 96:20 97:12	129:5 220:25 221:5	113:19	against 31:20 50:7,23	219:1,1	ancillary 207:24
102:10,12 103:3,21	accounts 129:3 173:5	addresses 2:15	194:11 203:5 204:4	allowing 72:9	Andes 189:23 195:1
107:1 108:8,10					
111:12 115:16	accumulate 189:3 204:19	addressing 3:1 4:18	207:6 212:20	allows 158:25 202:24 alluvial 168:7	angle 216:8,9
121:6,14 134:9		9:11 17:13 74:9	Agent 20:15 24:20		angular 194:23 195:1
138:21 141:12	accumulation 198:20	79:13 176:10	agglomeration 182:11	almost 1:20 7:7 9:8	195:2,7
145:19 153:7,17	227:23	adds 133:10 134:21	aggressive 140:17	40:5 60:24 74:12	Annex 45:21 46:3
163:8 166:17,25	achieve 88:25 114:18	186:5	ago 18:9 94:21 133:24	129:3 133:12 134:8	47:23 55:8 60:1
168:2,9 169:11,12	achieved 13:11 30:22	adequate 58:10	146:22 195:13	136:14 153:2 173:6	annexes 87:24
169:13,24 172:8,16	31:17 90:3 94:2	adjourned 123:15	204:11 209:15	176:5 184:13	annexure 1:1 3:9 4:7,9
179:16 180:22	116:22	229:15	215:21	alone 20:1 39:19	4:11,16,18,24 5:1
188:23 189:4,11	acknowledge 85:1	adjusted 35:22	agree 38:9 44:24 45:3	104:10 136:20	5:14 9:1,13 13:16
191:4 193:10	acquiesce 38:3	adjusting 11:5	45:8 106:25 169:14	140:4 147:22 149:2	13:19 15:10,13,18
195:19 199:19	acquiescence 104:10	adjustment 35:6	agreeable 123:21	153:4,6 161:8	23:25 46:4 48:4,6
204:8,11 206:4,11	acquire 104:17	Administered 129:12	agreed 41:7 49:4	163:12 173:6	52:6,21 55:9 56:24
207:17 210:10	acres 136:14 161:15	129:21 130:4,14	50:10 51:11 79:22	185:24	57:5,9 58:24 59:14
212:16 215:25	163:14	165:4	agreement 30:3 35:21	along 73:10 97:17	61:5 62:21,24 63:5
216:10 219:25	acre-feet 143:6 167:4	administers 129:7,10	35:23 36:6 42:25	119:21 131:3 194:3	75:2,19 77:4 79:19
220:10 224:12	167:6	administration 30:4	43:7 45:13,15,18,21	198:14 208:16	79:25 80:6,11 87:4
225:6	across 13:12 18:20,23	adopt 6:8 110:16	46:12 47:6,24 48:15	215:4	87:13 91:18 92:6,10
above 77:1 182:16	152:12 158:1 159:5	adopted 8:11 108:23	53:16,18 54:19 55:4	alongside 126:7	92:13 107:14,18,19
201:11,18 202:3	161:5 162:21	adopting 8:5 100:6	55:11 58:17,23	130:25 185:25	109:22 112:12,22
abraded 208:13	180:23	advance 2:21 12:17	59:14,20 60:2 61:17	186:7,16 205:25	115:11 119:8,18
225:12 226:3	act 24:13,15 219:23	23:2 43:21 70:2	61:21,21 70:15 71:9	already 72:7 88:18	120:5 122:1 135:20
abrasion 198:1 207:23	action 194:4	advanced 35:25	72:1 96:6 100:8	115:13 130:9 165:3	135:22 151:9
208:1 217:20	actions 93:7,9	advances 208:17	101:14,17 102:2,18	169:11 220:5	174:16 175:8,15
218:24 219:7,10	activities 145:5	advantages 212:10	102:18,21 103:2	alternative 96:12	176:8 186:18
220:4,22 221:4,7	activity 186:12 191:14	advisor 2:5,13,14	104:1 112:5 113:12	although 17:14 66:1	annexures 49:22 50:4
225:1	acts 78:19	17:20	114:1 116:8	92:6 135:21 154:15	50:9 55:23 116:14
absence 20:16 104:9	actual 194:21	Advisory 95:10	agreements 15:24	183:7	annual 142:20 143:5
	actually 16:18 17:13	advocates 12:20	75:15 87:24 101:13	altitudes 146:14	169:22 180:21
absolute 41:19 68:22	64:11,20 65:1 66:19	advocating 99:12,19	101:22 103:10	always 101:15 123:1	204:8 209:12
69:15 177:13 178:2 absolutely 56:18	115:19 131:24	Aegean 83:11 118:21	agricultural 127:11	190:8 200:8,9 209:6	223:25
absorb 195:23	150:1 153:3,10	120:6,10,11	127:25 135:13,24	214:12	annually 103:4 138:21
	159:20,24 160:5,16	Affairs 2:5	136:15 144:17,25	Al-Khasawneh 1:10	145:3
abstract 112:7	161:19 169:10	affect 21:17 22:1,15	145:7,11,18,24	72:3,4 73:2	another 30:5 41:2
abstracted 171:22	170:14 192:17	35:17 52:3 210:1,2	149:1,4,9 150:5	Ambassador 2:6 49:1	81:11 105:17 142:5
absurd 107:7	193:18 197:12	affected 22:24 181:24	154:5 158:16	49:16	150:5 156:10
accept 52:12 61:18	200:1 201:22 211:4	affects 209:25	163:14 172:14	ambiguous 107:7	160:19 170:17
68:10 83:13,17 85:7	214:23 218:20	affirmed 38:25	179:20 180:3,9	ambiguous 107.7 ambitions 176:6	172:11 173:10
85:11	223:19 224:4	affirms 99:1	185:23 186:7	amend 108:25	217:2 219:9 221:23
acceptable 50:21	acute 16:23	affords 5:15	agriculture 164:19	America 77:25	227:20
110:19 111:24	added 92:11	Afghanistan 150:18	172:1	Amity 90:18 91:1	answer 22:17 23:6
acceptance 34:14 64:6	addition 59:7 191:3	151:11	ahead 181:12	among 25:17 27:20	46:15 47:2 61:6
69:24 73:6	additional 12:13	afresh 176:17	aide-mémoire 35:4,7	34:14 48:16 75:23	40.13 47.2 01.0 66:23 70:5,8 83:21
accepted 3:19 33:21	149:16,24 150:25	after 25:10 27:13	35:8,16,22 38:17	76:16	83:24 102:17 106:4
34:13 42:4 86:3			39:17 69:16	amongst 17:19 18:19	
90:10 100:18 114:4	151:5 159:20	34:13 40:14 47:6		0	113:18 151:23
118:6 122:12 189:2	160:15 170:3	51:2 64:15 108:15	aimed 146:7	amount 37:9 51:16	168:25 169:3 170:1
accepting 68:17	173:24 174:25	126:20 140:25	akin 113:11,13 122:4	105:15 132:14	171:3 181:2,8 190:5
accepts 96:22	187:19 203:17	142:14 194:19	122:5	180:9,14 185:15	answered 21:18
accept[ed 42:8	204:2	195:12 197:17	Alam 40:8	194:13 196:21	169:11
	address 2:7 3:2 5:21	214:6 220:10	albeit 172:16	211:10 217:25	answering 57:21
access 190:15 200:6					

Trevor McGowan

Antarctic 100:4	15:15,22 28:15	90:21	104:20 105:4	avoid 31:6 36:18	147:10 163:24
anticipate 3:5 12:5,19	29:19 64:25 67:4,6	arguing 120:22	113:16	48:24 208:19	179:22
anticipated 11:23	68:1,3,6 77:2 83:14	argument 83:15 89:12	asking 98:9 166:25	214:11 220:2	Bank's 29:15,18 33:21
15:16 174:11 185:9	84:24 85:18 99:22	98:14 99:2 115:22	168:13	avoiding 34:11 69:9	33:23 34:20 38:16
anticipating 228:15	108:3,22 109:10	argumentation 98:2	aspect 86:22 87:21,22	109:23	45:12 46:7 49:18
anticipation 155:15	110:13,17 112:14	arguments 76:6	88:22 100:20,23	award 2:5,10 64:9	43:12 40:7 49:18 50:14 68:18,20
156:21	118:3,4 119:13	115:24 123:9	103:7 130:10	65:2,5,6 74:21	bargain 13:5,9,9,13
anti-vortex 213:19	120:20 177:12	arid 146:17	202:17	87:17 91:14 108:4	13:15,16,17 16:9,10
	209:18				
anyone 227:3 anything 20:19 62:4		arise 4:19 32:7 62:18	aspects 2:20 21:7	108:13 109:18	16:14 30:13 33:5
	approached 9:14 99:8	74:18 99:23,25	56:23 57:8 65:3	110:12 115:14	72:1 85:22 88:11,12
72:6 151:13 202:20	121:17	162:15	126:18 154:11	119:9,10	88:12 94:8 97:6
Anyway 72:21	approaches 30:6	arisen 2:2	190:1	awards 14:24	141:12
anywhere 147:12	approaching 193:17	arising 18:13 58:21	assessing 93:11	aware 67:1 79:6 93:12	bargains 7:24 13:14
198:2	appropriate 62:19	59:23 140:14	assessment 117:15	135:6 185:11	14:9 86:17 88:10
apart 206:24	94:5,6 105:1 110:15	arms 9:2	168:18 183:9	away 1:13 19:24 70:6	93:14 118:13 123:1
apologies 6:25	115:6,20 124:5	army 17:23,24 18:6	Assets 90:15	103:24 151:3 169:1	barrage 139:13,18
apologise 51:8	210:16 211:7	28:22	assist 159:15 160:11	218:25 227:18	140:7,8 142:15
Appalachian 195:12	appropriation 137:15	arose 74:16 108:9	assistance 56:22	AWN 1:10	158:7,8,8,9,20,22
apparent 48:13	140:8	around 9:3 12:6,9	Assistant 2:20	A3 125:1,3 153:20	158:25,25 159:21
112:13	approved 100:4	44:17 47:7 56:24	associated 8:22 84:3	160:4	161:24 164:24
apparently 62:10	approximately 128:22	116:20 134:16	127:24 158:3 185:2		165:15
appear 21:5 46:20	129:8,11,23 131:4	163:12 164:6 173:1	assume 89:11 110:17	B	barrages 155:6 158:4
56:25 68:19 74:8	132:6 137:8 143:6	178:15 179:1	121:13 211:11	b 39:5 45:21 46:3	158:4,5 159:11
121:12 122:1	144:18 145:2,11,12	199:11 206:21	assumed 36:24	47:23 55:8 60:1	161:2 162:17
124:15,22 154:16	149:22 150:12	207:6 208:7 211:15	assumptions 49:18	201:3,14	barrier 213:23 216:7
APPEARANCES 2:1	163:13 173:12	211:18 215:13	assurances 31:20	baby 16:18	based 16:18 29:21
appeared 78:3 130:2	178:13,14 192:7	arrangement 103:6	34:16	back 1:7 19:15 20:4	30:2 33:13 35:21
130:24 131:9	April 25:3 35:1 40:15	arrangements 103:3	assured 50:16 79:21	27:1 32:16 63:9	50:19 57:17 58:14
150:20	49:2 50:3,6 57:5	arrival 198:22	atmospheric 207:2	70:8 71:3 73:23	77:1 81:9 84:10
appears 25:14 57:25	59:14,17 60:25 61:4	arrow 217:14	attaining 89:16	75:2 83:22 84:1	109:14 137:17
58:16 118:5 142:8	121:25 135:15	arrows 196:11	attempt 36:22	85:14 90:3 98:20	140:20 145:17
142:23 180:20	143:20 144:10	article 1:1 8:25 9:12	attempted 30:10	99:9 100:7,12,16	146:7 149:8 154:8
182:19	April/May 191:12	13:4,4,15,16,17	45:19	103:17 106:10	218:22 221:10
appendix 25:12 40:2	Arabian 129:25 178:7	15:7,11 19:14 21:14	attempting 39:24	113:20 117:6	baseload 191:23
44:6 48:20 57:10	arbitration 1:1,4 2:18	21:21,22 22:10	attempts 56:6	123:17 125:1,2	205:25 206:3,6
61:3 63:14 67:18	3:16,18 6:13,19,20	23:24 25:8,22 29:14	attention 4:15 15:17	155:11 162:5	basic 32:1 45:15 49:18
68:9 105:9 143:2	19:5 78:10	29:16,22 32:23	62:5 64:19 87:16	167:15 169:1,2,7	159:4 207:22
applauded 123:7	archives 43:5 47:4,8	47:13 52:21 53:1,21	170:19	170:8 171:24 176:3	basically 121:1 168:7
applicable 99:13	50:5,7 57:6	54:1,4 55:5,25	ATTILA 2:11	186:25 195:24	189:5 193:23 194:8
107:18 140:13	area 28:9 128:19	63:23 64:7,14,21	Attorney 2:6	222:19 223:1 224:2	196:17 199:3 211:1
application 4:1 8:25	129:8 132:5 133:1	75:10,17 76:9,13,20	attributed 77:9,16	background 32:4	213:16 214:8 216:7
74:23 75:22 101:19	133:11 137:8,10	78:25 83:3,6,8,14	184:16	188:23	218:25
104:1 107:6,21,24	149:9,13,18,20,24	85:8 86:23 88:7	audiovisual 125:14	bad 221:20	basin 29:23 31:24
108:19 109:4 110:3	150:4,5,11,13,15,22	89:6 90:20 92:13	August 42:23 43:6		114:19 126:16,25
111:6 123:19,22,24	150:23 151:5,15,16	94:12 97:2 98:22	46:14 57:1 58:1,5	Baglihar 1:24 2:5,9,24	127:5 128:7,19
124:3	151:18,19,25 152:3	100:7,21,25 101:12	71:1 148:14 157:13	3:1,5,8,19,20,23,24	129:4,9 132:4,9,13
applied 73:18 81:11	152:4,6,25 153:4,6	101:17,25 102:7,10	173:8	4:1,2,2 6:5 7:10,14	133:4 142:2,3
86:10,11 87:18 98:7	162:4,6,7 165:6	102:23,23 104:13	auspices 102:22	7:15 8:2,5,11 19:16	144:13,14 147:20
98:25 100:18,23	174:18 178:24	104:22 106:17,23	authentic 17:7,12	19:19,25 76:7	149:5 150:9,13,17
111:3 122:8 218:14	193:4 203:21 204:4	107:2,6,9,13,16	authoritative 6:23	103:17 105:5,24	150:21,25 152:13
218:14 226:13,14	206:22 208:17	113:5 117:16,18	authority 3:3 6:17	113:19 114:14,24	156:23 164:1 166:5
applies 15:2 101:15	200.22 200.17 228:19	118:5,8 125:21	18:18 25:16 110:24	Baglihar/Kishengan	168:23 171:20
226:10	areas 127:15 132:3,16	135:6,10,11 137:17	162:20 184:15	2:17	172:12 173:2,5
apply 5:20 6:11 12:15	132:23 133:5,9	141:11,22 144:7	automobile 224:6,7,8	balance 35:17 50:13	172:12 175:2,5 178:4,6,8 180:3
21:23 74:22,24	134:15 147:6 148:5		availability 79:21	93:1,13 110:18,21	
,		147:14,25 148:7,16	e e	169:12,15 170:11	182:2,15,15,22 183:3,5 184:3,18
93:16 110:9 218:13 218:19 219:2	149:6,12,17,19	151:8 152:21 157:9	144:5 184:17	balancing 109:11	
	150:9,16,25 152:13	164:16 166:11 174:12,16 175:13	available 12:11,12	Balloki 158:8	185:5,6 192:23
	152.14 14 17 22 22		22:4 33:1,9 38:24	Balochistan 163:14	211:20 215:1,12,17
226:15	152:14,14,17,22,23		52.14 70.10 01		
226:15 applying 91:17 107:16	153:8 154:5 157:21	175:17 176:8	53:14 70:19,21	bank 17:17,20,24 18:3	216:7 217:7
226:15 applying 91:17 107:16 111:9	153:8 154:5 157:21 158:2,16 159:6,22	175:17 176:8 articles 53:10 98:4	113:25 122:7 135:9	29:16 30:10 31:4,22	basins 132:10 173:3
226:15 applying 91:17 107:16 111:9 appointed 102:8	153:8 154:5 157:21 158:2,16 159:6,22 162:12 164:11	175:17 176:8 articles 53:10 98:4 119:4 123:20 148:2	113:25 122:7 135:9 140:3 145:3 163:21	29:16 30:10 31:4,22 32:18 33:19 34:6	basins 132:10 173:3 178:5 216:22
226:15 applying 91:17 107:16 111:9 appointed 102:8 appointment 17:23	153:8 154:5 157:21 158:2,16 159:6,22 162:12 164:11 165:11 179:2	175:17 176:8 articles 53:10 98:4 119:4 123:20 148:2 articulated 47:16 69:2	113:25 122:7 135:9 140:3 145:3 163:21 177:7 180:18	29:16 30:10 31:4,22	basins 132:10 173:3 178:5 216:22 basin's 132:8
226:15 applying 91:17 107:16 111:9 appointed 102:8 appointment 17:23 apportionment 31:10	153:8 154:5 157:21 158:2,16 159:6,22 162:12 164:11 165:11 179:2 183:16 184:20	175:17 176:8 articles 53:10 98:4 119:4 123:20 148:2 articulated 47:16 69:2 69:5,17	113:25 122:7 135:9 140:3 145:3 163:21 177:7 180:18 190:24 198:21	29:16 30:10 31:4,22 32:18 33:19 34:6	 basins 132:10 173:3 178:5 216:22 basin's 132:8 basis 6:12 16:8,14
226:15 applying 91:17 107:16 111:9 appointed 102:8 appointment 17:23 apportionment 31:10 appreciable 45:1	153:8 154:5 157:21 158:2,16 159:6,22 162:12 164:11 165:11 179:2 183:16 184:20 186:7 194:24	175:17 176:8 articles 53:10 98:4 119:4 123:20 148:2 articulated 47:16 69:2 69:5,17 ASAD 2:5	113:25 122:7 135:9 140:3 145:3 163:21 177:7 180:18 190:24 198:21 200:11 225:9 226:1	29:16 30:10 31:4,22 32:18 33:19 34:6 35:2,7,17,20 36:24	basins 132:10 173:3 178:5 216:22 basin's 132:8 basis 6:12 16:8,14 22:21 32:16 35:14
226:15 applying 91:17 107:16 111:9 appointed 102:8 appointment 17:23 apportionment 31:10 appreciable 45:1 appreciate 6:4 18:5	153:8 154:5 157:21 158:2,16 159:6,22 162:12 164:11 165:11 179:2 183:16 184:20 186:7 194:24 Argentina 78:10 96:7	175:17 176:8 articles 53:10 98:4 119:4 123:20 148:2 articulated 47:16 69:2 69:5,17 ASAD 2:5 ascertain 37:8	113:25 122:7 135:9 140:3 145:3 163:21 177:7 180:18 190:24 198:21 200:11 225:9 226:1 226:13 228:1	29:16 30:10 31:4,22 32:18 33:19 34:6 35:2,7,17,20 36:24 37:17,20 38:2,8,12	basins 132:10 173:3 178:5 216:22 basin's 132:8 basis 6:12 16:8,14 22:21 32:16 35:14 36:18 50:21 101:10
226:15 applying 91:17 107:16 111:9 appointed 102:8 apportionment 31:10 appreciable 45:1 appreciate 6:4 18:5 154:2	153:8 154:5 157:21 158:2,16 159:6,22 162:12 164:11 165:11 179:2 183:16 184:20 186:7 194:24 Argentina 78:10 96:7 100:2,9	175:17 176:8 articles 53:10 98:4 119:4 123:20 148:2 articulated 47:16 69:2 69:5,17 ASAD 2:5 ascertain 37:8 aside 38:23	113:25 122:7 135:9 140:3 145:3 163:21 177:7 180:18 190:24 198:21 200:11 225:9 226:1 226:13 228:1 average 138:2 142:20	29:16 30:10 31:4,22 32:18 33:19 34:6 35:2,7,17,20 36:24 37:17,20 38:2,8,12 40:25 41:18 42:1	basins 132:10 173:3 178:5 216:22 basin's 132:8 basis 6:12 16:8,14 22:21 32:16 35:14 36:18 50:21 101:10 107:3 180:19
226:15 applying 91:17 107:16 111:9 appointed 102:8 apportionment 31:10 appreciable 45:1 appreciate 6:4 18:5 154:2 Appreciation 24:8	153:8 154:5 157:21 158:2,16 159:6,22 162:12 164:11 165:11 179:2 183:16 184:20 186:7 194:24 Argentina 78:10 96:7 100:2,9 arguably 97:14	175:17 176:8 articles 53:10 98:4 119:4 123:20 148:2 articulated 47:16 69:2 69:5,17 ASAD 2:5 ascertain 37:8 aside 38:23 asked 21:13 23:7	113:25 122:7 135:9 140:3 145:3 163:21 177:7 180:18 190:24 198:21 200:11 225:9 226:1 226:13 228:1 average 138:2 142:20 169:22	29:16 30:10 31:4,22 32:18 33:19 34:6 35:2,7,17,20 36:24 37:17,20 38:2,8,12 40:25 41:18 42:1 43:4 49:2,9 50:2 54:24 66:14,18 67:4 67:7 69:4 79:5	basins 132:10 173:3 178:5 216:22 basin's 132:8 basis 6:12 16:8,14 22:21 32:16 35:14 36:18 50:21 101:10 107:3 180:19 194:14 223:25
226:15 applying 91:17 107:16 111:9 appointed 102:8 apportionment 31:10 appreciable 45:1 appreciate 6:4 18:5 154:2	153:8 154:5 157:21 158:2,16 159:6,22 162:12 164:11 165:11 179:2 183:16 184:20 186:7 194:24 Argentina 78:10 96:7 100:2,9	175:17 176:8 articles 53:10 98:4 119:4 123:20 148:2 articulated 47:16 69:2 69:5,17 ASAD 2:5 ascertain 37:8 aside 38:23	113:25 122:7 135:9 140:3 145:3 163:21 177:7 180:18 190:24 198:21 200:11 225:9 226:1 226:13 228:1 average 138:2 142:20	29:16 30:10 31:4,22 32:18 33:19 34:6 35:2,7,17,20 36:24 37:17,20 38:2,8,12 40:25 41:18 42:1 43:4 49:2,9 50:2 54:24 66:14,18 67:4	basins 132:10 173:3 178:5 216:22 basin's 132:8 basis 6:12 16:8,14 22:21 32:16 35:14 36:18 50:21 101:10 107:3 180:19

					5, 5
bcm 167:2,7 168:5	benefit 7:2 33:2,10	124:2 166:21,22	148:9 190:16 205:3	52:5,12 64:15,18	120:12 121:1 122:6
beaches 195:11	38:24 117:9 167:7	167:16 169:8,19	205:21 209:12	214:6	122:17 124:3
bearing 94:7 166:6	benefits 198:10	Blackmore's 12:15	bringing 108:1 205:19	CAMERON 2:10	151:14 171:4,5,13
bearings 208:1	Bengal 114:2	19:2 108:10 111:12	211:14	canal 137:7 152:5	171:17 190:17
Beas 33:8 128:14	Besham 196:6	Black's 68:25	brings 19:5 61:14	155:22,23,24 156:4	199:9 201:12
130:23,25 131:8,9	bespoke 14:18 15:20	blade 218:21	88:16 96:18 106:17	156:20 157:1 159:2	206:16,16 209:16
131:13 137:3	118:12	blades 218:12,20	111:12 205:18	159:18 160:14,16	215:12 218:3
became 46:4 47:24	best 27:2 93:16 148:9	224:14	Britain 153:3	161:21 163:5,10,12	222:15 226:10
49:22 84:17 98:4	190:4 209:5 210:21	BLINK 2:21	British 24:12,13 155:1	163:16,21 164:3,4	cases 73:13 81:18 82:7
become 86:8 122:10	Bethlehem 2:9 3:3,5	blocks 193:3	brittle 195:25,25	164:24 165:7.8	82:15 83:11,20,23
126:10 183:21	139:6 172:25	blown 125:4	broad 7:1 9:15,19	185:18	100:4 107:5 118:17
184:9	better 165:23 209:5,7	blue 150:11,15,23	41:9 51:21 81:8,19	canals 26:12 27:7,11	118:19 194:7
becomes 121:10	between 1:15 3:7 8:18	boilers 205:8	82:8 122:17 141:11	28:7 148:13,22	200:16 226:21
194:13 225:1	8:21 15:4,6 16:15	boiling 216:2	182:4	151:2 155:7 156:5	cast 4:24
bed 193:11,15,24,25	23:22 26:22 29:7	bolted 206:23	broadbrush 16:7	156:11,12,13,13,14	catalyst 29:14
194:1,2,2,3,4,6,11	31:2 32:6 37:14	bolts 206:23	broader 13:10 71:8	156:15,15 157:12	catastrophe 165:21
194:13,15,21 196:4	45:22 46:5 54:2	bombs 28:22	113:4	157:21 158:3,13,18	catastrophic 165:20
196:9,19	56:4 59:2,13 70:15	Bond 81:3	broadly 101:6	158:23 159:11	226:9
beds 164:4	71:1 78:1,10,14	border 26:3	broke 188:10	161:6,8,8,9,11,12	catchment 132:23
bed-load 193:18	81:1 82:20 90:15	bores 168:1,15	broken 154:9 174:21	162:17 163:2,4,6,7	133:1,11,11 134:17
before 1:9 7:13 9:24	91:23 93:2 96:15	both 2:24 3:15 7:11	brought 87:18 113:21	163:8,17 165:1,12	149:13 150:1,4
11:15 17:23 19:7	103:14 104:1,5	20:15 21:23 22:7	brush 7:1	165:18	151:19 152:3,16,22
20:3 21:5,10 56:21	109:11 110:18	29:6 43:7 67:5,8	BRYCE 2:20	canal-building 26:9	154:7 156:10 158:2
74:8 79:16 83:2	112:4 114:8 132:7	71:15 73:6,13,19	bubbles 219:18,19	cane 146:6	category 177:13
112:11 119:22	133:12,25 135:15	77:20 78:9 79:5	buckets 207:5,7	canon 97:15 98:11	cater 58:10
124:19 125:10,11	143:20,21 144:1	81:18 102:6 126:6	buffer 168:18	canons 97:18,25 98:3	cause 21:25 22:14
129:23 130:5,16	150:15 155:1,2,4,11	140:20 152:21	build 41:20 165:6	98:5	49:13 170:23
131:4,8,12,14 135:3	155:13,21,23,24	160:10 198:3 211:4	174:16	canvassed 61:21	caused 27:20 36:17
137:18,24 141:13	156:2 157:4,15,16	215:22 219:23	building 9:21 75:17	capability 205:22	127:23 171:6,6,9,12
142:23 147:3	157:21 158:20,24	220:24 222:20	101:25 114:2 136:6	capable 22:13 136:13	208:20 215:11
155:16 175:8	159:8 160:1,6 161:7	bottom 1:16 115:3	228:23	capacity 119:16	causes 181:7 182:23
177:10 182:10	162:3 169:12 177:7	197:7,16 198:14	Buildings 2:10,11	136:22 140:6	207:7 216:15
184:13 188:10	178:17,25 181:17	203:9 204:10 212:5	builds 175:15	172:18 173:9,13,22	causing 182:25
199:2 224:3 225:13	181:22 184:1	213:2,5 214:16	built 35:24 44:13	191:21 193:9	caution 17:3
227:1	185:11,13 192:16	227:20	139:17 155:1,25	195:23,23 198:10	cautious 33:23
beforehand 171:17	197:20 202:6 214:3	boulders 192:24 193:11 196:9,9	156:6 160:17 187:8 209:14 218:10	201:17 202:25	cavitation 219:13,14
began 68:3 begin 10:17 14:12	218:11,20 220:11 beyond 5:18,20 7:16	boulder-sized 193:7	bulk 162:10	203:2,5,7,19,24 204:2 208:16,16	219:20,23 220:1 ceased 139:19
128:6 188:22	71:1 107:22 110:10	boundaries 36:11	BURKI 2:5	204.2 208.10,10	census 133:22
208:11	110:25 152:23	114:6	buy 224:9,10	capillaries 156:17	centimetres 216:10
beginning 9:7,8 23:15	159:6 181:8 187:15	boundary 39:1,9 76:1	buying 168:13	capita 177:4,15	central 36:1 116:10
34:25 72:8 82:13	197:2.10	78:14 90:4 113:10	Buytaert 1:12 169:9	capital 80:8 133:17	171:3
221:13	big 211:20 213:8	115:8,17,21,25	169:10 170:10,17	capitalised 80:11	centre 134:2 150:6
begins 225:3	215:18	116:11 117:1,6,14	171:18 172:3	capture 198:21	centrepiece 144:13
begun 160:8	bigger 1:14 161:11	117:17 118:2	180:14 181:9 227:4	captured 61:3 192:21	centuries 134:1
behalf 3:1 1:9 74:8	203:22,22,22 204:3	119:20 121:1 122:5	227:5 228:25 229:8	car 208:6 215:14,16	century 94:21 126:11
99:3 124:15	204:4 218:2	131:3,12	bypass 211:6,21,25,25	224:9	146:25 179:7 184:2
behind 5:11 23:17	billion 147:16,17,23	boundless 176:5,6	212:2,6	carbon 181:14	184:5,6 186:4
39:14 123:8 124:21	billions 167:2	branch 156:15,15		careful 82:25 93:1,13	ceramic 210:15
193:4 219:17	bimodal 196:17	161:8,8,9,12 163:2	С	219:25	ceremonies 10:6
being 18:21 24:23	binary 82:11	163:6,17	c 49:22 112:12 116:14	carefully 150:10,19	certain 43:19 52:23
27:3,21 53:14 69:1	binding 3:14 4:10	brand 225:4,24	151:9 201:15	186:17	53:21 56:22 70:1
69:5,16 70:19 78:2	7:15 19:25 20:8	break 11:1 12:7 73:22	cake 39:22	carried 183:7	73:8,9 78:11 87:19
82:14 89:7 97:13	54:15	74:1 79:16 120:15	calculated 33:13	carries 215:17	90:15 93:7 94:22
103:23 123:22	bit 1:13,14 5:10 11:24	123:12 176:13,17	79:20 80:3 142:3,6	carry 41:3	103:22 120:23
144:4 150:2 177:25	15:16 64:2 71:5,7,9	186:25 187:24	calculating 103:16	carrying 197:3	183:17 190:25
187:11 196:18	104:23 106:7	188:6,12 193:5	calculation 8:12 61:10	cascading 175:22	204:22 209:9
203:9 205:13	154:10,14 172:9	breaking 188:16	call 96:4 195:24	case 1:3 2:21 9:3	211:10 212:10
217:23 223:5	181:16 187:7	breeze 223:9	210:11 216:6 219:6	10:14 12:23 14:13	215:24 218:19
believe 62:25 64:16	189:21 191:4 192:7	bricks 14:13,16	called 34:21 41:23	20:18 58:11 59:5	220:19 221:11
73:17,18 97:23	192:16 193:16	brief 2:3 70:5 128:4,7	75:9 81:3,12 119:4	64:7,25 66:3,13	227:10
167:10 218:5	197:4 203:7 207:18	146:21 176:22	119:6,15 146:7	68:20 73:4 76:17	certainly 7:25 11:10
belong 138:25	208:20 216:16	briefly 10:11 12:21	155:24 163:5 177:4	77:24 78:10 81:3,6	28:12 37:22 47:7
belonging 91:8	217:22 218:2,2,8	139:6 151:22	180:25 206:15	81:11,12 83:8,12,12	62:3,12 64:1 69:8
below 9:21 138:23	221:6 Plack 20:17 25 24:1 4	166:17 178:10	calling 113:25	85:17 90:15 94:23	71:4,20 73:14 97:25
152:10 206:21 211:23 213:19	Black 29:17,25 34:1,4 Blackmore 1:11 12:7	188:23 bright 5:11	calls 101:7 111:21	95:5,23 96:7,14 98:25 101:6 105:12	106:10 110:16 122:9 123:8,8,21
beneficial 91:2	18:25 61:17 62:8	bring 87:16 101:2	came 30:13 35:19 46:8	98:25 101:6 105:12 114:3 120:7,10,10	144:16 168:15
ochenelal 71.2	10.23 01.17 02.0	oring 07.10 101.2	46:10 47:5 51:17	117.3 120.7,10,10	10100.13
	1				

170:4 171:12 182:5	Chashma 160:10	227:6	combined 136:7,17	184:5 196:20	concerns 19:21 34:3
182:14 186:3	Chashma-Jhelum	clearly 48:7 59:6	173:21	compares 215:9	36:23 42:5 44:9
cetera 189:23 190:11	159:18 160:14	60:22 61:3 94:18	come 2:18 9:4 12:6,16	comparing 153:25	45:19 52:7 53:7
213:21	cheapest 205:19	100:8 102:23	17:6 20:14 26:11	154:1	73:15 113:18
chairman 1:3,11,12	check 23:10 166:19	115:13 120:25	46:16 63:9 70:8	compartments 87:9	concession 54:16
1:19 5:7 8:13 9:4,24	167:5,6,14 170:3	158:12	71:2 73:23 75:2.19	comparinents 87.9	conclude 2:4 61:6
10:4 15:25 19:7	172:2 227:2	client's 210:23	83:22 85:14 88:6	compensate 160:20	227:1
20:19,23 21:4 24:5	chemical 81:5,6,9	climate 75:24 108:9	89:8 90:3 103:17	compensation 102:17	concluded 8:16 34:21
25:15 26:23 28:17	Chenab 33:1 35:9	108:18,18,21	106:10 108:8,10	competence 3:13 5:1	77:10,18 78:3,7,15
63:12 65:18 66:17	36:11 38:4 58:13	112:13,18,19	110:7 113:10 117:6	5:15 6:8,10 74:20	87:25 95:9,25
67:15 71:4 72:3,4	128:14 130:1,7,8,10	126:12,17 128:3	130:22 151:21	108:4 115:14,15	111:10
73:2,20 74:3,7 83:2	130:18 131:5,6,16	146:8,11,17 168:20	156:25 167:14	competing 97:24	concludes 120:15
84:13,15,21 85:5,24	132:17 143:8,15	171:9 177:16 178:9	168:6 169:1,2,7	98:11	186:19
86:4,21 97:11 99:9	155:25 156:1	180:2 181:10,15,17	170:8,25 171:24	compiled 180:17	concluding 9:5 19:9
100:19 103:13	157:25 158:8,15,21	181:19,20 182:1,23	186:8,25 188:24	complete 89:17	128:4
104:19 113:14	164:22,23 165:2,13	181:19,20 182:1,25	193:11 205:12	116:17,18 137:15	conclusion 7:7 10:20
118:15 120:8,19	165:17,21 178:25	224:25 225:9	219:18 223:2,5	140:9	13:20 14:2,7 18:3
121:5 123:5,17	chief 17:22 38:14	climate-change-affe	comes 46:13 71:20	completed 11:2 105:9	23:20 24:7 51:3
-		181:21	81:3 115:25 132:13	136:20 137:6	53:3 54:12 55:20
124:3,7,14 125:9,13 125:18 141:5	39:13 44:11,20 48:10	climatic 183:10	168:5 182:21 193:2	139:12 159:23	56:10,20 61:9 64:24
145:14 151:13	48:10 Chile 78:11	climbed 9:20	196:14 200:18	160:14	78:23 87:25 184:7
160:17 166:4,19	China 129:21 189:9				184:19 185:1 186:5
169:9 172:5 176:13	choice 82:11 95:20	clog 208:5 close 1:17 44:17 46:5	211:9 215:3 216:1 222:10,11	completely 47:8 60:11 67:12 69:22 86:13	conclusions 8:2,4
176:19 186:19,21	chronology 57:23	62:5 142:22 156:2	comfortable 5:11 12:3	98:23 99:5 122:3	23:23 52:18
187:10,22 188:8	Churchillian 9:6	163:1 202:13 213:1	187:11	98.23 99.3 122.3 194:18	concomitant 125:24
227:1 229:9,13	circled 155:22 160:12	226:24	coming 75:8 83:20	completion 139:18	concrete 122:10
Chairman's 96:18	161:20 163:11	closed 201:4	86:22 118:15 139:9	142:14 160:7,9	208:13
challenged 1:16	164:22	Closed 201:4 Closed-circuit 220:5	191:8,11 221:11,19	complex 152:8 182:3	condition 34:15 50:22
challenges 178:8	circular 104:23	closed-cycle 208:8	command 137:10	complex 152:8 182:5 compliance 103:22	conditions 54:25
185:20 186:2 209:4	circumscribe 111:4	closely 61:19 127:20	commenced 42:22	complicated 199:25	122:8 198:16 201:6
challenging 223:6,13	circumscribed 92:9	142:25	commencing 77:3	complexited 199.23 comply 176:7	223:6,12,14 225:2
224:22	circumscribes 112:24	closer 91:3 197:9	comment 115:16	component 224:21	227:9,10,12,12
chance 116:9,10	circumstance 23:1	closing 117:3,11	commentary 84:18	components 112:15	conduct 103:25
chances 31:23	circumstances 13:20	cloud 61:24 108:11	146:2	183:10 208:12	140:10 171:6,13
		ciouu 01.24 100.11	140.2	105.10 200.12	140.10 171.0,15
cnange 20.6 54.37	14.1 6 22.12 23.20	111.14.25	commented 26:10	209.9 224.13	conducted 147.9
change 20:6 54:3,7 75:24 78:18 108:9	14:1,6 22:12 23:20 45:8 52:23 66:12	111:14,25 cloudy 205:13	commenting 182.20	209:9 224:13 comprehensive 89:5	conducted 147:9 confidence 181:25
75:24 78:18 108:9	45:8 52:23 66:12	cloudy 205:13	commenting 182:20	comprehensive 89:5	confidence 181:25
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprised 142:7 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprised 142:7 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changes 50:661:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16 clarification 23:10	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25 concentration 210:4	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16 clarification 23:10 66:2 94:4 167:1	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16 clarification 23:10 66:2 94:4 167:1 clarify 23:7 63:24	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changes 50:661:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16 clarification 23:10 66:2 94:4 167:1 clarify 23:7 63:24 122:14	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprised 142:7 comprised 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confluence 158:20
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16 clarification 23:10 66:2 94:4 167:1 clarify 23:7 63:24 122:14 clarifying 102:12	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprised 142:7 comprised 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confirmes 92:6 conformity 5:16
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8 channel 161:24	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16 clarification 23:10 66:2 94:4 167:1 clarify 23:7 63:24 122:14 clarifying 102:12 121:15	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23 collapse 219:19,21	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17 95:11,13,25 96:1	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprised 142:7 comprised 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15 concept 36:7 60:3,8,9	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 conformity 5:16 conforms 4:5
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8 channel 161:24 168:17	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16 clarification 23:10 66:2 94:4 167:1 clarify 23:7 63:24 122:14 clarifying 102:12 121:15 classed 177:10	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23 collapse 219:19,21 colleague 126:19	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17 95:11,13,25 96:1 100:2,11	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15 concept 36:7 60:3,8,9 60:10 65:11 68:15	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:16 conformity 5:16 conforms 4:5 confusing 64:2
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changin 102:24 103:8 channel 161:24 168:17 channelling 68:15	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16 clarification 23:10 66:2 94:4 167:1 clarify 23:7 63:24 122:14 clarifying 102:12 121:15 classed 177:10 classification 178:1	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23 collapse 219:19,21 colleague 126:19 169:10	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17 95:11,13,25 96:1 100:2,11 common 40:8 48:21 77:20 194:24 201:7 201:8	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15 concept 36:7 60:3,8,9 60:10 65:11 68:15 69:12 71:11 73:18	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 confirms 51:0 conformity 5:16 conforms 4:5 confusing 64:2 connection 87:25
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changes 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8 channel 161:24 168:17 channelling 68:15 chapeau 92:6 107:8 chapter 2:15 126:14 126:15,18	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16 clarification 23:10 66:2 94:4 167:1 clarify 23:7 63:24 122:14 clarifying 102:12 121:15 classed 177:10 classification 178:1 classified 177:2	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23 collapse 219:19,21 colleague 126:19 169:10 colleagues 9:10	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17 95:11,13,25 96:1 100:2,11 common 40:8 48:21 77:20 194:24 201:7	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprised 142:7 comprised 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 comcoded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15 concept 36:7 60:3,8,9 60:10 65:11 68:15 69:12 71:11 73:18 78:17 198:5 201:19 201:20 223:18 224:15	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 confirms 4:5 confusing 64:2 connection 87:25 141:6
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8 channel 161:24 168:17 chanelling 68:15 chapeau 92:6 107:8 chapter 2:15 126:14	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16 clarification 23:10 66:2 94:4 167:1 clarify 23:7 63:24 122:14 clarifying 102:12 121:15 classed 177:10 classification 178:1 classified 177:2 classify 177:24 192:11	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23 collapse 219:19,21 colleague 126:19 169:10 colleagues 9:10 124:20	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17 95:11,13,25 96:1 100:2,11 common 40:8 48:21 77:20 194:24 201:7 201:8 commonly 177:6 227:10	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15 concept 36:7 60:3,8,9 60:10 65:11 68:15 69:12 71:11 73:18 78:17 198:5 201:19 201:20 223:18	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confluence 158:20 conformity 5:16 conforms 4:5 confusing 64:2 connection 87:25 141:6 connections 155:2
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changes 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8 channel 161:24 168:17 channelling 68:15 chapeau 92:6 107:8 chapter 2:15 126:14 126:15,18	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16 clarification 23:10 66:2 94:4 167:1 clarify 23:7 63:24 122:14 clarifying 102:12 121:15 classed 177:10 classified 177:2 classified 177:2 classified 177:24 192:11 clay 197:3 213:2 228:4	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23 collapse 219:19,21 colleague 219:19,21 colleague 9:10 124:20 collection 47:5	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17 95:11,13,25 96:1 100:2,11 common 40:8 48:21 77:20 194:24 201:7 201:8 commonly 177:6 227:10 communication 103:3	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprised 142:7 comprised 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 comcoded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15 concept 36:7 60:3,8,9 60:10 65:11 68:15 69:12 71:11 73:18 78:17 198:5 201:19 201:20 223:18 224:15	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confluence 158:20 conformity 5:16 conforms 4:5 confusing 64:2 connection 87:25 141:6 connections 155:2 connotes 95:19
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changed 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8 channel 161:24 168:17 channeling 68:15 chapeau 92:6 107:8 chapeau 92:6 107:8	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16 clarification 23:10 66:2 94:4 167:1 clarify 23:7 63:24 122:14 clarifying 102:12 121:15 classed 177:10 classification 178:1 classified 177:2 classify 177:24 192:11 clay 197:3 213:2 228:4 clays 192:3,4,5	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23 collapse 219:19,21 colleague 126:19 169:10 colleagues 9:10 124:20 collection 47:5 collectively 161:13	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17 95:11,13,25 96:1 100:2,11 common 40:8 48:21 77:20 194:24 201:7 201:8 commonly 177:6 227:10	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprised 142:7 comprised 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 concedted 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15 concept 36:7 60:3,8,9 60:10 65:11 68:15 69:12 71:11 73:18 78:17 198:5 201:19 201:20 223:18 224:15 concept 82:18 97:3	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confluence 158:20 conforms 4:5 confusing 64:2 connections 87:25 141:6 connections 155:2 connections 183:24
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8 channel 161:24 168:17 channeling 68:15 chapeau 92:6 107:8 chapeau 92:6 107:8 chapeat 162:48:9 55:19 84:8 85:12	$\begin{array}{c} 45:8\ 52:23\ 66:12\\ 112:24\\ \textbf{circumstantial}\ 20:6\\ \textbf{cite}\ 82:7\\ \textbf{cited}\ 19:18\ 64:8\ 75:1\\ 119:9\ 137:21\\ \textbf{cites}\ 182:9\\ \textbf{cites}\ 128:18\ 133:13\\ 133:16,25\ 178:21\\ \textbf{city}\ 133:16,17,18,20\\ \textbf{civil}\ 78:9\\ \textbf{claim}\ 35:8\ 102:16\\ \textbf{clarification}\ 23:10\\ 66:2\ 94:4\ 167:1\\ \textbf{clarify}\ 23:7\ 63:24\\ 122:14\\ \textbf{clarifying}\ 102:12\\ 121:15\\ \textbf{classification}\ 178:1\\ \textbf{classified}\ 177:2\\ \textbf{classifi}\ 177:24\ 192:11\\ \textbf{classifi}\ 177:24\ 192:34,5\\ \textbf{clean}\ 208:8\ 219:10\\ \textbf{clear}\ 3:17\ 22:18,21\\ 27:2\ 39:14\ 42:3\\ \end{array}$	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23 collapse 219:19,21 colleague 126:19 169:10 colleagues 9:10 124:20 collection 47:5 collectively 161:13 Collier's 25:10 Colombia 207:3 212:3 227:13	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17 95:11,13,25 96:1 100:2,11 common 40:8 48:21 77:20 194:24 201:7 201:8 commonly 177:6 227:10 communication 103:3 companies 91:9 company 139:25	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15 concept 36:7 60:3,8,9 60:10 65:11 68:15 69:12 71:11 73:18 78:17 198:5 201:19 201:20 223:18 224:15 concept 82:18 97:3 concept 36:17 42:11 112:11 117:7 173:17	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confusing 52:6 conforms 4:5 conforms 4:5 conforms 4:5 conforms 4:5 connections 155:2 connections 155:2 connotes 95:19 consensus 183:24 consent 37:6 43:10
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8 channel 161:24 168:17 channelling 68:15 chapter 2:15 126:14 126:15,18 chapter 16:2 48:9 55:19 84:8 85:12 characterise 67:14 characterised 64:5 65:9	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16 clarification 23:10 66:2 94:4 167:1 clarify 23:7 63:24 122:14 clarifying 102:12 121:15 classification 178:1 classified 177:20 classified 177:24 192:11 clay 197:3 213:2 228:4 clay 192:3,4,5 clean 208:8 219:10 clear 3:17 22:18,21	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23 collapse 219:19,21 colleague 219:19,21 colleagues 9:10 124:20 collection 47:5 collectively 161:13 Collier's 25:10 Colombia 207:3 212:3	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17 95:11,13,25 96:1 100:2,11 common 40:8 48:21 77:20 194:24 201:7 201:8 commonly 177:6 227:10 communication 103:3 companies 91:9 company 139:25 comparable 46:22	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprised 142:7 comprised 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15 concept 36:7 60:3,8,9 60:10 65:11 68:15 69:12 71:11 73:18 78:17 198:5 201:19 201:20 223:18 224:15 concept 82:18 97:3 concent 34:6 36:17 42:11 112:11 117:7	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confuence 158:20 conformity 5:16 conforms 4:5 conforms 4:5 confusing 64:2 connections 155:2 connections 155:2 connotes 95:19 consensus 183:24 consent 37:6 43:10 51:21 54:21
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8 channel 161:24 168:17 channelling 68:15 chapter 2:15 126:14 126:15,18 character 16:2 48:9 55:19 84:8 85:12 characterise 67:14 characterised 64:5	$\begin{array}{c} 45:8\ 52:23\ 66:12\\ 112:24\\ \textbf{circumstantial}\ 20:6\\ \textbf{cite}\ 82:7\\ \textbf{cited}\ 19:18\ 64:8\ 75:1\\ 119:9\ 137:21\\ \textbf{cites}\ 182:9\\ \textbf{cites}\ 128:18\ 133:13\\ 133:16,25\ 178:21\\ \textbf{city}\ 133:16,17,18,20\\ \textbf{civil}\ 78:9\\ \textbf{claim}\ 35:8\ 102:16\\ \textbf{clarification}\ 23:10\\ 66:2\ 94:4\ 167:1\\ \textbf{clarify}\ 23:7\ 63:24\\ 122:14\\ \textbf{clarifying}\ 102:12\\ 121:15\\ \textbf{classification}\ 178:1\\ \textbf{classified}\ 177:2\\ \textbf{classifi}\ 177:24\ 192:11\\ \textbf{classifi}\ 177:24\ 192:34,5\\ \textbf{clean}\ 208:8\ 219:10\\ \textbf{clear}\ 3:17\ 22:18,21\\ 27:2\ 39:14\ 42:3\\ \end{array}$	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23 collapse 219:19,21 colleague 126:19 169:10 colleagues 9:10 124:20 collection 47:5 collectively 161:13 Collier's 25:10 Colombia 207:3 212:3 227:13	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17 95:11,13,25 96:1 100:2,11 common 40:8 48:21 77:20 194:24 201:7 201:8 commonly 177:6 227:10 communication 103:3 companies 91:9 company 139:25	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15 concept 36:7 60:3,8,9 60:10 65:11 68:15 69:12 71:11 73:18 78:17 198:5 201:19 201:20 223:18 224:15 concept 82:18 97:3 concern 34:6 36:17 42:11 112:11 117:7 173:17 concerned 34:8 114:8 171:13	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 conforms 4:5 conforms 4:5 conforms 4:5 conforms 4:5 conforms 4:5 conforms 4:5 conforms 55:16 connections 155:2 connotes 95:19 consensus 183:24 consent 37:6 43:10 51:21 54:21 consequences 167:25
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8 channel 161:24 168:17 channelling 68:15 chapter 2:15 126:14 126:15,18 chapter 16:2 48:9 55:19 84:8 85:12 characterise 67:14 characterised 64:5 65:9	45:8 52:23 66:12 112:24 circumstantial 20:6 cite 82:7 cited 19:18 64:8 75:1 119:9 137:21 cites 182:9 cities 128:18 133:13 133:16,25 178:21 city 133:16,17,18,20 civil 78:9 claim 35:8 102:16 clarification 23:10 66:2 94:4 167:1 clarify 23:7 63:24 122:14 clarifying 102:12 121:15 classed 177:10 classification 178:1 classified 177:2 classified 177:2 clas	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23 collapse 219:19,21 colleague 126:19 169:10 colleagues 9:10 124:20 collection 47:5 collectively 161:13 Collier's 25:10 Colombia 207:3 212:3 227:13 colonial 24:12 147:1	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17 95:11,13,25 96:1 100:2,11 common 40:8 48:21 77:20 194:24 201:7 201:8 commonly 177:6 227:10 communication 103:3 companies 91:9 company 139:25 comparable 46:22	<pre>comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprises 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15 concept 36:7 60:3,8,9 60:10 65:11 68:15 69:12 71:11 73:18 78:17 198:5 201:19 201:20 223:18 224:15 concepts 82:18 97:3 concern 34:6 36:17 42:11 112:11 117:7 173:17 concerned 34:8 114:8</pre>	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 confirms 4:5 confirms 4:5 conformity 5:16 conforms 4:5 connotes 155:2 connotes 95:19 consensus 183:24 consent 37:6 43:10 51:21 54:21 consequences 167:25 185:6 226:22
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8 channel 161:24 168:17 channelling 68:15 chapeau 92:6 107:8 chapet 2:15 126:14 126:15,18 character 16:2 48:9 55:19 84:8 85:12 characterise 67:14 characterise 67:14 characterise 19:24 204:13 characteristic 91:24 204:14	$\begin{array}{c} 45:8\ 52:23\ 66:12\\ 112:24\\ \textbf{circumstantial}\ 20:6\\ \textbf{cite}\ 82:7\\ \textbf{cited}\ 19:18\ 64:8\ 75:1\\ 119:9\ 137:21\\ \textbf{cites}\ 182:9\\ \textbf{cities}\ 128:18\ 133:13\\ 133:16,25\ 178:21\\ \textbf{city}\ 133:16,17,18,20\\ \textbf{civil}\ 78:9\\ \textbf{claim}\ 35:8\ 102:16\\ \textbf{clarification}\ 23:10\\ 66:2\ 94:4\ 167:1\\ \textbf{clarify}\ 23:7\ 63:24\\ 122:14\\ \textbf{clarifying}\ 102:12\\ 121:15\\ \textbf{classed}\ 177:10\\ \textbf{classified}\ 177:2\\ \textbf{classified}\ 177:2$	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23 collapse 219:19,21 colleague 126:19 169:10 colleagues 9:10 124:20 collection 47:5 collectively 161:13 Collier's 25:10 Colombia 207:3 212:3 227:13 colomia 24:12 147:1 155:1 column 213:8 combination 146:16	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17 95:11,13,25 96:1 100:2,11 common 40:8 48:21 77:20 194:24 201:7 201:8 commonly 177:6 227:10 communication 103:3 comparies 91:9 compary 139:25 compare 224:6 compared 137:24	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprised 142:7 comprised 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 concedte 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15 concept 36:7 60:3,8,9 60:10 65:11 68:15 69:12 71:11 73:18 78:17 198:5 201:19 201:20 223:18 224:15 concept 82:18 97:3 concern 34:6 36:17 42:11 112:11 117:7 173:17 concerned 34:8 114:8 171:13 concerning 19:25 36:9 78:11,14 89:23	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confluence 158:20 conforms 4:5 confusing 64:2 connections 155:2 connections 155:2 consequences 167:25 185:6 226:22 Consequently 132:19 consider 80:24 110:15 187:23
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8 channel 161:24 168:17 channeling 68:15 chapeau 92:6 107:8 chapter 2:15 126:14 126:15,18 character 16:2 48:9 55:19 84:8 85:12 characteriste 67:14 characteriste 67:14 characteristic 91:24 204:13 characteristic 206:14 chart 153:10	$\begin{array}{c} 45:8\ 52:23\ 66:12\\ 112:24\\ \textbf{circumstantial}\ 20:6\\ \textbf{cite}\ 82:7\\ \textbf{cited}\ 19:18\ 64:8\ 75:1\\ 119:9\ 137:21\\ \textbf{cites}\ 182:9\\ \textbf{cites}\ 128:18\ 133:13\\ 133:16,25\ 178:21\\ \textbf{city}\ 133:16,17,18,20\\ \textbf{civil}\ 78:9\\ \textbf{claim}\ 35:8\ 102:16\\ \textbf{clarification}\ 23:10\\ 66:2\ 94:4\ 167:1\\ \textbf{clarify}\ 23:7\ 63:24\\ 122:14\\ \textbf{clarifying}\ 102:12\\ 121:15\\ \textbf{classification}\ 178:1\\ \textbf{classification}\ 178:1\\ \textbf{classification}\ 178:1\\ \textbf{classification}\ 178:1\\ \textbf{classifig}\ 177:24\ 192:11\\ \textbf{clay}\ 197:3\ 213:2\ 228:4\\ \textbf{clays}\ 192:3,4,5\\ \textbf{clean}\ 208:8\ 219:10\\ \textbf{clear}\ 3:17\ 22:18,21\\ 27:2\ 39:14\ 42:3\\ 44:23\ 45:7\ 47:17\\ 50:12\ 52:1\ 55:22\\ 67:25\ 68:2\ 72:22\\ 80:9\ 87:6\ 101:15\\ 112:18\ 171:7\ 181:7\\ \end{array}$	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23 collapse 219:19,21 colleague 126:19 169:10 colleagues 9:10 124:20 collection 47:5 collectively 161:13 Collier's 25:10 Colombia 207:3 212:3 227:13 colonial 24:12 147:1 155:1 column 213:8 combination 146:16 170:9 191:12	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17 95:11,13,25 96:1 100:2,11 common 40:8 48:21 77:20 194:24 201:7 201:8 commonly 177:6 227:10 communication 103:3 companies 91:9 compare 139:25 compared 137:24 142:18 145:7	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprised 142:7 comprised 133:2 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 compromise 116:21 116:22 conceded 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15 concept 36:7 60:3,8,9 60:10 65:11 68:15 69:12 71:11 73:18 78:17 198:5 201:19 201:20 223:18 224:15 concept 82:18 97:3 concern 34:6 36:17 42:11 112:11 117:7 173:17 concerned 34:8 114:8 171:13 concerning 19:25 36:9 78:11,14 89:23 90:23 102:7 107:20	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirme 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confirms 92:6 confuence 158:20 conforms 4:5 conforms 4:5 conforms 4:5 connections 155:2 connections 155:2 connections 155:2 connections 155:2 connections 155:2 connections 155:2 connections 155:2 connections 155:2 connections 155:2 connections 155:2 connects 95:19 consenus 183:24 consequences 167:25 185:6 226:22 Consequently 132:19 consider 80:24 110:15 187:23 consider able 11:9
75:24 78:18 108:9 108:18,18,21 110:19 112:13,18 112:20 126:12,17 128:3 168:11 171:9 177:16 178:10 180:2 181:10,15,17 181:19,20 182:1,23 184:17 185:21 197:12 198:5 changed 47:7 209:15 changes 50:6 61:4 127:24 155:12,13 160:5 171:8 183:4 184:2 changing 102:24 103:8 channel 161:24 168:17 channelling 68:15 chapeau 92:6 107:8 chapet 2:15 126:14 126:15,18 character 16:2 48:9 55:19 84:8 85:12 characterise 67:14 characterise 67:14 characterise 19:24 204:13 characteristic 91:24 204:14	$\begin{array}{c} 45:8\ 52:23\ 66:12\\ 112:24\\ \textbf{circumstantial}\ 20:6\\ \textbf{cite}\ 82:7\\ \textbf{cited}\ 19:18\ 64:8\ 75:1\\ 119:9\ 137:21\\ \textbf{cites}\ 182:9\\ \textbf{cities}\ 128:18\ 133:13\\ 133:16,25\ 178:21\\ \textbf{city}\ 133:16,17,18,20\\ \textbf{civil}\ 78:9\\ \textbf{claim}\ 35:8\ 102:16\\ \textbf{clarification}\ 23:10\\ 66:2\ 94:4\ 167:1\\ \textbf{clarify}\ 23:7\ 63:24\\ 122:14\\ \textbf{clarifying}\ 102:12\\ 121:15\\ \textbf{classed}\ 177:10\\ \textbf{classified}\ 177:2\\ \textbf{classified}\ 177:2$	cloudy 205:13 coal 205:7 206:1 coarse 192:17,17 196:24 197:6 228:3 coat 218:20 coated 220:11 coating 210:14,15 218:13,14 219:4 coatings 219:2 220:12 cobbles 192:24 193:14 196:9 cobble-sized 193:11 codified 103:4 coffee 12:6 73:22 186:25 coincide 153:22 coincidence 4:23 collapse 219:19,21 colleague 126:19 169:10 colleagues 9:10 124:20 collection 47:5 collectively 161:13 Collier's 25:10 Colombia 207:3 212:3 227:13 colomia 24:12 147:1 155:1 column 213:8 combination 146:16	commenting 182:20 comments 54:19 169:14 commerce 86:13,19 91:1 119:24 122:16 134:2 commercial 134:1 commission 36:8,8 37:8 77:19 97:17 102:6,13,16 103:20 116:23 commissioned 136:10 136:18 Commissioner 2:4 20:12 101:22 102:20 103:5 committee 72:17 95:11,13,25 96:1 100:2,11 common 40:8 48:21 77:20 194:24 201:7 201:8 commonly 177:6 227:10 communication 103:3 comparies 91:9 compary 139:25 compare 224:6 compared 137:24	comprehensive 89:5 166:23 183:9 comprise 130:22 150:16 comprised 142:7 comprised 142:7 comprised 129:12 136:11 149:3 161:1 comprising 133:2 150:12 concedte 54:25 concentration 210:4 212:17 213:2,4,4 220:16,17,20,20 222:9 concentrations 212:15 concept 36:7 60:3,8,9 60:10 65:11 68:15 69:12 71:11 73:18 78:17 198:5 201:19 201:20 223:18 224:15 concept 82:18 97:3 concern 34:6 36:17 42:11 112:11 117:7 173:17 concerned 34:8 114:8 171:13 concerning 19:25 36:9 78:11,14 89:23	confidence 181:25 configuration 197:16 201:8 206:3 213:21 214:9 configurations 200:10 214:22 configure 212:24 217:10 confined 60:8 confirm 28:3 60:20 107:10,13 confirmed 37:18 44:22 45:6 77:21 140:18 146:2 confirms 92:6 confluence 158:20 conformity 5:16 conforms 4:5 confusing 64:2 connections 155:2 connections 155:2 consequences 167:25 185:6 226:22 Consequently 132:19 consider 80:24 110:15 187:23

	-	-			
considerably 190:12	consumptive 35:11	control 25:18 27:21	147:19,20 189:10	criterion 58:15 59:1	d 1:10 4:7,11,16,18,24
201:9	42:10 52:3	30:23,24 31:6,8,19	215:8	60:3,11,17	9:1,13 13:16 15:10
consideration 93:18	contain 47:4 197:24	32:9,12 34:11 36:2	country 26:2 31:8,18	critical 16:21 23:22	15:13,18 23:25 46:4
115:5 148:18,19	contained 87:12	36:19 37:1 38:6,9	31:20 146:17 150:6	32:6 43:25 132:16	49:23 50:4 52:6,21
183:6 207:14	contemplates 4:18	38:19 39:22 40:24	150:6 161:5 162:22	141:7,23 144:3,6,22	55:9,23 56:24 57:5
considerations 58:6	contemporaneity	48:24 50:15,24 53:8	173:3 177:3,8	158:6 159:16 164:9	57:9 58:24 59:14
93:20 109:12	77:10	69:9 112:16 132:22	181:22 190:10	166:10 168:19	61:5 62:24 77:4
110:20	contemporaneous	134:5 142:22 156:2	country's 128:22	176:7 177:13 186:6	79:19,25 80:11 87:4
considered 76:18	44:16 79:11	158:6,25 159:16	145:3 161:16	186:9	87:13 91:18 92:6,10
91:11 97:16 104:10	contemporary 79:6,7	201:22 202:25	163:22	critically 7:20 16:5	92:13 107:14
considering 88:3	content 5:4 102:3	213:14	couple 65:2 157:19	17:15	112:12,12 115:11
considers 7:10 93:21	contention 3:7,25	controllable 201:13	204:1 205:4,10	crop 34:24 135:25	116:14 122:1 143:2
consistency 85:18	contest 4:1 20:11	201:20,21,24,24	211:3 214:1 215:20	143:19,19,21,23,25	174:16 175:8,15
consistent 7:22 34:23	36:21	202:2,4,14,19,22,23	217:5 227:13,14	144:4 164:17	176:8 186:18
59:19 76:17 90:24	contested 32:14	226:22	course 5:22 6:3,6,7,20	cropping 184:13	daily 58:11,21 59:4,23
108:3 196:23	context 4:12 23:17	convention 53:1 75:17	9:16 11:10,19 12:17	crops 144:4,8,11	143:14
constant 50:14 56:2	32:4 47:6,10 49:24	76:9,15 79:1 81:5	12:21 16:11 18:15	146:4 185:19	dam 19:16 22:23
56:12 60:24 67:20	50:5 56:22 75:23	82:10 83:4 84:11,17	64:16 72:12 74:17	crossing 131:12	58:12 136:9,12,21
constitute 63:15 66:16 103:25	76:14 79:13,18 82:17,24 86:24,25	94:13,14,21 95:4,15 95:23 98:4 99:6	83:6,11 117:8,18,23 122:24 123:6	cross-referenced 80:11	139:9 159:9 165:6 193:5 196:7 197:10
constituted 95:14 96:1	82:17,24 86:24,25 87:4,6,10,23 88:2,5	95:23 98:4 99:6 101:1	122:24 125:6	crowd 123:7	193:5 196:7 197:10
constituted 93:14 96:1 constitutes 63:20	87:4,0,10,23 88:2,3	conventional 79:11	124:22 125:6,25	crucial 88:13 146:15	197:19,22 198:15
65:14 72:18 95:4	95:21,23 98:13,24	108:2 205:7	129:15 130:23	160:18	203:13,13 208:17
101:14	100:10 101:24	conventions 74:24	131:18,19,20	crystallised 19:12	214:19 227:18,23
constituting 142:11	102:5 103:16 105:4	converging 131:5,16	132:15,25 134:6	32:23	damage 207:23
constitution 95:10	109:8 115:6,18	conversation 49:16	142:14 146:5 147:4	crystals 195:5	210:17 217:25
100:1,10 111:6	117:24 121:11	62:10 67:11	150:13,24 152:9	cubbyhole 62:9	219:24 224:20
constitutional 17:15	122:18 125:21	convert 202:14	153:22 157:5,18	cubic 104:6 136:13	226:9
constrained 32:15	141:6 167:17 204:5	converted 211:19	158:5 163:20 166:5	167:2 177:3,15,22	damages 219:22
173:21	205:1 209:20 229:4	conveyed 35:20 42:17	168:23 172:12	cumecs 111:10	damaging 198:2
constraining 51:1	contextual 87:18	cooling 208:2,3,5,8	173:18,20 175:8,11	cumulative 140:10,22	dams 12:9,11 17:11
constrains 93:8	contiguous 144:15	220:5	175:25 177:16,19	curious 62:22 85:7	18:22,22 19:1,1,2
constraints 46:2 94:2	Continental 118:22	cooperative 29:22	178:20 179:19	151:14	140:1 159:13
94:7 111:20 175:16	120:7	114:19	180:18 181:17	current 77:16 122:8	160:10,10 161:2
186:17 190:9,9,25	contingency 187:7	coordinated 162:19	183:19 188:1	122:25 138:16	173:1 201:8 202:25
191:1 213:12	continuance 104:18	core 43:2 82:4 98:3,5	189:18 190:13,21	151:14 171:20	208:12
construct 21:24 37:15	continue 20:21 72:9	98:15	191:22 192:1	177:25 182:7 183:9	dangerous 184:16
37:19,23 41:13 93:8 148:9	83:2 164:10 179:6 179:19 182:17	corner 215:14 cornerstone 100:22	195:21 197:25 202:18 205:23	212:1 227:7 228:14 229:7	Daniel 2:9 3:3,5 1:5,8 1:11 5:10 10:5,7,11
constructed 39:1	187:4,6,16,20 188:3	corporation 25:16	202.18 205.25 211:21 212:12	currently 62:7 68:8	20:23 24:11 28:13
42:12 46:2 103:14	226:25	Corps 18:6	226:7,9	189:17,19 212:3	75:12 76:3 79:9
105:13 144:23	continued 3:2 1:10	correct 6:7 46:19 70:4	courts 76:5 77:22	currents 198:11	85:5 88:10 101:25
158:18 173:1	30:19 40:12 44:2	73:11 105:4 108:14	Court's 3:2 7:4 8:4	227:16,22 228:9,17	104:12 106:13
174:22	continues 20:11	110:13 121:20	65:4 101:21 108:8	228:20,24	113:21 123:24
constructing 22:13	182:19 197:8	corrected 55:11	110:24 186:13	cursory 43:3	124:6 125:13 139:5
construction 14:14	continuing 187:15	correction 173:25	cover 132:4 192:3	curtailing 92:15	172:24 174:25
22:23,24 23:2,4	continuously 113:25	correctly 5:13 96:1	covered 78:9 112:15	curve 79:21 203:2,3,4	187:10 188:4
33:16 36:10 39:8	122:7 205:24	correspondence 19:13	covering 74:10	203:20 215:13	data 22:3 140:18,21
43:13,22 45:9 55:24	continuum 87:7	39:7 41:22 44:17	covers 149:22	custom 113:8	142:23 143:2,4
56:8 58:7,12 87:8	contours 20:2	52:1 69:4	Crawford 63:17 116:3	customary 52:25	167:10 180:19,25
93:22 111:21	contracts 74:15	corresponding 80:1	117:13	74:24 86:1,3 90:22	191:25 220:18
118:25 139:13,21	contractual 119:7	134:12 203:19	Creager 79:8	108:1,5 109:6,22	221:24,25 222:5
155:22 156:20	contrary 99:5,6	cost 33:17 147:24	create 104:7 118:14	110:2,14 111:3,7	223:4,4,5 225:21
157:20 159:9	164:15	205:20,20,21	121:7	112:23 121:22,23	228:1,12
173:11,25 174:2,7 174:23 175:10	contrast 82:20 89:18	211:21 218:2,3,3,4	created 88:24 126:9 216:15	122:12 140:13 customer 79:22	date 121:23,24 122:13 153:22 171:6
217:18,24 218:7	128:24 129:9 172:22	218:8,9 224:9,11,16 Costa 119:19,23	creates 89:6	customer 79:22 cut 26:23 27:10,11,12	174:22 182:12
constructions 105:7	contrasting 119:10	costs 147:15	creating 216:12	34:8	dated 45:13 126:15
construe 8:8 99:13	contrasting 119.10	cotton 146:5	creation 136:19	cutting 16:17 163:8	David 25:9
construed 13:2,10	contribute 220:21	couched 54:14 55:4	creature 182:25	cut-away 217:12	day 1:6 3:4 1:4 2:8
95:7,20 97:13 98:18	228:10	70:18	credit 190:24	cut-off 27:5	10:10 11:2 21:12
118:9	contributed 147:20,22	Counsel 2:20,20	crest 201:11 202:3,12	cycle 204:9 209:12	24:10,25 27:19
consular 91:4	contributes 142:3	countenance 40:15	criminal 78:9	225:20	56:15 57:14 187:3
consultants 34:21	145:11	counterweight 141:7	crisis 40:17 155:16	cycles 225:17	188:13 204:18
139:25	contributing 142:16	141:9	criteria 4:5,19 5:17	cyclical 171:8	229:10,15
Consultative 95:12	contribution 148:17	counter-memorial	8:9 13:2 19:23	C1 105:9	days 44:1 75:8 137:21
consume 145:7 172:16	contributions 41:5	27:25 105:6	76:16 79:14 93:10		147:22 205:10
consumes 145:2	contributor 133:6	countries 26:22 31:2	99:2,4 111:23	D	220:19,20,25 221:2

· ·	-				
221.2 5 17	J-B	215.5 25 221.0 11	115:1.2	165-0 174-10 209-4	Hatelberthen 156.11
221:3,5,17	delimit 117:7	215:5,25 221:9,11		165:9 174:10 208:4	distribution 156:11
de 129:14	delimitation 13:12	221:13,14 222:10	determinations 4:3	214:21	159:22 162:21
dead 8:7 15:19 88:4	90:4 113:11 114:4	222:12,14	5:19,23 6:17 92:20	disadvantages 212:10	ditches 161:13
deal 9:11 190:19	114:11 115:7	desanders 199:13,15	determine 31:9 63:24	disagreements 103:21	divergence 41:12
192:2,24 200:9	116:10,25	211:22 216:24	66:14 104:23 105:2	disappointed 47:1	divergent 101:7
dealing 1:21 2:20 7:3	delimitations 114:6	221:9 226:20	107:9 109:5	discern 63:19	diversion 151:15
111:15 114:3 199:7	delimiting 89:21 90:2	desanding 192:23	determined 76:4	discharge 58:20 59:22	divert 40:21 110:23
209:1	114:20 116:8	descended 130:9	99:16 104:25	80:2 198:17	211:15,17
deals 115:11	delivered 124:19	165:3	determining 110:18	discharges 143:14	diverted 159:1
dealt 2:1 76:6,23	delta 197:2,10,11,18	descending 130:5,16	detriment 151:19	191:22	divided 24:15
115:13 224:18	197:21,23 198:22	describe 117:1	devastate 28:22	discharging 129:25	dividing 30:22
debate 72:16,17	198:22,23 199:4	described 27:25 29:8	devastated 28:23	disclosure 106:13	division 16:14,17
debated 171:7	208:17 227:20	58:17 61:2 66:15	devastating 164:18	discuss 44:2 127:6	30:24 33:20 35:24
debris 200:17	demand 60:18 79:20	147:10	develop 29:18 39:21	135:2 141:15 152:7	36:2 40:6,20 45:15
decades 103:19	126:5,8 145:7 152:4	describes 28:1	51:21 52:13 75:11	discussed 45:22 46:13	50:15 53:12 91:22
181:12 182:17	176:10 178:8	describing 29:3	76:2 104:14 108:15	103:23 141:14	docked 187:20
223:21	179:23,24 180:1,3	144:21 150:2	189:6 191:2	155:16	document 66:24 67:1
decelerate 179:15	185:25 204:25	description 28:19	developed 140:2	discussing 108:6	102:3 106:13 139:3
December 46:12	demands 48:17,23	59:19 70:19	developing 102:25	discussion 17:8 34:13	documents 46:17
47:12 48:7,11 50:7	179:20	desert 29:11 31:15	development 29:23	35:13 63:15,18 64:1	66:12 67:7 70:7
53:23 54:2 55:13,21	demand-side 127:22	137:4,5	31:24 33:2,10 35:10	64:4,16 75:6 76:2	document-by-docu
56:2 204:13	176:21 180:10,11	design 3:24 4:4,13,19	37:5 49:5 51:12,22	96:20 106:21 163:8	107:3
decide 115:10	demographic 127:24	4:24 5:16 8:9,10,21	54:20 109:24	167:21	doing 1:18 16:10
decided 120:1	Demography 126:16	11:6 13:2 14:14	114:18,19 127:8	discussions 37:14 38:1	98:16 211:8 219:25
decision 3:15 92:21	demonstrate 126:1	19:22 46:1 58:7,15	131:21 134:9,10	38:12 43:3 103:20	domestic 74:15 80:19
94:3 140:14	dense 178:24	59:1 60:2,11,17	135:4 137:12	displace 84:9	120:9 135:12 145:5
decisions 1:24 3:1,3	density 178:22 198:11	86:1 87:8 93:17,25	138:10,17 140:17	displaced 84:5	172:15 179:23
4:10 14:24 78:19	227:7,16,22 228:9	102:19 111:21	147:20 155:20	dispositive 3:6,20 6:23	dominate 95:24 192:4
decision-maker 101:8	228:14,17,20,23	126:21 188:19	157:17	91:13 108:14	DON 1:11
decision[s 3:12	229:6	189:2 191:21	developments 62:5,15	disproportionate	done 2:23 116:25
-	denying 39:23				
declare 6:10		199:21 200:5,24	119:16	132:14 133:2	134:7 136:5 164:17
decline 170:21,23	depart 79:10	201:16 208:23	device 20:18	220:21	166:6 182:11
171:1	departing 85:22	210:8,16 213:14	diagram 164:7 195:16	disproportionately	189:18 194:17
declined 171:15	depend 6:1 112:9	214:10 219:1,25	200:21 201:3 202:6	178:19	201:2 213:23
decrease 151:17 181:5	185:3 188:13	225:5	202:7 213:18 215:3	dispute 1:22,25 4:12	216:23 227:13
deemed 61:24	dependence 40:13	designation 124:5	diagrams 153:16	8:14,17,18,20 13:18	dot 206:22
deep 18:20 25:4 40:18	143:11 152:19	designed 61:17 186:14	154:8	17:13 19:11,12,13	dotted 191:20 203:24
200:25 202:18	dependent 31:7 34:12	208:10,21,24 209:3	diamond 195:18	19:15,23 20:3,7	double 179:24
203:14 213:9,16	36:20 48:25 69:10	211:4 225:2	differ 74:14	25:3,11,24 26:4,5	double-check 73:17
228:21	146:13 148:14	designer 218:6	difference 45:1 115:9	26:22 28:6 29:7,9	169:21
deeper 19:16 197:15	157:13 165:15	designing 228:13	157:16 158:24	77:25 78:2,6,9,14	doubt 95:5 145:16
202:19	depending 190:9	designs 94:6 103:22	193:21 220:10	78:20 93:17 107:20	doubted 6:14
defer 11:11	213:21 220:15	175:15 189:12	differences 3:7 4:19	119:22	dovetails 143:18
deferred 35:13	depends 31:21 66:23	desirable 31:4	5:16 202:6	disputes 4:13 31:23	down 26:4 35:14
	-			-	
defined 47:25 55:15	66:25 198:16 219:4	desires 49:5 51:12	different 28:1 30:6	102:7,10,12 112:11	151:16 154:9
64:22 65:21 77:12	227:24	desirous 89:16	97:14 108:22 141:1	disrupt 166:15	156:25 159:1
80:25 81:13,19 82:3	depleted 178:4	Despite 41:9 139:21	141:21 146:9	dissonance 80:25	174:21 191:8 193:3
83:25 89:14 91:6	depletion 8:7 88:3	destroy 210:22	167:11,12,13,13	distance 163:15	193:7,11 196:16
96:10 201:23 202:2	172:19	detached 97:2	171:10 183:14	203:12 215:25	202:21 206:7 207:6
defines 79:24 89:6	deployment 186:16	detail 7:18 10:8 14:25	185:9 190:5 193:17	216:1	208:17 212:21
defining 86:18 91:24	deposit 197:1	16:5 25:13 27:15	194:5 195:21	distances 147:6	213:1 217:15
definition 45:25 59:18	deposited 196:17	28:6,11 43:4 47:13	200:10 201:19	distant 1:14	221:19 222:2 223:9
60:9,23 61:1 62:23	197:9	57:2,6 75:3 83:22	209:24 211:3 214:2	distilled 102:11	downgraded 177:9
81:2,17 121:24	deposition 196:24	97:5 135:2 152:8	214:22 217:6	distinct 79:12 197:12	downstream 21:15
200:20 202:4	deposits 196:10,11,14	154:1	222:19 223:12	197:14	24:19 73:8 131:17
definitive 114:7	197:22,23 227:20	detailed 9:12,16 15:13	228:19	distinction 64:11,20	137:14 140:16
definitively 86:6	deprivation 29:11	32:5 42:24 44:5	differentiate 192:16	65:7	158:9,19 161:24
deformation 225:1	31:14	45:22 46:1 50:25	differs 119:14	distinctive 46:19	163:11 165:14,22
degree 35:1 105:22	depth 200:25 202:21	52:6 57:4 98:15	difficult 61:7 198:23	distinguish 76:3 162:2	175:19 190:11,19
134:7	213:19	99:4 148:3 180:18	216:20 227:25	181:17	197:8,9 212:16,20
delay 22:20 155:17	Deputy 2:19 20:15	189:15	difficulty 187:9	distinguished 83:23	213:11 226:22
delegation 37:18	24:20	details 32:18 43:21	208:20	118:19	downward 180:16
delegations 94:19	derived 145:22 194:8	178:3	dimension 2:17	distort 164:14	dozen 224:3
Delhi 41:6	derogant 97:20	determination 2:5,10	diminish 88:21	distributaries 156:16	Dr 1:11 2:10,13 4:1
deliberate 91:22 120:2	derogate 97:21	3:6,19,22 4:1,2,22	directed 49:21	156:18 163:3	2:19 11:2,12 12:7,8
137:16	derogated 96:5	5:25 6:2,5,15 7:11	direction 192:9	distribute 125:9	12:15,17 17:6 18:9
deliberately 27:14	desander 199:6,15,17	7:14,20 8:5 19:25	directly 49:23 93:21	152:12 156:18	18:13,18,24,25 19:2
denderately 27.14				-	
53:4 54:14 111:17	214:3,4,6,6 215:1,2	20:1 57:17 58:14	118:1 156:1 161:22	162:22	19:4 40:8 61:17
•	214:3,4,6,6 215:1,2	20:1 57:17 58:14	118:1 156:1 161:22	162:22	19:4 40:8 61:17

Trevor McGowan

Page 6

	-				
62:8 86:9 108:10	137:14 138:4	195:12	emissions 181:16	130:5 137:18 138:7	Essex 2:9,10
		east-flowing 170:20			·
111:12 123:20,25	143:12,23,24,25		emphasise 110:12	140:12,21,23	establish 59:7,9 76:16
124:2 126:19,22	144:3,8,10 146:25	easy 150:11 207:11	190:7	227:17	190:25 213:19
142:25 143:3	147:3 154:20	eating 39:22	emphasised 38:21	entered 71:22	established 147:21
166:21,22 167:16	155:21 160:8,13	echo 6:8	42:13 48:7 49:9	entering 129:22 131:5	201:16
169:8,19 175:21	164:17 184:12,23	economic 91:3 93:20	50:22 76:25 89:19	131:9 211:13	establishing 113:23
176:2,17 180:17	184:24 191:21,24	109:24 145:9	91:16 109:17	enters 130:8 131:10	118:10
181:2 187:1,4,23	197:4 198:13 201:5	economical 86:1,8,12	Empire 134:3	143:7,7,8 164:23	estates 94:24
188:9,10,21 227:1,5	204:18,19,23	86:19 111:20	employ 98:2	165:2 169:25 197:5	estimate 145:23 229:1
227:11 229:3,10,12	205:23 226:6	122:22	employed 98:12	198:12	229:2
draft 37:12 43:7,20	dust 97:19	economy 42:19 45:1,4	employs 145:12	entertaining 65:6	estimated 147:15
45:13 47:11,13 48:1		141:25 145:16,16	empty 202:15 212:7,8	entire 27:12 31:24	179:8
48:7,11 50:2,4,6,7,9	E	148:11 186:8	212:13	32:25 33:8 36:2	estimates 173:8
53:23 54:2,8,9		eddies 214:11,15	enable 22:4 31:8 93:9	38:21 53:13 69:12	179:14 194:5,7
	e 48:4,6 49:22 50:5	-			-
55:11,13,21 57:5	55:23 62:21 63:5	215:19,22 216:4	encapsulated 25:8	129:24 138:13,18	et 189:23 190:11
58:1,5 59:12,14,17	80:6 112:12 116:14	eddy 215:11,18,20,24	45:21	165:14 218:21	213:21
59:25 61:4 71:10	each 11:18 12:20 30:7	effect 5:24 6:18,24	enclosure 49:15 58:2	entirely 5:13 60:24	Eugene 29:17
206:17,23 217:10	30:25 31:8,18 33:20	7:15,16 20:9 22:6	207:4	66:4 70:4 192:22	evaporation 180:5
217:14 222:16	43:6 53:13 66:25	33:14,17 40:6,19	encouraging 91:2	entirety 152:12	185:17
drafters 79:4 84:7	85:13 86:9 89:23	88:21 90:13 163:9	encroach 36:22	entitled 42:9 54:8 55:6	evapotranspiration
drafting 84:2,10	93:10 114:20	165:20	encroachment 39:15	126:15 135:18	171:10 180:5
drafts 43:7 47:5,9	117:20 129:14,15	effected 54:7	end 9:7,8,8 26:6 37:17	142:1	185:24
56:13 57:23 59:15	129:17 133:6 141:2	effective 45:10 121:23	57:23 59:10 61:14	entitlement 47:23	even 2:22 9:7 34:10
60:25 72:8	154:22 163:4,6	121:24 122:13	65:6 73:5 106:21	93:8 110:23	38:9 40:6 41:20
drainage 128:19		219:3 220:12	108:11 136:3	entitles 137:18	42:17 63:21 64:21
dramatic 127:24	175:2 203:17 204:2	effectively 64:10	153:23 166:16	entrainment 210:9	68:15 71:8 94:20
140:16 183:21	210:10 225:22	131:11 139:19	184:1 186:4 187:3	212:25 214:10	99:19,22 137:1
140:16 183:21 185:16 206:6	eager 10:7	158:25 165:5	184:1 180:4 187:3	entrance 214:7 216:6	143:24 163:22
	earlier 72:8 114:12				
dramatically 136:24	118:16 120:7 144:3	175:23	209:17,18 221:13	enumerated 92:1	165:19 175:17
draw 23:23 61:9 94:6	151:2 160:17 165:2	effectiveness 82:16	229:10	environment 109:7,25	177:17 178:5
121:20 170:19	181:9	88:17	endeavour 11:20	141:24 190:10	182:17 185:15
212:21 213:7	early 23:2 26:8,24	effects 5:18 88:9	endeavours 148:9	191:2 204:14 209:8	186:8 216:12
drawdown 6:14 8:6	32:21 35:1 43:24	108:18 182:1	ends 197:17	209:11,14,19	228:11
20:10 92:21	56:16 80:14 144:9	efficiency 224:25	energy 179:20 205:2	224:22 226:5	evening 204:20
drawing 90:6	144:10 146:4	225:4,6,7 226:2	221:5,6 225:7,24	environmental 93:20	evenly 216:17
draws 9:25	164:17,25 177:15	egregious 175:16	226:5	109:11 110:19,20	event 104:14 115:18
drew 4:14 15:17	earnest 10:17	eight 189:11	engage 18:13 75:5	119:5 190:18	140:16 197:5
drilling-down 71:12	Earth 144:15,16	eighth 181:21	115:24	envisaged 29:22 31:13	events 24:6,8 25:2
drinking 161:18,22,23	-	either 21:24 31:20	engine 205:6	33:5 43:8 48:2,4	28:6 192:25 193:6
drives 202:20	easier 65:10 207:13	60:20 64:12 83:16	engineer 17:25 190:8	52:2	eventually 54:25 68:7
driving 223:7	easily 96:10 121:9	83:19 104:14	engineering 3:25 11:7	EPA 81:12	69:24
drop 177:22 196:16	200:7	111:17 165:12	17:4,7,12,19 18:2	equally 73:18 89:16	ever 21:15 25:6
-	east 151:25			1 0	
200:2 206:24	eastern 13:8 16:15	168:17 190:20	21:16,24 22:14	133:12 179:6	131:23 147:11
217:15 221:13	30:24,25 33:8,15	221:9	61:25 122:25	equates 147:16,23	186:9 222:3
225:7,8,8,8 228:9	34:10,17 36:3 38:23	elaborated 9:10	188:20	equation 71:16	every 100:23 154:22
drops 227:19	39:23 40:23 50:15	132:11	engineers 17:9,16,22	equilibrium 197:20	175:4 225:14
drop-off 141:3	53:14 117:9 126:3	elaborates 126:13	18:6 79:5 224:18	198:8	everybody 226:11
drought 183:22	127:5,8,16 129:4,16	elected 95:13,16	engineer's 126:21	equipment 190:16	everyone 1:3 123:12
184:10,12,14,16	130:22 131:20,24	electricity 25:18	enhancing 146:8	198:1 200:6 207:24	123:17 125:11
dry 126:4 127:9 134:8	133:11,24 134:6,13	139:11 159:15	enjoyed 40:23	209:10,25 224:19	everything 9:9 72:22
137:14,18,21	134:16,21 135:4,5,8	element 106:8	enormity 166:7	equivalent 60:1 119:8	91:15 202:3
140:11 152:6	135:19,24 136:5,19	elements 8:1 14:8	enormous 136:6 157:8	119:18 120:5	everywhere 194:25
160:23 184:24	136:25 137:12,16	26:21 76:14 154:15	166:14	erode 225:3	ever-growing 185:25
191:7 204:15,15	,	154:23	enormously 134:14	eroded 195:13 225:12	ever-increasing 48:17
dual 90:13	137:21,23 138:2,12	elevation 201:11	185:5	erodes 193:4	48:23 180:11
due 6:20 53:9 109:21	138:14,18 139:17	203:2,4,6,16,18,21	enough 116:20 192:21	erosion 197:25 217:24	ever-present 26:19
126:11 131:21	139:22 140:6,9,11	203:25 204:1,6	204:16 228:22.22	escape 96:9	evident 56:4 97:7
	140:18,21 141:4,6,8	eleven 38:16	enquire 10:1	-	
134:9 146:15	141:14,19 142:12			especially 126:2	evidently 96:25
148:10 164:2 180:2	142:15 146:19	eliminated 221:4	enquiry 15:25 18:24	164:16 184:24	111:25
185:19,23 225:1	147:8 148:5,15,21	eliminating 214:25	19:3 62:17	essential 24:9 49:12	evolution 52:19 57:8
duration 35:1 219:4	149:20 150:14,24	Embassy 2:7,8	Enron 96:7 100:2,9	94:8 125:21 141:6	70:17,22 78:19
during 11:19 12:16,20	151:1 152:3 153:5	embedded 168:1	ensure 14:16 22:17	172:15,17	85:13 119:5 120:12
27:8 28:16 33:11	154:7 155:4,5	embodied 14:9 30:16	52:6 68:22 114:7	essentially 5:17 8:3	evolutionary 86:5
40:7 50:22 64:16	156:22 157:2,14,22	39:16	176:5	15:12 32:2 59:11	108:24 119:12
70:17 74:9,18 94:13	158:2,17 160:15,21	embraces 101:18	ensured 52:9,10	70:14 83:5 126:4	121:3,10,19
111:23 117:11	160:24 162:12,13	emerged 41:11	ensures 161:18	141:18 142:15	evolutive 83:9,17,19
123:6 134:2 135:16	164:12 165:9 166:9	emergency 168:20	ensuring 161:16	151:15,23 152:11	85:1 120:24
135:17,17,24	172:19,23 179:3	emerging 61:20	enter 109:9,10 115:15	175:9 180:7	evolve 120:4
1	112.17,25 117.5	00			

Trevor McGowan

					1 accady, > c ary 202
evolved 59:13 61:1	136:23 137:11,25	express 84:7 109:12	175:13	109:17 110:12	flag 62:17 63:1 124:25
evolving 119:1 122:20	139:20 140:2 142:2	expressed 2:11 42:11	falls 62:18,25 107:2	119:10 128:5 185:7	flash 182:25
exacerbate 185:20	142:24 144:2 145:8	84:7 114:11	132:15	223:16	flatlining 140:24
exact 83:20	145:13,20 146:14	expressing 66:20	familiar 18:21 25:11	finally 17:6 23:22 92:5	flattens 203:20
exactly 1:16 6:12	147:17 163:24	72:11	25:14 74:12 82:14	104:9 119:19 131:4	flawed 7:11 20:17
28:11 153:3 162:2	173:14 179:25	expression 72:5	82:18,23	151:11 163:19	flick 157:15
169:20 223:12	181:23 182:7	expressions 5:13	familiarity 189:21	Finance 145:10	floating 200:17,18
exaggeration 132:20	184:18	expressly 8:1 92:1	Fan 189:9	financed 147:19	floc 216:20
145:15	exhibits 12:14 29:24	110:8,21 111:4	far 31:6 75:6 113:16	financial 102:16	flood 25:18 103:3
examination 21:12	132:10 167:12	116:13 135:10	151:3 200:20	190:21,24	193:1,2 197:4
examine 102:16	178:3 184:6	expropriation 95:3	203:14	financing 40:5	198:13 200:22,22
example 11:25 15:19	exist 111:18	extend 113:15 135:12	farming 26:2	find 28:2 47:1 70:13	200:24 201:10,16
43:17 61:24 67:9,10	existed 72:7 105:11	151:2 161:8	farmland 161:15	113:8 119:1	221:19
67:15 72:10 79:8,15	existential 26:19	extending 35:1 213:17	farm-to-farm 156:19	finding 93:24 94:3	flooding 137:15
90:14 102:15	existing 30:7,9,19 34:7	extends 110:25 132:5	FATIMA 2:7	findings 6:18,19,21,24	184:10
106:24 111:14	34:16 68:4 73:13,13	163:12	faulty 6:9,11	25:23 35:5 91:12	floodplain 168:8
112:2 137:2 157:20	73:15 174:6 190:20	extension 150:3	favour 8:4	fine 187:10 188:4	floodplains 146:9
159:2 163:10,11	exists 164:2	extensive 25:13 26:16	fear 27:17	192:16,17,20 197:1	floods 182:25 183:1
164:21 165:15	exit 222:14	103:19 142:24	fearful 26:6	197:24 198:20	183:22 184:14
170:5 197:19 219:15	expand 56:6 134:14 134:19	185:18 extensively 65:2	fears 29:10 31:14 38:5 175:9	199:4 finer 197:7	200:10 201:7 floodwater 131:22
examples 77:23 82:6	expanded 136:24	189:17	feasible 165:5	fines 192:11 228:2,3	floor 74:3
99:25 157:19	expanded 136:24 expanding 140:5	extent 11:8 66:25 92:3	feature 56:12	finger 217:5	Florida 195:10
227:13	expansion 146:24,25	104:24 107:24	features 23:16 85:14	fingertips 169:6	flow 15:7 16:19,22,24
exceed 59:3 60:7	147:2,4,25 148:4	110:8 117:10 175:6	153:18 158:11	finish 176:16 187:22	25:25 26:12 32:25
except 33:3,11 55:15	151:24,25 153:10	175:7 176:1 185:2	161:19 163:16	223:16	33:4,8 34:18 35:9
135:9 137:14	153:12 154:2,19,22	external 112:25	February 3:6 8:17	finished 1:5,6 189:14	36:2,13 37:10,24
exception 15:8 47:25	154:23 157:8 160:1	142:10	20:2 30:10 139:12	finishing 189:15	38:21 39:3,10 40:1
48:2 54:15 55:19	160:2	extra 226:6	fed 137:3 161:24	firm 15:10 34:21 38:1	42:12 43:15,18
68:7 75:13 78:24	expansions 155:14	extract 116:2	feed 163:7,17 183:16	38:7 39:8 60:4,7,9	44:10 46:7 47:14,16
94:25 95:5,6 96:16	expansive 26:9	extracted 102:23	feeding 132:17	60:23 61:1,11,13	52:4,9 53:5,13,19
97:13 98:14,16	expect 197:14 218:23	extraneous 85:21	feel 71:4	62:22,23 72:25	53:25 54:6,16 67:20
99:15,16 131:22	224:23 228:23	154:11	feeling 27:20	79:17 80:5,12	68:12 69:13 72:5
151:9 174:15	expectation 187:4	extreme 27:17,21	feels 69:18 105:21	firmly 40:7 53:7	80:3 92:9 96:19,20
175:14	223:22	150:20	106:7	first 1:7 2:7,8 1:4	97:1,4 109:5,20
exceptions 15:5,12	expected 179:5 184:2	eyes 25:25	fell 104:4	10:18 11:18 19:12	111:10 116:12
32:11 48:9 49:25	expecting 229:4		few 144:20,21 162:1	23:19 24:3 30:16	125:24 126:2
53:21 55:23 56:9	expedient 28:24	F	204:11	32:8,21 34:5 36:7	134:22,24 138:2,25
69:13,23,25 71:13	expedition 148:10	f 3:9 4:9 5:1,14 112:12	field 18:8 194:22	37:14 39:20 42:24	139:19 140:18
94:11,15 96:20,23	expendable 223:19,23	face 135:22	fields 28:25	46:11 47:11,16 53:3	141:23 142:20,23
96:25 97:9,9 99:13	224:7	faces 164:21 186:1	fiercely 32:14 36:21	55:11 57:25 71:19	143:5,7 152:20
135:11 141:19,21	expensive 211:22	facial 5:12	56:7	72:16 74:9 75:9	161:4 166:10
exchange 44:3 101:21	experience 17:25	facilitate 159:5 217:11	Fietta 2:11,11,12,12	76:8,13,19 77:24	168:17 170:19,20
115:24	18:20 82:1 218:6	facilitating 161:6	2:13 3:21 1:18 2:25	87:1,21 88:16 89:4	171:1,22 174:10
exchanges 48:18	224:22 226:9 227:9	fact 34:6 66:5 73:16	7:3 10:24 16:4 17:4	101:11 102:2	175:22 181:11
49:21 56:4 exclusive 33:1,9 38:24	expert 3:5,12 4:10,21 5:15,19,22,24 6:5	116:6,20 121:21	108:15 124:9,11,14 125:10,19 151:13	103:19 108:21 116:2 118:23 127:2	182:21,25 183:2 186:10 187:15
53:14	6:17 7:10,20 8:19	128:20 130:8	151:21 167:9	128:9 139:4 146:24	191:16,19 198:14
exclusively 40:5 150:7	17:9,25 72:21 79:4	134:19 145:18	168:22 169:16,20	149:12,17 154:24	200:22 202:10
150:23	114:25 115:14	148:19 156:23,23	170:16,25 171:24	156:5,20 159:9	203:1 211:12
exclusivity 35:25	181:1	183:23 184:11	172:7,8 176:16,19	166:24 172:6	214:13 215:4,10
39:22	Experts 4:3	201:25	176:20 186:21,23	173:16 174:21	221:10
Excuse 46:6	Expert's 3:22 5:1 6:15	facto 129:14 factor 52:23 57:17	fifth 127:22	178:9,11 179:7	flowed 13:12
executive 116:23	20:1	58:11,11,15 61:10	figure 142:8 143:16	180:14 183:25	flowing 24:19 27:5
exercise 10:16 14:12	explain 13:25 16:14	61:12 93:23 213:13	144:19 149:3 154:8	184:7 191:4 205:19	129:23 131:14
16:17 93:17 106:13	47:9 52:22 82:2	factors 84:5 93:18	154:16 175:1 189:6	firsthand 26:8	138:22 145:25
109:11 112:6	102:3 112:15 126:5	171:7 183:18	196:8	fit 125:8	156:24 180:15,21
exercised 115:4	154:22 175:21	185:24	figures 138:8	fits 12:24	214:12,12
Exhibit 26:14,18 29:2	explained 31:16 44:11	fade 103:24	fill 194:18 202:15	Fitzmaurice 77:11	flows 69:22 103:3
30:11 34:1,5,19	103:5 172:22,25	failed 7:21 24:15 30:3	203:13,15	84:2,15	126:9 127:10 128:2
35:4,12 37:11,25	explanation 7:2 46:25	fair 33:20 80:23	filling 14:7 204:4	five 102:7,9 104:4	129:21 131:2 132:8
38:4,11 40:2,16	97:12	fairly 82:5 200:25	fills 193:3	133:13 136:21	132:22 133:3,6
41:1,17,25 42:15,20	explicitly 53:24 151:8	faith 76:15 77:20	filtration 216:19	140:1 220:10	134:5 137:23,24
	exploit 128:24	98:24 100:21 101:1	final 3:13 4:9 50:9,13	225:13,23	138:5 139:22
43:22 44:15 45:5,11	-	2012110012110111			140 01 00 04 141 0
45:14 47:13 48:12	exploitation 126:3	101:5,7,10	52:16 53:5 54:3,9	fixed 118:18	140:21,22,24 141:2
45:14 47:13 48:12 49:20 50:4,5 51:4,9	exploitation 126:3 138:18	101:5,7,10 Falkenmark 177:5	56:1,2,5 60:25 61:5	fixing 89:21 90:1	141:3 143:10,18,22
45:14 47:13 48:12 49:20 50:4,5 51:4,9 53:22 54:23 58:2	exploitation 126:3 138:18 exploited 136:4	101:5,7,10 Falkenmark 177:5 fall 11:21 63:12,22	56:1,2,5 60:25 61:5 70:16 71:2 84:15,22	fixing 89:21 90:1 109:20 114:20	141:3 143:10,18,22 143:25 144:3
45:14 47:13 48:12 49:20 50:4,5 51:4,9	exploitation 126:3 138:18	101:5,7,10 Falkenmark 177:5	56:1,2,5 60:25 61:5	fixing 89:21 90:1	141:3 143:10,18,22

150.10 16 160.11	fortification (0.10.20	20.16 21.2 25.17	217:20	143:11 146:14	86:21 98:24 100:21
159:10,16 160:11	fortification 69:19,20	30:16 31:3 35:17	217:20		
163:23 164:14,15	70:11 71:11,12	36:18 71:25,25	generated 66:4,5,13	182:17 185:2,8,12	101:1,5,7,9 123:5
165:7,14,16,20	fortified 53:4 67:23	175:12	66:18 67:2 179:18	glaciers 133:7 145:22	124:7,14 125:19
166:2,2,13 168:11	fortifies 70:23	fundamentally 7:11	generating 136:15	182:21 183:3,11	187:7 190:22
170:6 171:4,8,15	forward 29:21 43:7	20:17 30:6	generation 25:19	gleaned 57:11	192:10,22 205:12
183:17,20 184:23	49:10 58:15 99:3	funded 41:4	32:13 38:10 41:14	global 61:22 181:16	207:4,11 215:19
184:24 185:3,21	142:17 179:5	funding 148:17	43:2 44:4 45:24	181:20 182:16,24	218:17 223:3,17
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		8			
186:4	229:11	funny 222:21,22	47:21 50:1 51:15	185:9	goodwill 89:22
fluctuations 58:20	fought 56:7	furious 26:3	54:13 55:2,16 92:2	global-wide 185:10	govern 58:7
59:5,22	found 11:22 15:10,12	further 1:13 7:2 20:20	92:17 127:18	GLOF 192:25	governed 102:25
flush 8:11	19:11 46:22 78:8	31:16 35:14 49:10	139:16 140:6 145:6	go 12:2 19:15 23:21	government 37:7
flushes 20:12	109:2 113:6 182:6	49:16 53:23 55:20	166:18 172:10,11	27:1 47:10 52:22	44:24 48:10 54:22
flushing 6:14 8:6	foundation 9:15,20	57:4 61:15 72:12	172:20 173:22	57:21 68:18 70:6	136:10 177:21
20:10 92:21 189:16	16:18	73:1,2 99:11 109:9	generator 199:21,24	73:3 79:13 86:9	governments 25:21
191:3 199:10	foundational 41:7	-	200:3 208:3 225:18	98:19 99:9 100:12	41:5 47:12 55:12
		112:4 113:7 120:14			
211:24 212:5,14,22	53:11	134:21 136:21	generators 220:5	100:16 113:17,20	government-owned
226:19,20 227:8	foundations 10:16	160:10 174:4 179:8	generic 5:19 61:23	116:20 125:8	139:25
focal 128:8	founded 133:23	181:12 197:9 229:9	85:16,25 86:13	126:25 129:1	governs 114:22
focus 57:10 149:20	founding 25:15	future 26:7 35:10	120:3,3,8 122:15	135:21 155:11	117:19
154:23 157:18,19	four 10:15 32:19	62:15 63:2 122:25	203:3	162:4 169:1,16	gradation 228:5
focused 40:4 147:4	52:18 75:4 76:13	126:7 179:14 180:8	genesis 1:21,24	176:23 187:25	grades 228:2
	102:9 125:3 153:20		0	188:1 191:18	8
154:15 178:22		182:2 183:2,8 189:4	Geneva 95:4		gradual 206:9
focuses 146:11	154:1,10 158:1		gentlemen 188:22	193:20 195:10	grammar 97:19
folders 124:21 153:15	162:22 183:23	G	geologic 93:19	198:13 199:17	grand 30:13
153:20	fourth 33:16 56:20	G 1:1 75:2,19 107:18	geology 126:23 190:14	201:21 203:10,14	granite 195:4
follow 10:12 13:24	75:25 83:21 90:5	107:19 109:22	210:2,3	209:22 212:11,25	granted 111:4 124:3
16:4 99:9 121:15	100:20 127:17	112:22 119:8,18	geometry 214:23	213:1 215:9,13,24	graph 204:10,10
128:11 129:13	160:3 185:1		Georgina 1:23	219:2 221:12 224:9	graphed 222:3
140:19	fraction 192:5	120:5	Gerald 77:11	goal 34:11	graphic 191:16 192:12
		Gabcikovo-Nagyma			01
followed 10:21,23	framed 186:17	118:23	German 94:23	goes 70:25 79:15	204:12 209:23
37:16 77:2 80:20	framers 56:14	gained 30:12	gets 196:17 197:9	80:17 160:16 203:6	211:23 212:5
114:4 183:1 184:23	framework 10:13 12:3	Gandaki 194:17	203:15,16,21 208:4	211:19 219:16	grave 175:18
following 20:1 38:12	15:2 16:10 89:5	196:13	222:3 225:14	228:6	gravel 194:18,20
38:14 42:17 91:19	France 78:1	Gandhi 137:2	getting 69:18 219:11	going 2:7 9:23 17:5	197:4
134:4 139:1 141:16	Francis 199:22,23		222:17,23	20:4 41:23 42:21	great 33:24 50:19
146:18 147:1,9	206:11,12,15 225:5	Ganga 138:10	ghosts 40:17	51:5 52:17 61:7	73:20 153:3
		Ganges-Brahmaput	0		
154:21 155:15	free 37:19 53:20 71:4	173:5	giant 157:20	71:13 74:16 75:2,5	greater 137:4 219:1
156:21 158:14	125:7 126:2 141:23	Ganges-Brahmaput	Gilgit-Baltistan	75:9,11 76:10,10,12	green 129:8 132:24
166:8 172:18 176:2	152:20 174:10	129:2	129:23	83:15,20 84:1,22	149:11 151:15,18
229:15	175:22	gap 106:7 206:22	give 10:11 11:16 18:10	87:15,16 90:3 91:13	152:6 153:1 156:13
follows 3:9 4:6,22	freeboard 105:17	gaping 59:11	18:24 30:25 44:14	93:11 100:7 101:24	173:22 174:6
5:22 77:13 89:19	200:20 201:9,17,19	GARTH 2:19	45:9 56:19 57:2	107:17 108:10,12	Gregory 2:13 11:2
182:20	201:23 202:1,8,14		63:3 65:10,13,14	109:3,9,16 110:7	grey 162:5,7
follow-up 104:19	freedom 91:1 92:16	gas 205:5	66:22 68:19 79:14	114:15 115:2 116:3	grid 205:16,18,21
food 146:12 161:16.17		gate 201:3,4,6,10			8
	frequency 35:2	202:8,10,13	90:14 102:15	118:20 125:10	gross 136:12 137:10
foothills 132:15	frequent 229:1	gates 201:17,23	105:25 107:2	142:16 151:22	groundwater 142:1
footnote 64:9	frequently 200:11	202:16 208:13	109:21 117:8	153:10 154:22	163:20,22 164:2,5
footprint 181:14	207:16 216:24	gateway 4:12 109:3	127:17 152:25	156:6 157:23	168:1,6,14,23
force 101:4 145:13	fresh 164:2	gauge 180:19,24 196:6	153:23 169:5,6,14	168:25 170:25	169:12 170:11,13
forced 42:1 68:10	friction 31:2 216:15	gave 11:25 20:8 43:17	187:13 192:18	173:15 176:9,11	170:15
Foreign 2:5 33:25	Friday 9:18 223:10	95:10 111:14 167:3	227:12	181:8 183:13 190:5	groundwork 75:7
50:18	friendly 41:5		given 13:6,7 15:15,20	191:24 198:6,6	group 35:2 123:8
forerunner 46:4	friendship 89:22	175:1 CDB 145:12	15:22 16:11 35:14	200:21 203:14	226:14
foreshadowed 88:10	front 1:15 124:20	GDP 145:12	61:19 65:22 75:12	205:10 207:19	growing 179:18
		general 2:6,19 6:24			
forever 223:22 224:24	125:11 188:21	14:21 17:21 28:8	76:22 78:22 83:18	208:22,23,25 210:1	grown 178:15
form 65:4,21 69:25	213:24 227:23	40:2 42:8 65:4	87:10 95:21 100:1	210:2 211:14	growth 126:5 127:24
170:4 172:11	frontier 78:11 113:24	66:23 67:6 75:10	115:17 174:1 177:8	213:13 218:2,13,17	167:22 178:9,11,17
177:11	fuel 205:20,21	76:8 81:9 88:7,25	178:3 185:23 210:2	218:23 221:6,7,15	178:19 179:5,8,15
formal 11:13 59:18	full 43:21 55:11 116:4	94:15,25 97:21 98:2	210:3	221:15,16,20	179:16
64:25	117:10 136:5	-	gives 146:20 196:8	222:12 223:11,15	guarantee 34:7
formally 64:5 65:14	166:10,13 191:23	98:9 99:6 107:6	203:18	223:22 224:10,10	Guavio 227:21
66:7,11	201:5 204:17,21	118:10 167:21	giving 17:10 45:3 66:8	224:11,24 225:7	Gudu 34:17
		192:9,10,18 209:23	0 0	-	
former 154:6	220:3	generalia 97:20	105:7 127:4	226:4 227:2,25	guidance 18:7 62:14
formerly 17:21	fully 106:25	generally 77:8 179:21	glacial 182:24 183:1	228:9,16	guide 14:19 207:25
formidable 147:5	functioning 102:10	215:6	183:14,16 184:20	golden 88:8	Gulhati 37:18 42:6
forms 144:13	functions 36:8	generate 55:6 60:19	184:25 185:15	gone 19:24 27:14 82:8	Gulland 1:23
	E J 147.01 170.9 14		191:12 193:1	good 1:3 9:11 29:18	1
formulated 57:20	Fund 147:21 179:8,14	92.7 139.11 159.14	191.12 193.1	good 1.5 7.11 27.10	
formulated 57:20 forth 195:24 222:19	fund 147:21 179:8,14 fundamental 8:14	92:7 139:11 159:14 179:19 180:9	glacier 132:3,7,16	67:4 76:15 77:20	н
		92:7 139:11 159:14 179:19 180:9		8	н

Trevor McGowan

-	1				-
h 36:15 135:20	72:25 124:8	218:15	93:14 97:6 141:12	III(2) 54:1	15:3 175:18
Hague 1:5	heard 7:12 17:8 20:11	Hill 189:8	190:1,7 207:21	III(2)(d) 174:16	imported 90:22
half 114:15 145:24	67:22 79:3 89:1	him 18:15 25:22 187:2	223:13 224:14	III(4) 55:25	importing 82:23
176:12 179:7,12	91:12 106:19	188:2	hydroelectric 15:9	ILC 97:24	impose 113:7
180:11 224:3,15	141:12 177:23	Himachal 130:3,25	26:16 32:13 41:11	ILC's 77:12 84:18	imposed 94:2 115:5
225:13	hearing 1:7 1:4 2:7,22	131:15	41:14 43:2,8 44:4	Iliff 38:15 39:12 42:6	186:18
half-power 221:20	9:23 64:17,17	Himalaya 183:12	45:24 47:22 50:1	42:16 49:17	impossible 191:1
HAMDIA 2:7	229:15	190:2 192:3,4	51:2 52:14 54:14	Iliff's 51:2	impression 27:16,17
hand 19:7 48:22 64:4	heart 29:6 44:8 88:11	193:15 194:10,16	55:3,16 58:8 69:25	illuminating 107:11	incarnation 53:5
64:6 99:22 124:23	heat 205:8	196:4 228:2	71:14 103:14 105:6	illustrate 12:12 77:23	inception 18:2
218:14,18 226:17	heavily 3:22 133:14	Himalayan 3:24 11:6	105:10 127:7 136:7	90:14 166:7,10	incident 25:4 27:20,24
handbook 189:8	146:13	18:21 126:22 133:8	136:18 139:24	illustrated 128:25	include 36:9 41:16
handful 155:6	heavy 137:15 143:11	188:19 194:23	140:3,5 172:18,20	149:7 159:2	133:16 150:25
handouts 153:9	227:19	206:4 228:18	173:4,8,13 176:6	illustrates 180:16	173:4
hangovers 160:6	hectares 136:14	Himalayas 12:10	Hydrologic 93:19	illustration 142:18	included 55:16 58:25
happen 61:19 71:12	137:10 139:10	18:23 185:8,13	hydrological 17:1,2,4	154:24 155:4,10	96:2 105:15,16,17
183:13 208:25	144:17 149:1,23	189:11 191:6	hydrology 126:16,24	161:20 175:5 176:3	136:8 157:19 160:9
210:23,24 225:25	161:14	Hindu 133:7 183:12	190:14 191:5,6,7	illustrations 125:1	includes 133:13 137:6
228:18 happened 27:23 28:12	held 17:17 40:7 41:6 42:24 53:7 91:4	185:8,12 hinged 100:8	206:5 hydromechanical	154:18 156:14 162:1,25	including 16:2 20:10 20:13 37:2 48:15
70:3 164:17	42:24 53:7 91:4 94:23 99:7 102:9	historic 30:18 33:15	207:24	imagine 197:3	20:13 37:2 48:15 49:25 50:4 79:7,7
happening 28:21	94:23 99:7 102:9 helm 18:1	72:9 131:18	hydropower 22:23	immediate 87:1,21	49:23 30:4 79:7,7 84:18 85:15 92:2
168:17	help 5:6 10:2 20:20	historical 23:17,19	51:25 197:23 198:4	immediately 126:20	106:16 113:5,18
happens 196:14	31:1,13 139:8	24:8 73:6	199:1,8,12 205:1,3	147:2 154:20 197:6	121:25 122:11
197:19 216:11	159:10 226:15	historically 38:22	205:11,17,20,22	immobile 196:20	127:13 132:17
219:21 225:25	helped 138:12	40:23	216:23	immune 155:18	134:6,16 145:5
226:17	helpful 23:9 57:21	history 21:8 44:5	hydro-electric 39:21	177:19	151:2 152:14 164:5
happy 5:6 72:12,25	73:21 104:20 125:5	50:12 56:8 67:24	41:21 49:7 55:6	immunities 91:5	183:18 186:12
187:17,19	HEP 11:6 56:12	70:4 146:21	80:1 92:3,7,17 94:1	immunity 90:23	incoming 165:18
hard 152:11 195:16	103:22 112:16	hit 222:12	Hydro-electricity	impact 28:9,14 61:20	incorporate 48:5
196:2	166:14 175:4	hits 164:23	38:10	61:22 140:16	incorporating 85:21
hardening 71:15	HEPs 8:10 19:23	HI-AWARE 146:7	H.E 2:6	164:18 175:18	increase 37:1 126:8
harder 153:16 177:17	20:13 37:15 46:2	hold 11:14		183:17 184:16	142:18 180:2,7
195:20 196:1	48:5 126:22 136:21	holds 43:18	<u> </u>	impacted 86:14	181:5 183:25 184:4
hardly 165:23 194:20	164:13 171:14	hole 59:11	IBIS 144:14	impacts 126:12 128:3	185:23 202:19
hardness 195:17	173:15,17 174:9,17	holistic 82:12	ICJ 76:23 77:21 90:17	181:15 190:20	203:7,19 210:13
210:3,13,14	174:20 175:6,6,14	holistically 13:1	90:24 113:5 119:1	207:21 214:23	220:4
hard-fought 50:13	175:22 186:12,17 HEP building 38:7	homework 105:8	ICSID 96:7	impede 68:12	increased 179:22
harm 45:10 109:7,15 109:24 110:25	HEP-building 38:7 42:2	honour 21:5 74:7 124:15	idea 67:17 68:4,11	imperative 48:24 impermeable 164:4	180:4 184:10,23 185:17,18
harmony 105:23	42:2 her 15:1 45:4	hope 1:25 7:19 9:3	71:5 83:3 87:19	impermissible 109:1	increasing 61:11
harnessed 173:10,11	hesitate 34:20	14:20 118:2 123:17	88:19 90:4 97:4,21	impermissibly 109:13	69:20 170:24
haunted 40:18	high 26:17 43:4	226:11	98:17 108:16	impinging 217:19,21	171:10 191:13
having 29:15 39:21	146:14 191:22	hopefully 171:19	113:10,17 117:7 192:19 196:8 209:5	implementation 103:7	202:22 203:21
64:15 83:18 130:8	192:25 193:6	188:10 208:10	210:21 212:6 216:9	implemented 81:4	increment 203:18
138:3 139:19	207:19 212:15	horizontal 215:20,22	ideally 215:2	implication 55:19	204:1
141:14 191:15	213:4,7,25 217:18	horizontally 217:16	identification 88:13	implications 6:22	incremental 204:3
201:11 205:13	217:19 220:19,20	hour 123:11 176:12	identified 38:16	88:16 226:21	incrementally 70:23
haze 5:12	221:18	hours 204:22,23	101:23 110:22	implies 203:23	indeed 6:12 50:21
head 35:23 37:18 40:3	higher 179:20 182:23	207:12 210:23	181:20	import 112:23	109:1 119:1
206:13 210:20,22	184:2 203:10,10,15	house 58:12	identify 126:8 181:25	importance 16:21	independence 24:22
211:16,17 216:10	203:16 206:14	huge 65:4 134:17	identifying 19:13	17:15 32:8 38:18	30:22 31:4,17 33:21
216:12,15	highlands 129:20	144:25 154:2	ignore 8:3 49:17	61:11 89:19 96:6	39:24 49:19 50:16
headline 15:6 16:7,7	131:14	162:18	IGNP 137:2	104:7 141:23 146:3	147:1 153:12 154:3
184:7	highlight 23:16 52:18	hugely 18:7	ii 13:16 26:18 43:23	176:24 186:13	independent 24:12
headrace 199:17	77:8 89:9 118:21	human 177:7	53:10 135:6,11	204:5	31:1 39:16 49:13
213:17 heads 35:21 36:6	157:23 highlighted 58:4	Humphrey 97:24 98:20	137:17	important 16:5 18:7	162:15 168:15 Index 181:20
heads 35:21 36:6 37:13 38:13,13	highlighted 58:4 75:12 89:15 138:6	98:20 hundreds 151:3 161:7	III 8:25 9:12 13:4,4,15	26:21 42:22 49:24 52:23 63:19,24	Index 181:20 Indian 26:19 34:11
42:25 43:7 45:13,14	highlights 134:23	212:19	13:17 15:7,11 23:24	64:12 77:7 89:13	37:1,18 38:5,7
45:18,21 46:12 47:6	highly 143:10 181:14	hurt 44:14	47:13 52:21 53:10	112:6 130:10	41:15 42:2 44:9
47:24 53:16,18	182:3 191:15	Hurt 44.14 Hydel 42:10	54:4 92:13 97:2	134:25 146:24	45:20 49:10 53:8
54:19 55:10 56:16	highway 223:8,9	hydraulic 116:11	102:23 125:21	159:12 162:24	69:23 92:1 127:18
58:16,23 59:13,20	high-head 226:7	117:1,6,14 118:2	141:11,22 144:7 151:8 152:21	164:5 167:20	127:20 129:12,21
60:2 70:15 71:9	high-level 70:9 183:23	194:3 217:1 221:10	164:16 166:11	168:23 176:4	130:4,14 131:15,21
206:14 207:19	184:19 185:1	221:14 225:2 227:8	174:12 175:13,17	178:23 181:10	134:9 136:10,15
headworks 161:2		hydraulics 214:24	176:8	183:5 207:14	137:4,6 138:9
incau works 101.2	high-sediment 221:17	nyurauncs 214.24			
hear 2:19 9:18 10:18	high-temperature	hydro 13:15 88:12	III(1) 32:23	importantly 14:20	139:15,25 150:12

150:22 151:6 165:4	171:20,22 172:1	instrument-type 85:6	84:6.25 85:9 87:1	158:16 161:14	jet 205:6 216:13
			,		
171:6 172:10 173:7	173:2,16 178:4,20	intake 199:5 208:18	87:18 88:2,9,17,20	irrigated 145:19 148:5	Jhelum 33:1,3 35:9
173:15 175:6	180:3 182:2,14,15	210:9 212:24 213:7	90:8,24 91:20 92:13	149:4,10,12,15,18	36:11 110:24
177:21 186:12,12	182:22 183:3	213:16,21,22,24	93:4 94:4,11 96:4,9	149:19 150:7,13,14	128:13 130:13,19
Indians 192:15	184:15,17	214:5,10,14,24	96:12 97:16,18,25	151:1 152:24,25	132:18 143:9
Indian-administered	industrial 145:5	integral 89:7	98:11 99:1,21 100:5	153:5 157:22 161:4	157:25 158:7,15,21
133:5,9 145:23	172:15 179:24	integrated 162:18	100:9,24 103:8,11	179:2	159:10 160:19,20
150:15	industry 208:21	226:14	104:2 105:1,20	irrigating 136:14	165:24
Indian-controlled	216:19,23	intend 57:10 187:3	106:18 107:4,13,21	irrigation 26:9 27:9	Jhelum-Chenab
24:18 132:19	ineffective 87:19	intended 9:6 59:6	107:23 108:5,19,24	44:22 49:6,12	162:8
165:11	inflow 164:8 197:21	78:25 79:21 80:10	109:1,4 110:3 111:5	124:25 125:4 127:8	job 223:1
India's 2:23 8:3 19:16	198:7 229:6	83:18 114:18	112:2,7 115:16	127:11,14 132:1	join 156:12
19:19,22 22:24 26:9	inflows 142:7,10	intending 17:3 123:25	118:4 119:12,24	134:14 136:7,18,24	joined 130:12
· ·		intense 56:4	120:24 121:17		•
28:24 32:9,11,22	165:10,10 204:11			139:16 144:12,13	joining 131:6
33:5 35:8 37:14	influence 5:25 209:25	intent 65:24 114:21	interpretations 20:8	144:14,16,21,23	joins 131:11
38:18 40:10 41:10	210:4	intention 84:7 107:11	99:15,17,24 101:7	146:15,21 147:10	joint 30:4 119:7
43:1,8,10 44:3	influenced 28:15	122:19,20	186:13	147:24 148:4,6,13	jointly 106:1
47:14,21,22 48:17	91:20	intentional 85:16	interpretative 5:24	148:25 149:6,21	Juan 119:21
48:22 49:25 51:1	inform 22:5	inter 115:7	6:24 10:16 15:4,15	150:3,9,12,17,22	Judge 1:10 72:3,4
53:24 54:12,15 55:1	information 4:16	interaction 5:5	15:21 20:3 98:8	151:6,24 152:7,9,13	73:2
55:23 56:6,9 59:7	12:11 56:11 72:13	intercourse 91:3	108:22	153:11 154:3,13,19	judgment 76:24 120:6
89:11,12 92:7,16	73:1	interest 24:8	interpreted 13:1,5	154:25 155:18	168:21
94:4 125:23 126:3	information-sharing	interested 57:18 157:4	27:11 75:14 76:21	156:7 157:8,12	July 1:6 1:1 34:1
129:3,5,13 131:2	21:22 43:24 56:18	170:10 215:21	77:14 78:2 85:21	159:7,14 160:4,22	jump 51:6
134:10,22 135:4	112:21	interesting 120:10	86:10,11 87:13	163:19 164:1,10	jump 51.0 jumped 159:24
'	informed 17:16 38:8	156:23 197:11	94:16 95:1 96:17		June 38:13 42:6 50:9
136:8 137:2,12,15				166:5,12,16 167:23	
138:11 140:8,10,17	41:18	206:4 227:15	97:10	168:10 169:13	54:8,8 60:25 144:10
141:8 148:17 151:9	informs 2:13	interests 31:10 48:12	interpreter 101:8	170:11 171:23,25	jurisdiction 120:9
166:14 172:18,24	infrastructure 158:14	94:23	interpreting 81:4 87:4	174:9 180:6	Justice 94:22 95:10
173:6,13 174:20	160:7 161:4	interfere 36:12 37:9	91:17 95:15 98:16	IRSA 162:20	justified 90:10
175:11,21 176:5	infrequently 199:11	37:24 39:2,3,9,10	101:5 106:1,9	Islamic 1:16 2:2 3:2	Justifying 31:3
179:10 186:16	infuses 2:18	39:25,25 42:4,12	107:16 108:7	1:10 21:6 24:22	Justin 79:8
India-Pakistan 131:3	initial 218:3,7,9	43:14 166:2	112:14	124:16	
indicate 185:5	initially 57:16 69:8	interfered 52:12	interrupt 80:14	icalate 175.0	K
	minany 57.10 09.8	Interfered 52.12	mierrupi 80.14	isolate 175:2	A I
indicated 12:1 27:3	70:18 182:24	interference 16:24	intervention 29:15	isolated 155:3	
					Kabul 128:14,15
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20	intervention 29:15 155:19	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intrinately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indicators 137:2	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intrinately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indugence 57:22	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indug 1:2 2:4 10:20	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi 183:14
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indugence 57:22	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indug 1:2 2:4 10:20	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indicator 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indugence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indicator 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introducing 39:20 55:21 69:12	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicator 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introduction 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indicaton 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicator 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7 94:22,25 95:9 97:17	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introduction 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi's 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keen 46:24
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indicator 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7 94:22,25 95:9 97:17 98:23 100:22 108:2	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intrinately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introducing 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investments 91:3	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keen 46:24 keep 14:16 28:25
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7 94:22,25 95:9 97:17 98:23 100:22 108:2 109:22 110:3 111:3	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introducing 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investment 91:3 investor 190:23	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicators 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7 94:22,25 95:9 97:17 98:23 100:22 108:2 109:22 110:3 111:3 112:23 140:13	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introducing 2:22 introducing 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investor 190:23 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi's 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18 117:5 118:20 119:2	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7 94:22,25 95:9 97:17 98:23 100:22 108:2 109:22 110:3 111:3 112:23 140:13 internationally	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introduction 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investments 91:3 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invited 25:22	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(14) 104:13	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18 117:5 118:20 119:2 126:16,25 127:4	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15 220:17,23 228:1,7	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7 94:22,25 95:9 97:17 98:23 100:22 108:2 109:22 110:3 111:3 internationally 192:15	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introduction 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investment 91:3 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invited 25:22 involve 43:13	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(14) 104:13 IV(2) 55:5 90:20	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keen 46:24 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12 187:21 203:21
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicator 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18 117:5 118:20 119:2 126:16,25 127:4 128:7,12,12,19,21	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15 220:17,23 228:1,7 228:19	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7 94:22,25 95:9 97:17 98:23 100:22 108:2 109:22 110:3 111:3 internationally 192:15 interpret 27:2 74:21	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introduction 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investor 190:23 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invited 25:22 involved 43:13 involved 40:12 50:19	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(1) 104:13 IV(2) 55:5 90:20 IX 1:1 19:14 107:13	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12 187:21 203:21 207:5
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicator 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18 117:5 118:20 119:2 126:16,25 127:4 128:7,12,12,19,21 129:4,9,19 130:3,13	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15 220:17,23 228:1,7 228:19 instances 12:13 93:6	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7 94:22,25 95:9 97:17 98:23 100:22 108:2 109:22 110:3 111:3 112:23 140:13 internationally 192:15 interpret 27:2 74:21 90:18 99:4	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introduction 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investment 91:3 investor 190:23 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 25:22 involve 43:13 involved 40:12 50:19 52:3	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(1) 148:7 IV(1) 104:13 IV(2) 55:5 90:20 IX 1:1 19:14 107:13 107:16	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keen 46:24 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12 187:21 203:21
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18 117:5 118:20 119:2 126:16,25 127:4 128:7,12,12,19,21 129:4,9,19 130:3,13 131:19 132:4,9	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15 220:17,23 228:1,7 228:19 instances 12:13 93:6 105:19	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7 94:22,25 95:9 97:17 98:23 100:22 108:2 109:22 110:3 111:3 112:23 140:13 internationally 192:15 interpret 27:2 74:21 90:18 99:4 interpretation 3:14	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introducing 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investment 91:3 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 25:22 involve 43:13 involved 40:12 50:19 52:3 involves 93:18	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(1) 104:13 IV(2) 55:5 90:20 IX 1:1 19:14 107:13	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12 187:21 203:21 207:5
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indicaton 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18 117:5 118:20 119:2 126:16,25 127:4 128:7,12,12,19,21 129:49,91 9130:3,13 131:19 132:4,9 133:4 142:2 143:7	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15 220:17,23 228:1,7 228:19 instances 12:13 93:6 105:19 instead 27:7 55:4 60:4	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7 94:22,25 95:9 97:17 98:23 100:22 108:2 109:22 110:3 111:3 112:23 140:13 internationally 192:15 interpret 27:2 74:21 90:18 99:4 interpretation 3:14 5:20 6:22 7:21 8:24	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introducing 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 25:22 involve 43:13 involved 40:12 50:19 52:3 involves 93:18 involving 33:24 35:10	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(1) 104:13 IV(2) 55:5 90:20 IX 1:1 19:14 107:13 107:16 IX(1) 102:7,10	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karahmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keen 46:24 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12 187:21 203:21 207:5 keeping 109:21
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18 117:5 118:20 119:2 126:16,25 127:4 128:7,12,12,19,21 129:4,9,19 130:3,13 131:19 132:4,9 133:4 142:2 143:7 143:14 144:13,14	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15 220:17,23 228:1,7 228:19 instances 12:13 93:6 105:19	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7 94:22,25 95:9 97:17 98:23 100:22 108:2 109:22 110:3 111:3 112:23 140:13 internationally 192:15 interpret 27:2 74:21 90:18 99:4 interpretation 3:14	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introducing 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investment 91:3 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 25:22 involve 43:13 involved 40:12 50:19 52:3 involves 93:18	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(1) 148:7 IV(1) 104:13 IV(2) 55:5 90:20 IX 1:1 19:14 107:13 107:16	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keen 46:24 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12 187:21 203:21 207:5 keeping 109:21 key 1:22 8:1 23:16 32:18 52:19 56:24
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indicaton 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18 117:5 118:20 119:2 126:16,25 127:4 128:7,12,12,19,21 129:49,91 9130:3,13 131:19 132:4,9 133:4 142:2 143:7	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15 220:17,23 228:1,7 228:19 instances 12:13 93:6 105:19 instance 32:17 55:4 60:4 69:11 201:10 210:15	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7 94:22,25 95:9 97:17 98:23 100:22 108:2 109:22 110:3 111:3 112:23 140:13 internationally 192:15 interpret 27:2 74:21 90:18 99:4 interpretation 3:14 5:20 6:22 7:21 8:24	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introducing 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 25:22 involve 43:13 involved 40:12 50:19 52:3 involves 93:18 involving 33:24 35:10	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(1) 104:13 IV(2) 55:5 90:20 IX 1:1 19:14 107:13 107:16 IX(1) 102:7,10 J	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi's 161:22 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keen 46:24 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12 187:21 203:21 207:5 keeping 109:21 key 1:22 8:1 23:16 32:18 52:19 56:24 75:5 90:19 93:10,24
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18 117:5 118:20 119:2 126:16,25 127:4 128:7,12,12,19,21 129:4,9,19 130:3,13 131:19 132:4,9 133:4 142:2 143:7 143:14 144:13,14	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15 220:17,23 228:1,7 228:19 instances 12:13 93:6 105:19 instead 27:7 55:4 60:4 69:11 201:10	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7 94:22,25 95:9 97:17 98:23 100:22 108:2 109:22 110:3 111:3 112:23 140:13 internationally 192:15 interpret 27:2 74:21 90:18 99:4 interpretation 3:14 5:20 6:22 7:21 8:24 8:24 9:12,17 10:23	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introducing 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invited 25:22 involve 43:13 involve 43:13 involve 43:13 involve 43:13 involve 93:18 involving 33:24 35:10 42:10 46:20 58:12	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(14) 104:13 IV(2) 55:5 90:20 IX 1:1 19:14 107:13 107:16 IX(1) 102:7,10 J 2:14	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12 187:21 203:21 207:5 keeping 109:21 key 1:22 8:1 23:16 32:18 52:19 56:24 75:5 90:19 93:10,24 109:17 110:11
$\label{eq:constraints} \begin{array}{l} \mbox{indicated } 12:1 \ 27:3 \\ 69:7 \ 188:10 \\ \mbox{indicates } 169:24 \\ \mbox{indicates } 169:24 \\ \mbox{indicating } 137:22 \\ 185:7 \ 206:17 \\ 211:16 \ 214:19 \\ \mbox{indication } 68:21 \\ \mbox{indicator } 68:21 \\ \mbox{indicator } 177:5 \ 178:2 \\ \mbox{indicator } 177:5 \\ \mbox{indicator } 122:4 \\ \mbox{indicator } 103:20 \ 103:20 \\ \mbox{indicator } 103:20 \ 108:20 \\ \mbox{indicator } 110:4 \ 114:10.18 \\ \mbox{indicator } 175:5 \ 127:4 \\ \mbox{indicator } 129:4,9,19 \ 130:3,13 \\ \mbox{indicator } 133:4 \ 142:2 \ 143:7 \\ \mbox{indicator } 147:20 \\ \mbox{indicator } 147:20 \\ \mbox{indicator } 147:20 \\ \mbox{indicator } 120:123 \\ indicat$	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15 220:17,23 228:1,7 228:19 instances 12:13 93:6 105:19 instance 32:17 55:4 60:4 69:11 201:10 210:15	interference 16:24 21:25 22:14 26:20 31:20 38:3,5 39:19 44:9 47:18 49:14 52:8 53:20 55:14 186:11 interim 113:2 interlock 13:19 interlocking 13:14 internal 41:22 44:17 169:21 170:2,5 international 42:25 46:22 74:24,25 75:21 76:4 77:19,22 81:23 82:5,19,24 90:20,21,23 91:7 94:22,25 95:9 97:17 98:23 100:22 108:2 109:22 110:3 111:3 112:23 140:13 internationally 192:15 interpret 27:2 74:21 90:18 99:4 interpretation 3:14 5:20 6:22 7:21 8:24 8:24 9:12,17 10:23 14:1,4,19,22 15:2	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introduction 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invited 25:22 involve 43:13 involved 40:12 50:19 52:3 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:12 involves 93:13 involves 93:12 involves 93:12 involves 93:12 involves 93:12 involves 93:12 involves 93:13 involves 93:12 involves 93:12 involves 93:13 involves 93:12 involves 93:13 involves 93:12 involves 93:13	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(14) 104:13 IV(2) 55:5 90:20 IX 1:1 19:14 107:13 107:16 IX(1) 102:7,10 J J 2:14 JAMAL 2:8	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12 187:21 203:21 207:5 keeping 109:21 keeping 109:21 keeping 109:21 ke1 52:19 56:24 75:5 90:19 93:10,24 109:17 110:11 154:23 189:25
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicator 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18 117:5 118:20 119:2 126:16,25 127:4 128:7,12,12,19,21 129:4,9,19 130:3,13 131:19 132:4,9 133:4 142:2 143:7 143:14 144:13,14 14:6:9,12 147:20 149:5,25 150:1,9,13 150:17,21 160:19	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15 220:17,23 228:1,7 228:19 instead 27:7 55:4 60:4 69:11 201:10 210:15 instinctual 74:12 instinutional 19:5	interference $16:24$ 21:25 $22:14$ $26:2031:20$ $38:3,5$ $39:1944:9$ $47:18$ $49:1452:8$ $53:20$ $55:14186:11interim 113:2interlock 13:19interlocking 13:14internal 41:22 44:17169:21$ $170:2,5international 42:2546:22$ $74:24,2575:21$ $76:4$ $77:19,2281:23$ $82:5,19,2490:20,21,23$ $91:794:22,25$ $95:9$ $97:1798:23$ $100:22$ $108:2109:22$ $110:3$ $111:3112:23$ $140:13internationally192:15interpret 27:2 74:2190:18$ $99:4interpretation 3:145:20$ $6:22$ $7:21$ $8:248:24$ $9:12,17$ $10:2314:1,4,19,22$ $15:219:22$ $23:24$ $52:2452:25$ $65:20$ $72:23$	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introduction 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investor 190:23 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 32:32 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 51:2 Iran 90:15,21 Irania 90:15 iron 110:6 119:9,13	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(14) 104:13 IV(2) 55:5 90:20 IX 1:1 19:14 107:13 107:16 IX(1) 102:7,10 J J 2:14 JAMAL 2:8 Jammu 35:11 137:1	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karakoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keen 46:24 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12 187:21 203:21 207:5 keeping 109:21 keeping 109:21 ke2 1:2 8:1 23:16 32:18 52:19 56:24 75:5 90:19 93:10,24 109:17 110:11 154:23 189:25 Khan 2:5 34:1
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indication 68:21 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicator 177:5 178:2 indugence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18 117:5 118:20 119:2 126:16,25 127:4 128:7,12,12,19,21 129:4,9,19 130:3,13 131:19 132:4,9 133:4 142:2 143:7 143:14 144:13,14 146:9,12 147:20 149:5,25 150:1,9,13 150:17,21 160:19 161:25 162:9,20	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15 220:17,23 228:1,7 228:19 instances 12:13 93:6 105:19 instead 27:7 55:4 60:4 69:11 201:10 210:15 instruction 171:16	interference $16:24$ 21:25 $22:14$ $26:2031:20$ $38:3,5$ $39:1944:9$ $47:18$ $49:1452:8$ $53:20$ $55:14186:11interim 113:2interlock 13:19interlocking 13:14internal 41:22 44:17169:21$ $170:2,5international 42:2546:22$ $74:24,2575:21$ $76:4$ $77:19,2281:23$ $82:5,19,2490:20,21,23$ $91:794:22,25$ $95:9$ $97:1798:23$ $100:22$ $108:2109:22$ $110:3$ $111:3112:23$ $140:13internationally192:15interpret 27:2 74:2190:18$ $99:4interpret 31:45:20$ $6:22$ $7:21$ $8:248:24$ $9:12,17$ $10:2314:1,4,19,22$ $15:219:22$ $23:24$ $52:2452:25$ $65:20$ $72:2374:4,11,14,23$ $75:10$	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introduction 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investor 190:23 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 32:32 involved 40:12 50:19 52:3 involves 93:18 involving 33:24 35:10 42:10 46:20 58:12 Iran 90:15,21 Iranian 90:15 iron 110:6 119:9,13 216:8	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(2) 104:13 IV(2) 55:5 90:20 IX 1:1 19:14 107:13 107:16 IX(1) 102:7,10 J J 2:14 JAMAL 2:8 Jammu 35:11 137:1 139:10	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Karahoram 132:15 133:8 183:14 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keen 46:24 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12 187:21 203:21 207:5 keeping 109:21 key 1:22 8:1 23:16 32:18 52:19 56:24 75:5 90:19 93:10,24 109:17 110:11 154:23 189:25
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18 117:5 118:20 119:2 126:16,25 127:4 128:7,12,12,19,21 129:4,9,19 130:3,13 131:19 132:4,9 133:4 142:2 143:7 143:14 144:13,14 146:9,12 147:20 149:5,25 150:1,9,13 150:17,21 160:19 163:12 164:1	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15 220:17,23 228:1,7 228:19 instances 12:13 93:6 105:19 instead 27:7 55:4 60:4 69:11 201:10 210:15 institutional 19:5 instruction 171:16 instrument 17:14	interference $16:24$ 21:25 $22:14$ $26:2031:20$ $38:3,5$ $39:1944:9$ $47:18$ $49:1452:8$ $53:20$ $55:14186:11interim 113:2interlock 13:19interlocking 13:14internal 41:22 44:17169:21$ $170:2,5international 42:2546:22$ $74:24,2575:21$ $76:4$ $77:19,2281:23$ $82:5,19,2490:20,21,23$ $91:794:22,25$ $95:9$ $97:1798:23$ $100:22$ $108:2109:22$ $110:3$ $111:3112:23$ $140:13internationally192:15interpret 27:2 74:2190:18$ $99:4interpretation 3:145:20$ $6:22$ $7:21$ $8:248:24$ $9:12,17$ $10:2314:1,4,19,22$ $15:219:22$ $3:24$ $52:2452:25$ $65:20$ $72:2374:4,11,14,23$ $75:1075:22,25$ $76:25$ $77:3$	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introducing 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investor 190:23 investor 190:23 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invited 25:22 involves 43:13 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 19:5 iron 110:6 119:9,13 216:8 irons 216:9	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(1) 104:13 IV(2) 55:5 90:20 IX 1:1 19:14 107:13 107:16 IX(1) 102:7,10 J 2:14 JAMAL 2:8 Jamua 35:11 137:1 139:10 January 204:13	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keen 46:24 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12 187:21 203:21 207:5 keeping 109:21 key 1:22 8:1 23:16 32:18 52:19 56:24 75:5 90:19 93:10,24 109:17 110:11 154:23 189:25 Khan 2:5 34:1 Kharif 135:25 143:19 143:23,25 144:9
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18 117:5 118:20 119:2 126:16,25 127:4 128:7,12,12,19,21 129:4,9,19 130:3,13 131:19 132:4,9 133:4 142:2 143:7 143:14 144:13,14 146:9,12 147:20 149:5,25 150:1,9,13 150:17,21 160:19 161:25 162:9,20 163:12 164:1 165:23 166:5	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15 220:17,23 228:1,7 228:19 instances 12:13 93:6 105:19 instance 17:15 instinutual 74:12 instinutual 19:5 instruction 171:16 instrument 17:14 118:18 119:13	interference $16:24$ 21:25 $22:14$ $26:2031:20$ $38:3,5$ $39:1944:9$ $47:18$ $49:1452:8$ $53:20$ $55:14186:11interim 113:2interlock 13:19interlock 13:19international 42:2546:22$ $74:24,2575:21$ $76:4$ $77:19,2281:23$ $82:5,19,2490:20,21,23$ $91:794:22,25$ $95:9$ $97:1798:23$ $100:22$ $108:2109:22$ $110:3$ $111:3112:23$ $140:13internationally192:15interpret 27:2 74:2190:18$ $99:4interpretation 3:145:20$ $6:22$ $7:21$ $8:248:24$ $9:12,17$ $10:2314:1,4,19,22$ $15:219:22$ $23:24$ $52:2452:25$ $65:20$ $72:2374:4,11,14,23$ $75:1075:22,25$ $76:25$ $77:380:20$ $81:23$ $82:1,4$	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introducing 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investor 190:23 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 25:22 involves 43:13 involved 40:12 50:19 52:3 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 19:5 iron 110:6 119:9,13 216:8 irons 216:9 irrelevant 154:11	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(14) 104:13 IV(2) 55:5 90:20 IX 1:1 19:14 107:13 107:16 IX(1) 102:7,10 J J 2:14 JAMAL 2:8 Jammu 35:11 137:1 139:10 January 204:13 JC 162:8,9	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keen 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12 187:21 203:21 207:5 keeping 109:21 key 1:22 8:1 23:16 32:18 52:19 56:24 75:5 90:19 93:10,24 109:17 110:11 154:23 189:25 Khan 2:5 34:1 Kharif 135:25 143:19 143:23,25 144:9 146:4 184:12
indicated 12:1 27:3 69:7 188:10 indicates 169:24 indicating 137:22 185:7 206:17 211:16 214:19 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicator 177:5 178:2 indicators 177:5 Indira 137:2 indulgence 57:22 Indus 1:2 2:4 10:20 21:8 24:17 29:12,19 32:25 36:10 38:21 40:9 50:10 74:19 76:3 78:21 89:3 91:10,23 95:8 96:15 101:23 102:6 103:20 108:20 110:4 114:10,18 117:5 118:20 119:2 126:16,25 127:4 128:7,12,12,19,21 129:4,9,19 130:3,13 131:19 132:4,9 133:4 142:2 143:7 143:14 144:13,14 146:9,12 147:20 149:5,25 150:1,9,13 150:17,21 160:19 163:12 164:1	70:18 182:24 inlet 215:12 innovation 108:11 111:13,19,22 112:7 112:8 innovations 123:1 insecurity 24:24 25:6 insight 17:11 81:17 insights 105:25 insignificance 35:15 145:6 insignificant 33:3 35:11 69:14 insisted 41:15 insisting 8:6 insofar 3:21 6:23 7:17 installed 136:22 202:12 instance 66:17 67:12 69:13 195:4 197:13 216:8,19 219:15 220:17,23 228:1,7 228:19 instances 12:13 93:6 105:19 instead 27:7 55:4 60:4 69:11 201:10 210:15 institutional 19:5 instruction 171:16 instrument 17:14	interference $16:24$ 21:25 $22:14$ $26:2031:20$ $38:3,5$ $39:1944:9$ $47:18$ $49:1452:8$ $53:20$ $55:14186:11interim 113:2interlock 13:19interlocking 13:14internal 41:22 44:17169:21$ $170:2,5international 42:2546:22$ $74:24,2575:21$ $76:4$ $77:19,2281:23$ $82:5,19,2490:20,21,23$ $91:794:22,25$ $95:9$ $97:1798:23$ $100:22$ $108:2109:22$ $110:3$ $111:3112:23$ $140:13internationally192:15interpret 27:2 74:2190:18$ $99:4interpretation 3:145:20$ $6:22$ $7:21$ $8:248:24$ $9:12,17$ $10:2314:1,4,19,22$ $15:219:22$ $3:24$ $52:2452:25$ $65:20$ $72:2374:4,11,14,23$ $75:1075:22,25$ $76:25$ $77:3$	intervention 29:15 155:19 Inter-Governmental 95:11 intimately 18:21 intricate 162:17 introduce 123:22,24 124:4 introduced 36:7 46:11 58:1 60:10 introduces 59:18 129:17 introducing 2:22 introducing 39:20 55:21 69:12 invariably 156:25 investment 190:23 investor 190:23 investor 190:23 investor 190:23 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invite 20:21,25 70:2 invited 25:22 involves 43:13 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 93:18 involves 19:5 iron 110:6 119:9,13 216:8 irons 216:9	isolated 155:3 isolation 135:5 issue 2:16 3:21 15:23 16:6 35:13 41:10,11 52:20 61:23 67:15 75:15 106:3 110:5 168:12 170:8 175:8 issued 75:6 issues 1:23 2:1 3:4 8:14,20,22 9:12 10:2,8 11:7,16 12:9 16:13 17:5 18:13 48:16 106:6 111:16 111:16 115:15 126:23,24 127:1 209:1 IV 53:21 102:23 104:22 147:14 148:2 157:9 IV(1) 148:7 IV(1) 104:13 IV(2) 55:5 90:20 IX 1:1 19:14 107:13 107:16 IX(1) 102:7,10 J 2:14 JAMAL 2:8 Jamua 35:11 137:1 139:10 January 204:13	Kabul 128:14,15 150:18 154:12 175:25 Kachhi 163:10 Kali 194:17 196:13 Karachi 41:6 129:25 161:21 Karachi's 161:22 Kashmir 24:18 33:4 35:12 129:12,22 130:5,9,14,16 137:1 139:10 165:4 Kathmandu 222:23 KC 2:9,11 keen 46:24 keep 14:16 28:25 49:11 122:19 124:23 125:10 164:9 166:12 187:21 203:21 207:5 keeping 109:21 key 1:22 8:1 23:16 32:18 52:19 56:24 75:5 90:19 93:10,24 109:17 110:11 154:23 189:25 Khan 2:5 34:1 Kharif 135:25 143:19<

131:4 132:6 137:8,9	92:8 98:6 101:16	181:12 184:5	171:20 185:7,21	lines 21:13 25:1 57:15	long-standing 151:6
137:9 149:23 151:3	122:1	192:22 194:24	196:15 200:23	109:17 163:5	long-term 183:15
					8
153:2,4 161:9,13	large 18:22 26:17	218:5	201:5,5,12,18	linguistic 77:17	218:8
163:2,13 212:2,4	48:11 127:15	leave 7:6,8 61:22 62:1	202:13 213:18	link 112:18 155:7,22	look 6:4 23:19 42:14
227:18	129:10 134:15	leaves 173:12 198:21	levels 59:3 185:9	155:23,24 156:4,5	59:17 66:11 68:14
kind 27:8 71:22	139:15 140:1 147:6	led 10:19 17:18 24:6	196:16	156:12,20 157:1,21	68:25 69:3,6 70:7
105:16 106:6 113:6	148:17 153:8 182:9	35:5 38:6 45:12	lex 113:1,6	157:24 158:3,13,18	72:11,12 73:1 75:9
114:10 147:11	189:7 192:3,21	82:19 101:9	liability 95:3	158:23 159:11,18	75:16,25 90:4 97:1
215:14	194:10,11,12,13	left 24:16 25:4 27:16	Liberia 96:1	160:14,16 161:6	98:5,6,20 99:4
kinds 85:2	196:15 206:23	150:19 195:12	licence 112:23	164:24 165:7,12,18	101:8 106:3 107:21
KING 2:20	227:21	196:5 200:20 202:6	lies 23:17	linked 60:4,17	122:10,22,24
Kingdom 2:7,8,9	largely 20:4,6 41:4	203:6 206:11	Lieutenant 17:21	links 155:5 157:24	127:10 148:2
Kishenganga 1:23 2:5	56:1,25 59:19 66:5	209:23 215:16,17	life 189:6 201:25	liquidation 94:24	150:10,19 156:8
2:10,24 3:1,18 6:13	143:3 144:23	left-hand 196:25	lifeblood 144:25 163:3	Lisa 1:23	160:25 169:1,18
6:20 8:1,4,22 14:22	154:25 183:10	202:1,7 213:16	172:14	list 55:15 105:9	190:5 195:4 196:12
14:23 19:4,11 20:8	196:9	legal 2:5,20,20 15:1	lifetime 208:23,24	181:23	203:3,8 214:11
22:25 23:4 27:4	larger 153:7 178:14	16:13 17:14 22:18	lift 202:9 214:15	litre 212:17,20	216:2 219:17
	8				
63:18 64:2,10 76:7	192:16 196:19	98:2 120:11,13	lifted 193:25 194:3	little 1:12,13 5:10	220:17 223:4
77:2 87:3 88:1	211:24,25 226:18	123:3	lifting 199:22	11:16,24 12:2 15:16	229:10
89:10,12 91:11	largest 95:24 132:1	legible 125:5	light 13:3,5,10 77:16	56:22 64:2 99:11	looked 27:13 46:24
92:19 99:7,7 107:12	133:13,17,18,20,25	length 129:24 215:4	105:20 117:24	154:10,14 167:18	88:1 95:16,17 97:24
108:13,23 109:2	144:15,15 147:11	217:5	126:3,25	172:9 187:7 189:21	99:16 167:17
113:2,19 115:23	laser 191:17	lens 16:12	lightning 223:11	191:4 192:7,16	220:24 222:5
118:1 119:9,11	last 1:20 42:21 118:15	less 175:2 177:3,11,14	like 5:3 7:6,8 9:14	193:16 195:5 197:4	looking 5:2 23:6 61:2
189:19 199:9	128:15 133:22	177:20 181:7,13	12:14 21:10 28:10	203:7 207:18	65:13 66:3 84:19
knock-on 88:9	159:25 160:3	183:17,21 184:9	61:24 62:17 63:7	208:20 209:23	86:7,23 87:22,23
know 18:18 23:9 24:6	171:19 176:18	186:3 192:6 196:2	69:11,18 82:14,15	211:17 216:16	88:4 102:14 113:3
46:8,10 59:12,15	184:12,14 219:4,5	201:9 207:18	96:21 105:25	217:22 218:1,2,8	120:20 122:18
60:21 61:7 100:22	223:22 224:24	210:16 212:2	113:24 114:6	219:18 221:6 223:2	176:21 179:4
125:15 139:24	late 34:25 72:19	224:12	116:16 117:6	223:21	193:13 209:3,7
141:17 151:13	146:25 184:5,6	lesser 176:1	122:14,22,22,22	live 37:23 58:19	212:3 216:3
162:2 171:20 175:3	later 40:17 62:18	lesson 120:25	141:12,14 145:5	lived 24:24 25:6	looks 71:10 169:22
199:2 215:23 216:2	84:25 103:16	let 9:22 10:11 12:21	149:14 155:9,15	living 76:5 85:6	195:4 222:3
222:20,25 228:18	121:14 126:11	15:7 46:6 47:14,16	156:8,17 166:24	118:18 119:13	lose 208:15 225:3,4
knowing 57:18	130:11 151:22	53:5,19,25 54:6,16	167:21 168:21	LLOF 193:1	226:4
known 137:5 162:9	160:18 187:23	67:19 71:23 72:5	169:4 174:9 176:15	LLOF 155.1 LLP 2:11,12,12,13	loss 134:13 166:9
Kotri 161:24	199:19 208:11	73:3 83:2 90:14	181:18 187:22	load 57:17 58:10,11	180:4 182:16,24
	212:11				
Kush 133:7 183:12		92:9 96:19,20 97:1	188:22,23 191:4	58:15,22 59:4,24	185:2,8,12,15,19
185:8,12	latest 139:15	97:4,12 99:10	193:5 194:25 195:5	60:3,8,10,18 61:9	216:10,12,15
	Latin 97:19 101:2	104:10 113:20	203:9 205:5,7 208:5	61:12 79:20 190:14	lost 134:20 160:20
L	latter 30:9 71:7,9	116:12 125:9,24	213:20 215:13,14	193:23,24 194:4,6,9	lot 17:9 194:19 196:18
L 2:13	127:19	134:22 166:19	216:2,8 219:21	194:11,11,12,13,16	198:16 204:2 208:4
label 17:3	Laura 2:12 10:18	186:10 191:17	221:2 222:23 223:7	194:21 220:21	221:25 222:7,17
laboratory 222:1	law 53:1 74:15,25	193:20 227:12	224:9,11,15 227:25	221:1,10,14,19	225:9 226:6 227:19
labour 145:13	75:21 76:17 77:19	229:3	228:7 229:4	228:16	lots 166:24
lack 47:9	81:24 82:5,19 90:20	letter 19:17 33:25 34:4	likelihood 186:3 187:5	located 128:18 132:18	low 144:5,10 191:19
lacking 47:8	90:21,23 91:7 94:25	38:15,20 39:12 42:5	likely 10:25 36:12	133:1,3 149:13,19	204:25 213:4
Lafitte 115:19	97:17 98:23 100:23	44:20 45:6 201:3,13	37:9,13 57:3 184:22	150:18 173:2	228:21
Lafitte's 6:5	107:18 108:2	201:14,15	Likewise 69:15	178:19,21 214:1,3	Lowe 63:17
Lahore 26:2 133:16	109:22 110:3,10	letters 29:20,25 68:25	Lilienthal 25:9,14	location 128:17 175:4	lower 24:23 39:18
133:23 134:7,16	111:3,7 112:23,25	80:9	26:8 28:18,19 31:13	locations 94:6 214:2	149:25 193:7
136:9 156:2,24,25	118:10 140:13	let's 67:15 85:1 169:18	Lilienthal's 29:14,22	locati[ng 31:18	202:21 217:21
158:9 164:6 179:1	laws 190:17,18	176:19 189:2,3	limit 51:20 59:7,9	logs 200:18	226:1
laid 14:9 76:9 167:22	lawyer 16:12	198:25 204:8,18	92:24 190:15	London 2:9,10,10,11	low-cost 218:7
lake 183:1 193:1,2	lawyerly 80:8	209:22 211:7,11	limited 22:11,12 48:8	2:11,12,12,13 42:23	low-head 226:8
land 13:13 24:15	lawyers 98:1	219:6,14,15 224:6	85:2,20 90:11,25	44:1 45:12,23 57:1	low-load 220:2,3
28:23 114:3,6	lay 29:6 75:6	let-flow 13:3 32:22	110:24	long 51:17 101:3	low-velocity 217:17
136:15 139:10	laying 10:15 14:12	45:16 48:8 49:25	limiting 55:19 204:6	114:8 137:9 178:1	low-water 42:13
144:17 149:1,4,9	lead 34:22 107:7	53:3 55:18 56:9	limits 51:16 110:8	212:1,14 214:20	lunch 11:1 108:15
	161:12 167:25	67:17 68:15,22 69:2	115:5 175:7	221:15	120:15 123:11,18
150:5 163:14	leading 9:15 18:18	69:5,11,15,19 70:12	linchpin 41:2	longer 11:24 40:14	120110 120111,10
171:10 190:18	50:8 154:20	70:23 71:6,11 96:25	linchpins 40:25	60:3 70:8 71:18	M
landed 167:18	leak 168:8	144:6 151:10	line 9:25 38:7 56:15	111:5 131:13,20	
landmark 35:19	leakage 164:3	175:12 176:24	78:11 139:15	203:15,17	machines 210:5
landslide 193:2,2,4	leap 155:12	level 12:25 15:19 43:4	142:22 156:2	longest 137:7 212:1	225:14
language 4:7 46:6,7	-	88:4 104:7 121:8	190:24 191:20,20	longstanding 17:25	made 3:15 25:23
46:19,22 47:1,20,22	least 9:2 11:20 26:25		-	8 8	44:22 45:7 50:6
53:12,17 55:5,17	68:24 136:21	141:2 152:9,10	203:24	long-lasting 25:4	61:4,13 63:17 66:3
			-	8 8	

101:22 114:13	manipulation 201.22	187:13 199:8	186:19 188:14	167:4 168:1,14	224:25 225:8 226:4
126:14 138:2	manipulation 201:22 manner 7:22 8:9		memorandum 49:2	,	
		207:14 209:11		178:15,15 179:9	monsoon-type 204:14
142:13 155:12,14	87:14 151:18	211:24 212:1	Memorial 2:12,13,15	millions 161:23	month 38:14 42:17
160:5 168:4 182:5	Mann-Kendall 180:25	214:13 216:4	2:23 7:13 17:17	195:13	months 34:13 56:5
189:5 200:1 216:8	mantle 17:4	maybe 70:8 159:19	18:6 25:12 44:7	mind 51:19,23 94:7	143:12 168:16,16
Madhopur 138:23	many 18:19 88:8 93:6	192:5 193:11 197:4	46:18 48:20 57:10	106:15 188:15	168:16 184:24
MAF 49:6 51:24	183:18 194:7	210:20 213:20	67:16 79:10 84:24	minds 27:18 28:14	191:21,24
138:21	197:12 199:11,13	216:10 218:8	85:19 94:18 100:3	mine 14:13	morning 1:3 11:14
magazine 25:10	199:14 208:21	228:16 229:4,5,6	105:8 120:21	Minear 1:11 21:11,13	12:17 21:6 24:15
magnitude 22:5 59:22	226:12	MC 2:6 9:22	126:15,19 129:1	22:10,19 23:12 24:1	74:17 187:5 204:20
Mailsi 159:4	map 128:9,17 129:1	McGowan 1:23	132:12 137:20	46:6,9,18 47:3 51:6	223:7,18 226:25
main 24:17 28:13 32:7	130:7 149:8 150:24	McGraw 189:8	142:9 143:2,17	51:8 52:15 57:13,14	229:11
54:3 58:13 86:25	152:18,24 172:23	mean 80:2 152:13	144:19 146:20	62:17 63:5,7,11	Morocco 77:25
91:23 156:12,13,14	maps 128:10	162:14 206:13	149:3,8 154:9,17	79:15 80:5,14,17	Morris 2:13 4:1 11:2
157:23 159:2,14,15	Marala 143:15 155:23	226:4	172:22 174:1,1	81:16,22 82:22 83:1	11:12 12:8 18:9,13
162:9 163:5,6,16	164:23 165:15	meanders 131:3	180:20	88:18 114:24	18:18,24 19:4
165:1,7 171:22	Marala-Ravi 155:24	meaning 15:16,20,22	memorials 27:4	Minear's 61:6	123:20,25 126:19
172:2 175:24 178:8	March 40:4 41:1	75:12 76:14,19,22	memories 25:5	minerals 195:9	126:22 142:25
200:13	48:14 102:5 126:15	77:6,8,9,15 78:5,22	memory 19:6 168:2	minimal 49:14 106:5	143:3 175:21
mainly 126:12	135:15 143:21	78:24 79:12,17,19	mention 163:19	166:1	176:17 180:17
mainstay 158:13	margin 139:4	79:25 80:7,10,12,24	210:11	minimise 210:9 214:9	181:2 187:1,4,23
e e	marginalisation 61:9		mentioned 18:9 79:9	220:1 221:22	
maintain 185:22	8	81:1,7,7,8,18,20			188:9,10,21 227:1,5
201:4 207:13	maritime 95:11,12	82:3,4,11,11,17,21	82:12 88:18 111:25	224:23	227:11 229:3,10,12
maintained 41:12	100:2,11 114:3,6	83:5,25 84:1,3,3	139:6 151:2,12	minimiz[e 31:2	Morris's 12:17 17:6
68:5	marked 47:20 150:23	87:2 90:12 95:16,19	160:21 162:24	minimum 57:17 59:3	176:2
maintenance 144:3	mass 182:17,24	95:21 98:24 107:9	165:2 167:11	80:2 91:8 109:5,20	mortar 14:15
165:16 199:24	master 10:5	107:10,19 118:18	169:23 172:13	111:10 213:18	most 26:11,21 27:10
218:23	matched 47:17	119:1,25,25 120:3	217:10 220:6 227:7	Minister 33:25 34:4	56:23 76:12 89:13
maintenance/repair	matches 198:7	meanings 80:18	menu 10:12	50:18	89:16 116:17,18
218:4	material 64:12 193:7	means 14:4 59:21	merges 131:8	Ministers 30:1 69:4	127:12 128:18
major 35:19 128:18	193:15,25,25 194:1	65:19 72:23 75:16	merging 130:17	ministry 2:4,5 44:21	132:9,16 139:4
128:24 133:5	194:1,2 196:4,19,20	101:3 106:18,25	merits 1:7 64:17,18	138:9,20,24 139:7	143:25 160:1,5
153:11 161:2,6	197:5,7,7 218:16	107:4,13,15 112:16	message 42:16	145:10 173:7	162:7,10,25 171:13
172:25 173:3	227:19	144:22 165:5	met 34:18 185:14	minute 210:12	177:13 178:4,20,24
178:21 225:19	materially 6:18 21:17	203:17 204:3	227:10	minutes 12:2 43:5	181:21 191:8,9
majority 129:8 132:25	22:2,15	meant 37:1 90:1 120:4	method 103:15 218:18	46:14,14 57:2 124:6	193:8 195:9 201:7
144:18 182:21	materials 63:22 64:21	122:4 123:3	methodology 7:12 8:2	144:20,21 205:4	226:5 228:1
	materials 05.22 04.21				220.3 220.1
184:21	65:13,18,21,23 66:9	measure 19:5 177:6	metre 204:3 217:4	mirrored 53:15	mostly 173:20 191:10
184:21 make 4:17 10:24				·	
make 4:17 10:24	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13	mirrored 53:15	mostly 173:20 191:10
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 mountainside 193:12
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7	 mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 mountainside 193:12 move 14:14 73:10
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middLe 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 mountainside 193:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 mountainside 193:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 115:16 116:4 156:4 165:4 166:4 166:4	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19	 mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 mountainside 193:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 115:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 123:17	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 midh 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24 83:18 100:7,11,12	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21	 mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 mountainside 193:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 115:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 14:8 20:18 121:16	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19 56:16 59:5 62:2	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24 MEGAN 2:13	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24 83:18 100:7,11,12 106:9 121:9 153:14	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21 modifications 200:4	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 mountainside 193:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18 222:23
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 15:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 14:8 20:18 121:16 132:8 168:9 194:6 14:59 105 116	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19 56:16 59:5 62:2 65:8 70:4 74:24	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24 MEGAN 2:13 MEHAR 2:4	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24 83:18 100:7,11,12 106:9 121:9 153:14 159:18 163:9	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21 modifications 200:4 modify 210:13 214:23	 mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18 222:23 movement 70:14
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 15:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 14:8 20:18 121:16 132:8 168:9 194:6 malevolently 44:25	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19 56:16 59:5 62:2 65:8 70:4 74:24 84:5,18 85:9,14	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24 MEGAN 2:13 MEHAR 2:4 melt 132:7 146:14	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24 83:18 100:7,11,12 106:9 121:9 153:14 159:18 163:9 167:24 170:23	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21 modifications 200:4 modify 210:13 214:23 MOL 213:18	 mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 mountainside 193:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18 222:23 movement 70:14 moving 214:14
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 115:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 14:8 20:18 121:16 132:8 168:9 194:6 malevolently 44:25 manage 161:4 190:3	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19 56:16 59:5 62:2 65:8 70:4 74:24 84:5,18 85:9,14 103:21 104:6	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24 MEGAN 2:13 MEHAR 2:4 melt 132:7 146:14 184:25 191:13	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24 83:18 100:7,11,12 106:9 121:9 153:14 159:18 163:9 167:24 170:23 177:22 188:12,13	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigation 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21 modifications 200:4 modify 210:13 214:23 MOL 213:18 moment 11:3 13:23	 mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 mountainside 193:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18 222:23 movement 70:14 moving 214:14 much 1:11,14 8:23
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 115:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 14:8 20:18 121:16 132:8 168:9 194:6 malevolently 44:25 manage 161:4 190:3 209:21 226:15	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19 56:16 59:5 62:2 65:8 70:4 74:24 84:5,18 85:9,14 103:21 104:6 105:11,19 106:23	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24 MEGAN 2:13 MEHAR 2:4 melt 132:7 146:14 184:25 191:13 melting 184:23	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24 83:18 100:7,11,12 106:9 121:9 153:14 159:18 163:9 167:24 170:23 177:22 188:12,13 188:15 214:19,20	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigation 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21 modifications 200:4 modify 210:13 214:23 MOL 213:18 moment 11:3 13:23 18:9 32:16 112:18	 mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18 222:23 movement 70:14 moving 214:14 much 1:11,14 8:23 19:15 21:1 27:15
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 115:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 14:8 20:18 121:16 132:8 168:9 194:6 malevolently 44:25 manage 161:4 190:3 209:21 226:15 management 8:8	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19 56:16 59:5 62:2 65:8 70:4 74:24 84:5,18 85:9,14 103:21 104:6 105:11,19 106:23 107:21,22 110:9	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24 MEGAN 2:13 MEHAR 2:4 melt 132:7 146:14 184:25 191:13 melting 184:23 meltwater 133:7	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24 83:18 100:7,11,12 106:9 121:9 153:14 159:18 163:9 167:24 170:23 177:22 188:12,13 188:15 214:19,20 Miles 2:10 2:19 86:9	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21 modifications 200:4 modify 210:13 214:23 MOL 213:18 moment 11:3 13:23 18:9 32:16 112:18 125:16	 mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 mountainside 193:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18 222:23 movement 70:14 moving 214:14 much 1:11,14 8:23 19:15 21:1 27:15 35:13 46:15 47:2
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 115:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 14:8 20:18 121:16 132:8 168:9 194:6 malevolently 44:25 manage 161:4 190:3 209:21 226:15 management 8:8 18:19 29:19 126:24	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19 56:16 59:5 62:2 65:8 70:4 74:24 84:5,18 85:9,14 103:21 104:6 105:11,19 106:23 107:21,22 110:9 112:18,24 113:8,14	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24 MEGAN 2:13 MEHAR 2:4 melt 132:7 146:14 184:25 191:13 meltwater 133:7 146:3 191:11	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 mid-Septembe	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobilis 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21 modifications 200:4 modify 210:13 214:23 MOL 213:18 moment 11:3 13:23 18:9 32:16 112:18 125:16 momentum 215:17	 mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 mountainside 193:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18 222:23 movement 70:14 moving 214:14 much 1:11,14 8:23 19:15 21:1 27:15 35:13 46:15 47:2 49:4 51:12,23 52:2
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 115:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 14:8 20:18 121:16 132:8 168:9 194:6 malevolently 44:25 manage 161:4 190:3 209:21 226:15 management 8:8 18:19 29:19 126:24 198:23 210:25	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19 56:16 59:5 62:2 65:8 70:4 74:24 84:5,18 85:9,14 103:21 104:6 105:11,19 106:23 107:21,22 110:9 112:18,24 113:8,14 120:22 121:18	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24 MEGAN 2:13 MEHAR 2:4 melt 132:7 146:14 184:25 191:13 melting 184:23 meltwater 133:7 146:3 191:11 meltwater-dependent	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24 83:18 100:7,11,12 106:9 121:9 153:14 159:18 163:9 167:24 170:23 177:22 188:12,13 188:15 214:19,20 Miles 2:10 2:19 86:9 milligrams 212:17,20 millimetres 192:13	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21 modifications 200:4 modify 210:13 214:23 MOL 213:18 moment 11:3 13:23 18:9 32:16 112:18 125:16 momentum 215:17 money 211:21	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18 222:23 movement 70:14 moving 214:14 much 1:11,14 8:23 19:15 21:1 27:15 35:13 46:15 47:2 49:4 51:12,23 52:2 57:2 60:18 62:14
make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 115:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 14:8 20:18 121:16 132:8 168:9 194:6 malevolently 44:25 manage 161:4 190:3 209:21 226:15 management 8:8 18:19 29:19 126:24 198:23 210:25 221:22	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19 56:16 59:5 62:2 65:8 70:4 74:24 84:5,18 85:9,14 103:21 104:6 105:11,19 106:23 107:21,22 110:9 112:18,24 113:8,14 120:22 121:18 124:21 125:5,13	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24 MEGAN 2:13 MEHAR 2:4 melt 132:7 146:14 184:25 191:13 melting 184:23 meltwater 133:7 146:3 191:11 meltwater-dependent 132:9	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24 83:18 100:7,11,12 106:9 121:9 153:14 159:18 163:9 167:24 170:23 177:22 188:12,13 188:15 214:19,20 Miles 2:10 2:19 86:9 milligrams 212:17,20 millimetres 192:13 228:8,8	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21 modifications 200:4 modify 210:13 214:23 MOL 213:18 moment 11:3 13:23 18:9 32:16 112:18 125:16 momentum 215:17 money 211:21 monitoring 142:21	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 mountainside 193:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18 222:23 movement 70:14 moving 214:14 moving 214:14 much 1:11,14 8:23 19:15 21:1 27:15 35:13 46:15 47:2 49:4 51:12,23 52:2 57:2 60:18 62:14 65:7 68:17 73:20
 make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 115:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 14:8 20:18 121:16 132:8 168:9 194:6 malevolently 44:25 manage 161:4 190:3 209:21 226:15 management 8:8 18:19 29:19 126:24 198:23 210:25 221:22 Manager 2:21 	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19 56:16 59:5 62:2 65:8 70:4 74:24 84:5,18 85:9,14 103:21 104:6 105:11,19 106:23 107:21,22 110:9 112:18,24 113:8,14 120:22 121:18 124:21 125:5,13 144:10 150:1	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24 MEGAN 2:13 MEHAR 2:4 melt 132:7 146:14 184:25 191:13 melting 184:23 meltwater 133:7 146:3 191:11 meltwater-dependent 132:9 members 1:19 5:2	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24 83:18 100:7,11,12 106:9 121:9 153:14 159:18 163:9 167:24 170:23 177:22 188:12,13 188:15 214:19,20 Miles 2:10 2:19 86:9 milligrams 212:17,20 millimetres 192:13 228:8,8 million 104:5 133:21	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21 modifications 200:4 modify 210:13 214:23 MOL 213:18 moment 11:3 13:23 18:9 32:16 112:18 125:16 momentum 215:17 money 211:21 monitoring 142:21 143:15	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18 222:23 movement 70:14 moving 214:14 much 1:11,14 8:23 19:15 21:1 27:15 35:13 46:15 47:2 49:4 51:12,23 52:2 57:2 60:18 62:14 65:7 68:17 73:20 74:5 85:22,22 97:8
 make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 115:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 14:8 20:18 121:16 132:8 168:9 194:6 malevolently 44:25 manage 161:4 190:3 209:21 226:15 management 8:8 18:19 29:19 126:24 198:23 210:25 221:22 Manager 2:21 managing 226:19 	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19 56:16 59:5 62:2 65:8 70:4 74:24 84:5,18 85:9,14 103:21 104:6 105:11,19 106:23 107:21,22 110:9 112:18,24 113:8,14 120:22 121:18 124:21 125:5,13 144:10 150:1 158:19 159:1,24	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24 MEGAN 2:13 MEHAR 2:4 melt 132:7 146:14 184:25 191:13 melting 184:23 meltwater 133:7 146:3 191:11 meltwater-dependent 132:9 members 1:19 5:2 6:25 8:13 9:4 19:7	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24 83:18 100:7,11,12 106:9 121:9 153:14 159:18 163:9 167:24 170:23 177:22 188:12,13 188:15 214:19,20 Miles 2:10 2:19 86:9 milligrams 212:17,20 millimetres 192:13 228:8,8 million 104:5 133:21 136:13 137:10	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21 modifications 200:4 modify 210:13 214:23 MOL 213:18 moment 11:3 13:23 18:9 32:16 112:18 125:16 momentum 215:17 money 211:21 monitoring 142:21 143:15 monitors 162:21	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 mountainside 193:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18 222:23 movement 70:14 moving 214:14 much 1:11,14 8:23 19:15 21:1 27:15 35:13 46:15 47:2 49:4 51:12,23 52:2 57:2 60:18 62:14 65:7 68:17 73:20 74:5 85:22,22 97:8 102:22,25 106:14
 make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 115:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 14:8 20:18 121:16 132:8 168:9 194:6 malevolently 44:25 manage 161:4 190:3 209:21 226:15 management 8:8 18:19 29:19 126:24 198:23 210:25 221:22 Manager 2:21 managing 226:19 mandatory 13:2 96:13 	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19 56:16 59:5 62:2 65:8 70:4 74:24 84:5,18 85:9,14 103:21 104:6 105:11,19 106:23 107:21,22 110:9 112:18,24 113:8,14 120:22 121:18 124:21 125:5,13 144:10 150:1 158:19 159:1,24 162:3 163:7 169:16	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24 MEGAN 2:13 MEHAR 2:4 melt 132:7 146:14 184:25 191:13 melting 184:23 meltwater 133:7 146:3 191:11 meltwater-dependent 132:9 members 1:19 5:2 6:25 8:13 9:4 19:7 21:4 24:5 74:7,11	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24 83:18 100:7,11,12 106:9 121:9 153:14 159:18 163:9 167:24 170:23 177:22 188:12,13 188:15 214:19,20 Miles 2:10 2:19 86:9 millignams 212:17,20 millimetres 192:13 228:8,8 million 104:5 133:21 136:13 137:10 143:6 144:17 149:1	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21 modifications 200:4 modify 210:13 214:23 MOL 213:18 moment 11:3 13:23 18:9 32:16 112:18 125:16 momentum 215:17 money 211:21 monitoring 142:21 143:15	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18 222:23 movement 70:14 moving 214:14 much 1:11,14 8:23 19:15 21:1 27:15 35:13 46:15 47:2 49:4 51:12,23 52:2 57:2 60:18 62:14 65:7 68:17 73:20 74:5 85:22,22 97:8 102:22,25 106:14 122:18 123:5,10,13
 make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 115:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 14:8 20:18 121:16 132:8 168:9 194:6 malevolently 44:25 manage 161:4 190:3 209:21 226:15 management 8:8 18:19 29:19 126:24 198:23 210:25 221:22 Manager 2:21 managing 226:19 mandatory 13:2 96:13 Mangla 159:10 	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19 56:16 59:5 62:2 65:8 70:4 74:24 84:5,18 85:9,14 103:21 104:6 105:11,19 106:23 107:21,22 110:9 112:18,24 113:8,14 120:22 121:18 124:21 125:5,13 144:10 150:1 158:19 159:1,24 162:3 163:7 169:16 170:1 171:24	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24 MEGAN 2:13 MEHAR 2:4 melt 132:7 146:14 184:25 191:13 melting 184:23 meltwater 133:7 146:3 191:11 meltwater-dependent 132:9 members 1:19 5:2 6:25 8:13 9:4 19:7 21:4 24:5 74:7,11 124:14 141:5	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 mid-September 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24 83:18 100:7,11,12 106:9 121:9 153:14 159:18 163:9 167:24 170:23 177:22 188:12,13 188:15 214:19,20 Miles 2:10 2:19 86:9 milligrams 212:17,20 millimetres 192:13 228:8,8 million 104:5 133:21 136:13 137:10 143:6 144:17 149:1 149:23 161:12,14	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21 modifications 200:4 modify 210:13 214:23 MOL 213:18 moment 11:3 13:23 18:9 32:16 112:18 125:16 momentum 215:17 monitoring 142:21 143:15 monitors 162:21 Monsieur 115:19 monsoon 146:18	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 mountainside 193:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18 222:23 movement 70:14 moving 214:14 much 1:11,14 8:23 19:15 21:1 27:15 35:13 46:15 47:2 49:4 51:12,23 52:2 57:2 60:18 62:14 65:7 68:17 73:20 74:5 85:22,22 97:8 102:22,25 106:14 122:18 123:5,10,13 126:13 131:13
 make 4:17 10:24 11:13,15 18:11 19:9 23:11 39:2,9,25 44:25 62:20 70:20 82:22 98:14 106:20 108:16 111:22 122:17 125:5 128:4 148:3 152:16 154:14 155:17 166:8 177:17 183:23 191:1 204:24 209:5,7 217:3 223:17 makes 26:6 87:6 113:7 115:16 116:4 making 11:19 12:20 14:8 20:18 121:16 132:8 168:9 194:6 malevolently 44:25 manage 161:4 190:3 209:21 226:15 management 8:8 18:19 29:19 126:24 198:23 210:25 221:22 Manager 2:21 managing 226:19 mandatory 13:2 96:13 	65:13,18,21,23 66:9 66:10,14,18 68:23 71:21 106:15,16,22 matrix 195:7 matter 1:1 8:19,20 213:10,10 matters 3:13 20:9 27:16 matter[s 3:14 maximise 127:7 maximum 8:12 59:2 60:6 205:22 may 4:17 7:17 11:8,12 11:13,23 18:14 20:20 22:4 34:5 35:7,20,23 36:6 37:13,17 39:1 54:19 56:16 59:5 62:2 65:8 70:4 74:24 84:5,18 85:9,14 103:21 104:6 105:11,19 106:23 107:21,22 110:9 112:18,24 113:8,14 120:22 121:18 124:21 125:5,13 144:10 150:1 158:19 159:1,24 162:3 163:7 169:16	measure 19:5 177:6 193:18 222:8,10 measured 141:4 142:21 measures 113:3,5 209:20,22 mechanical 224:19 225:6 mechanism 228:14 mechanisms 31:22 medium 192:17 228:3 228:6 meet 51:11 58:20 59:4 59:22 79:22 meeting 37:17 meetings 57:1,3 102:9 103:24 MEGAN 2:13 MEHAR 2:4 melt 132:7 146:14 184:25 191:13 melting 184:23 meltwater 133:7 146:3 191:11 meltwater-dependent 132:9 members 1:19 5:2 6:25 8:13 9:4 19:7 21:4 24:5 74:7,11	metre 204:3 217:4 metres 104:6 136:13 167:2 177:4,15,22 203:13 204:1 207:17 210:20,22 211:11,12,13,15,17 211:18 213:20 214:20 mhos 195:17,19 middle 201:3 mid-June 38:2 144:1 might 21:16 28:3 39:2 39:9 42:12 51:17 57:19 60:15 61:20 62:1,17 65:22 81:24 83:18 100:7,11,12 106:9 121:9 153:14 159:18 163:9 167:24 170:23 177:22 188:12,13 188:15 214:19,20 Miles 2:10 2:19 86:9 millignams 212:17,20 millimetres 192:13 228:8,8 million 104:5 133:21 136:13 137:10 143:6 144:17 149:1	mirrored 53:15 misanalysed 174:2 misnomer 224:17 missing 183:10 misspoken 150:2 mitigate 165:19 212:18,20 mitigating 109:6,15 109:23 110:25 mitigation 209:20,22 mobile 193:13 mobilising 193:7 mode 206:6,7 model 214:18,18,18 modelling 182:9 189:16,19 models 214:21 modifications 200:4 modify 210:13 214:23 MOL 213:18 moment 11:3 13:23 18:9 32:16 112:18 125:16 momentum 215:17 money 211:21 monitoring 142:21 143:15 monitors 162:21 Monsieur 115:19	mostly 173:20 191:10 192:6 motivated 23:5 motivations 39:14 mountain 133:8 146:3 189:22 192:25 193:3 194:24 mountains 26:17 130:5,9 146:8 165:4 193:6 195:12 move 14:14 73:10 101:11 135:3 141:15 166:17 198:6,25 moved 6:15 53:17 68:5 194:3 197:18 222:23 movement 70:14 moving 214:14 much 1:11,14 8:23 19:15 21:1 27:15 35:13 46:15 47:2 49:4 51:12,23 52:2 57:2 60:18 62:14 65:7 68:17 73:20 74:5 85:22,22 97:8 102:22,25 106:14 122:18 123:5,10,13

Trevor McGowan

161:10 170:13	121:3,10,19 122:3	68:1,3 71:6,8 73:5	146:19	90:25 91:5,10,14,19	oft-expressed 53:7
176:14 181:24	navigability 81:16	73:11 112:4	non-consumptive	90:25 91:5,10,14,19	oh 84:25
				-	
186:23 195:20	navigable 81:13	negotiator 38:14	41:16 43:9 55:2	96:11,15 98:6,25	oil-fired 205:8
196:1,19 200:6	navigation 25:18	39:13 44:11,20	68:6 135:12	100:12 117:24	okay 23:9 63:6 124:8
205:17 206:7	navigational 83:12	48:10	non-interference 13:3	118:3 119:14 121:6	125:18 169:8 172:3
212:21 213:10	85:17 86:14,20	negotiators 27:18	15:8 32:9,11 38:19	122:21	172:8 186:22 229:3
217:4 218:18 221:7	119:19,22 120:25	40:19 102:8	39:16 40:8 97:3	objected 19:19	229:9
221:7 226:8 227:5	122:16	Nepal 146:7 189:12	non-legal 6:25	objection 4:17 19:16	old 72:16 222:20,22
muddy 198:12	NE 115:6,8	194:17 196:13	non-Pakistani 19:1,2	19:21	once 8:14 100:7 107:1
Mueenudin 38:15	near 26:2 106:21	211:4 221:25	non-travaux 63:22	objections 76:24	209:15 216:2
42:16 44:22 45:6	115:2 129:25 198:2	Nepalese 146:10	106:22	objectives 92:23	ones 98:7 164:25
Mueenudin's 38:20	208:13 220:3	net 165:21	normal 201:5,5	obligation 21:15 22:8	173:23 174:6,7,7,22
Mughal 134:3	nearly 94:21 138:13	Netherlands 1:5 2:7.8	normally 151:17	22:8,11 32:22,22	174:25
MUHAMMAD 2:4	138:18 179:24	2:9 153:7	176:13	45:16 47:14,16,25	one's 207:3
multiple 4:8 99:14,24	181:16 194:10	network 125:4 127:14	norms 119:5	48:8,9 49:25 53:5	ongoing 116:23 119:6
100:14,18 147:19	necessarily 30:19	132:1 134:14	north-west 150:20	53:18,25 54:6,15	182:3
	40:24 64:19 83:14	136:25 137:6 148:4			online 205:15,19
157:20 200:12	221:8		notably 56:23	55:18 56:9 70:12,22	-
212:19 215:8,8		148:25 149:7	note 2:14 16:6 128:21	70:24 71:23 97:1	only 3:5 7:16 8:17
223:25	necessary 14:16 40:21	151:24 152:5,8	132:24 159:12	116:11 125:24	9:19,20 15:1 18:11
multiplied 178:12	64:24 74:22 75:22	153:11,18 154:3,12	162:24 178:23	134:22 144:6	18:21 40:19 48:2
multipurpose 139:16	78:5 107:23,25	154:19,25 156:11	noted 20:16 37:4 93:1	147:14 151:10	58:10 59:21 60:13
multi-year 189:15	108:7 109:2,8	160:5,22,25 161:1	103:13 109:19	175:12 176:24	75:21 88:23 90:1
MURPHY 1:10	110:16	162:17 163:18,19	111:14 118:16	obligations 21:23	99:4,13,25 107:22
must 6:6 13:2,4 30:18	need 3:10 5:8 23:10	164:3,11 165:22	138:20 180:14	88:24 89:23 96:10	107:24 108:6
41:16 76:25 77:14	64:19 68:4 69:23	166:12 174:9 180:6	notes 110:2	109:12 110:21	110:25 111:1 116:7
78:22 87:13 95:6,20	72:22 90:16 98:16	185:18	nothing 59:12 118:9	114:21 117:20	116:13 128:21
95:21 101:4 109:20	103:11 108:25	networks 163:22	142:16 165:19	obscure 107:7	131:23 135:17,17
114:7 183:6 224:16	116:21 129:1	neutral 3:5,12,22 4:3	227:17,18	observation 11:18	142:13,18 145:7
224:16,16	135:21 170:3,8	4:10,21 5:1,15,18	notice 23:2 196:7,10	19:9 166:25 167:9	155:6 162:25 166:1
MUSTANSAR 2:6	190:22 205:8,14	5:22,24 6:5,14,17	197:18 199:20	observations 7:8 9:5.6	168:5 172:16,24
mutual 22:7 30:21	208:19 209:11	7:10,19 8:19 20:1	206:5 216:4	11:15 182:4 183:23	173:1,9 175:23
31:16 33:21 39:16	211:25 218:11,22	28:20 72:21 114:25	noticed 61:17 162:3	observe 214:22	179:21 180:11
49:19 50:16	needed 33:14 152:12	115:14	215:7,23	observed 25:24 28:18	190:22 203:13
mutually 87:13 91:2	159:17	never 19:23 222:3	notification 20:13	39:18 57:14 74:20	211:9 227:18
	139:17	never 19:25 222:5	nouncation 20:15	59:16 57:14 74:20	211:9 227:18
	11 010 00	0 < 11 /1 < /5 10	118 01 1 (00 0 10	07 5 101 4 110 14	
MW 136:15,22 139:11	needle 210:22	new 26:11 41:6 45:13	notify 21:16 22:2,10	87:5 101:4 113:14	onto 3:4
140:2,3 173:9,13,22	needs 51:11 79:22	60:11 72:10 102:3	noting 118:7	146:12 163:24	onward 156:11
	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9
140:2,3 173:9,13,22	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 <u>Nahar 137:2</u>	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 <u>Nahar 137:2</u> name 25:14	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 obsierves 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 obsioserves 40:9 obvious 1 13:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 obsiously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasionally 34:25	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowest 99:18	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasionally 34:25 occur 143:23,25	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrowed 82:17 narrowed 82:17 narrowed 99:22 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasionally 34:25 occur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 132:25 198:12 207:22 215:22	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrowed 82:17 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 34:25 occur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrower 99:22 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasionally 34:25 occur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrower 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6, 8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasionally 34:25 occur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurs 101:19 191:9	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operate 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11 65:16,22 66:4,10	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observer 28:20 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasionally 34:25 occur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurs 101:19 191:9 203:8 206:8 219:14	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10 162:19	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11 65:16,22 66:4,10 67:24 70:4 93:2	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19 164:22 169:2	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18 228:25	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasionally 34:25 occur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurs 101:19 191:9 203:8 206:8 219:14 229:1	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23 213:18 223:20
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowst 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10 162:19 nationally 179:11	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11 65:16,22 66:4,10 67:24 70:4 93:2 101:10	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19 164:22 169:2 172:10 174:20	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18 228:25 numbers 166:24 169:5	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasionally 34:25 occur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurs 101:19 191:9 203:8 206:8 219:14 229:1 October 143:21	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23 213:18 223:20 operation 3:24 11:7
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10 162:19	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11 65:16,22 66:4,10 67:24 70:4 93:2 101:10 negotiation 17:16	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19 164:22 169:2 172:10 174:20 177:15 178:16	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9,9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18 228:25 numbers 166:24 169:5 169:5 192:18 222:2	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasionally 34:25 occus 113:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurs 101:19 191:9 203:8 206:8 219:14 229:1 October 143:21 off 27:10,11,12 28:24	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operated 43:14 44:25 operated 43:14 44:25 operated 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23 213:18 223:20 operation 3:24 11:7 17:11 24:10 58:7
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowst 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10 162:19 nationally 179:11	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11 65:16,22 66:4,10 67:24 70:4 93:2 101:10 negotiation 17:16 23:21 24:6 62:7	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19 164:22 169:2 172:10 174:20 177:15 178:16 180:16 182:8 187:1	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18 228:25 numbers 166:24 169:5 169:5 192:18 222:2 229:5	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 13:23 coccur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurs 101:19 191:9 203:8 206:8 219:14 229:1 October 143:21 off 27:10,11,12 28:24 34:9 97:19 163:8	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23 213:18 223:20 operation 3:24 11:7 17:11 24:10 58:7 87:8 93:22,25
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrowed 82:17 narrowet 99:22 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10 162:19 nationally 179:11 nationals 77:24 91:9	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11 65:16,22 66:4,10 67:24 70:4 93:2 101:10 negotiation 17:16 23:21 24:6 62:7 94:20	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19 164:22 169:2 172:10 174:20 177:15 178:16 180:16 182:8 187:1 193:20 201:21	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18 228:25 numbers 166:24 169:5 169:5 192:18 222:2 229:5 numerical 124:5	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasionally 34:25 occur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurs 101:19 191:9 203:8 206:8 219:14 229:1 October 143:21 off 27:10,11,12 28:24 34:9 97:19 163:8 193:12,25 205:3	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23 213:18 223:20 operation 3:24 11:7 17:11 24:10 58:7 87:8 93:22,25 118:25 119:16
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrowed 82:17 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10 162:19 nationally 179:11 nationals 77:24 91:9 nations 95:24	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11 65:16,22 66:4,10 67:24 70:4 93:2 101:10 negotiation 17:16 23:21 24:6 62:7	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19 164:22 169:2 172:10 174:20 177:15 178:16 180:16 182:8 187:1	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18 228:25 numbers 166:24 169:5 169:5 192:18 222:2 229:5	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 13:23 coccur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurs 101:19 191:9 203:8 206:8 219:14 229:1 October 143:21 off 27:10,11,12 28:24 34:9 97:19 163:8	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23 213:18 223:20 operation 3:24 11:7 17:11 24:10 58:7 87:8 93:22,25 118:25 119:16 126:21 148:10
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10 162:19 nationally 179:11 nationally 179:11 nationally 179:19 nations 95:24 natural 36:13 37:10 37:24 38:21 39:3,10	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11 65:16,22 66:4,10 67:24 70:4 93:2 101:10 negotiation 17:16 23:21 24:6 62:7 94:20	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19 164:22 169:2 172:10 174:20 177:15 178:16 180:16 182:8 187:1 193:20 201:21	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18 228:25 numbers 166:24 169:5 169:5 192:18 222:2 229:5 numerical 124:5	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasionally 34:25 occur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurs 101:19 191:9 203:8 206:8 219:14 229:1 October 143:21 off 27:10,11,12 28:24 34:9 97:19 163:8 193:12,25 205:3	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23 213:18 223:20 operation 3:24 11:7 17:11 24:10 58:7 87:8 93:22,25 118:25 119:16
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrowed 82:17 narrowed 82:17 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10 162:19 nationally 179:11 nationals 77:24 91:9 nations 95:24 natural 36:13 37:10 37:24 38:21 39:3,10 40:1 43:15 44:10	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11 65:16,22 66:4,10 67:24 70:4 93:2 101:10 negotiation 17:16 23:21 24:6 62:7 94:20 negotiations 10:19	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19 164:22 169:2 172:10 174:20 177:15 178:16 180:16 182:8 187:1 193:20 201:21 214:25	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18 228:25 numbers 166:24 169:5 169:5 192:18 222:2 229:5 numerical 124:5 Nurek 189:13 228:19	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasionally 34:25 occur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurrs 101:19 191:9 203:8 206:8 219:14 229:1 October 143:21 off 27:10,11,12 28:24 34:9 97:19 163:8 193:12,25 205:3 207:11 214:16	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23 213:18 223:20 operation 3:24 11:7 17:11 24:10 58:7 87:8 93:22,25 118:25 119:16 126:21 148:10
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10 162:19 nationally 179:11 nationals 77:24 91:9 nations 95:24 natural 36:13 37:10 37:24 38:21 39:3,10 40:1 43:15 44:10 52:4,8 78:22 131:19	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11 65:16,22 66:4,10 67:24 70:4 93:2 101:10 negotiation 17:16 23:21 24:6 62:7 94:20 negotiations 10:19 17:18 18:1 27:8	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19 164:22 169:2 172:10 174:20 177:15 178:16 180:16 182:8 187:1 193:20 201:21 214:25 Nicaragua 119:19	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18 228:25 numbers 166:24 169:5 169:5 192:18 222:2 229:5 numerical 124:5 Nurek 189:13 228:19	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obvious 113:15 176:22 obvious 113:15 176:22 obvious 113:15 176:22 obvious 113:15 176:22 obvious 113:15 176:22 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasion 21:15 22:9 occur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurs 101:19 191:9 203:8 206:8 219:14 229:1 October 143:21 off 27:10,11,12 28:24 34:9 97:19 163:8 193:12,25 205:3 207:11 214:16 215:15 220:15	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operate 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23 213:18 223:20 operation 3:24 11:7 17:11 24:10 58:7 87:8 93:22,25 118:25 119:16 126:21 148:10 155:7 188:19 198:5
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10 162:19 nationally 179:11 nationals 77:24 91:9 nations 95:24 natural 36:13 37:10 37:24 38:21 39:3,10 40:1 43:15 44:10 52:4,8 78:22 131:19 149:13 150:1,3	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11 65:16,22 66:4,10 67:24 70:4 93:2 101:10 negotiation 17:16 23:21 24:6 62:7 94:20 negotiations 10:19 17:18 18:1 27:8 28:16 30:2 32:3,17	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19 164:22 169:2 172:10 174:20 177:15 178:16 180:16 182:8 187:1 193:20 201:21 214:25 Nicaragua 119:19 night 223:10	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6, 8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18 228:25 numbers 166:24 169:5 169:5 192:18 222:2 229:5 numerical 124:5 Nurek 189:13 228:19 229:4	$\begin{array}{c} 146:12\ 163:24\\ 180:16\ 194:22\\ 215:10\ 227:16\\ \textbf{observer}\ 28:20\\ \textbf{occasionally}\ 17:10\ 46:23\\ \textbf{52:5\ 65:15\ 66:3}\\ \textbf{98:11\ 170:3,13,20}\\ 202:25\\ \textbf{occasionally}\ 34:25\\ \textbf{occasionally}\ 34:25\\ \textbf{occasionally}\ 34:25\\ \textbf{occasionally}\ 34:25\\ \textbf{occasionally}\ 34:25\\ \textbf{occasionally}\ 34:25\\ \textbf{occurring}\ 105:14\\ 143:24\\ \textbf{occurs}\ 101:19\ 191:9\\ 203:8\ 206:8\ 219:14\\ 229:1\\ \textbf{October}\ 143:21\\ \textbf{off}\ 27:10,11,12\ 28:24\\ 34:9\ 97:19\ 163:8\\ 193:12,25\ 205:3\\ 207:11\ 214:16\\ 215:15\ 220:15\\ 221:3,9\ 222:3\\ \end{array}$	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operate 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23 213:18 223:20 operation 3:24 11:7 17:11 24:10 58:7 87:8 93:22,25 118:25 119:16 126:21 148:10 155:7 188:19 198:5 206:2 210:11
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10 162:19 nationaly 179:11 nationals 77:24 91:9 nations 95:24 natural 36:13 37:10 37:24 38:21 39:3,10 40:1 43:15 44:10 52:4,8 78:22 131:19 149:13 150:1,3 152:2,21 170:23	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{needs} 51:11 \ 79:22\\ 98:17 \ 125:15 \ 129:3\\ 129:6 \ 135:24\\ 162:15 \ 173:4\\ 218:19\\ \textbf{Neelum-Jhelum} \ 17:8\\ 18:14 \ 22:23 \ 23:3\\ 189:18 \ 192:1\\ 199:16 \ 200:1,13\\ 206:21 \ 214:5\\ 215:23 \ 217:13\\ 220:9,24,25\\ \textbf{Neelum-Kishenganga}\\ 130:15\\ \textbf{negate} \ 111:4\\ \textbf{negotiated} \ 79:2\\ \textbf{negotiating} \ 3:6 \ 21:3,7\\ 30:12 \ 32:6 \ 42:24\\ 50:12 \ 56:5,8 \ 59:11\\ 65:16,22 \ 66:4,10\\ 67:24 \ 70:4 \ 93:2\\ 101:10\\ \textbf{negotiation} \ 17:16\\ 23:21 \ 24:6 \ 62:7\\ 94:20\\ \textbf{negotiations} \ 10:19\\ 17:18 \ 18:1 \ 27:8\\ 28:16 \ 30:2 \ 32:3,17\\ 35:19 \ 40:4 \ 41:23\\ 42:22,24 \ 44:2,18\\ \end{array}$	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19 164:22 169:2 172:10 174:20 177:15 178:16 180:16 182:8 187:1 193:20 201:21 214:25 Nicaragua 119:19 night 223:10 nine 168:16 189:11 non 97:20	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6, 8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18 228:25 numbers 166:24 169:5 169:5 192:18 222:2 229:5 numerical 124:5 Nurek 189:13 228:19 229:4	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observer 28:20 obvious 113:15 176:22 obvious 113:15 176:22 obvious 113:15 176:22 obvious 113:15 176:22 obvious 113:15 176:22 obvious 113:12 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurs 101:19 191:9 203:8 206:8 219:14 229:1 October 143:21 off 27:10,11,12 28:24 34:9 97:19 163:8 193:12,25 205:3 207:11 214:16 215:15 220:15 221:3,9 222:3 offer 166:1	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23 213:18 223:20 operation 3:24 11:7 17:11 24:10 58:7 87:8 93:22,25 118:25 119:16 126:21 148:10 155:7 188:19 198:5 206:2 210:11 216:25 220:2,4,13 220:14 225:23
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrowed 82:17 narrowed 82:17 narrowed 99:12 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10 162:19 nationals 77:24 91:9 nations 95:24 natural 36:13 37:10 37:24 38:21 39:3,10 40:1 43:15 44:10 52:4,8 78:22 131:19 149:13 150:1,3 152:2,21 170:23 naturally 149:14	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11 65:16,22 66:4,10 67:24 70:4 93:2 101:10 negotiation 17:16 23:21 24:6 62:7 94:20 negotiations 10:19 17:18 18:1 27:8 28:16 30:2 32:3,17 35:19 40:4 41:23 45:23 48:16 49:22	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19 164:22 169:2 172:10 174:20 177:15 178:16 180:16 182:8 187:1 193:20 201:21 214:25 Nicaragua 119:19 nigh 223:10 nine 168:16 189:11 non 97:20 non-agricultural	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6, 8 218:15 nozzles 207:9, 8 218:15 nozzles 207:9, 9 112 nuclear 205:9, 25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18 228:25 numbers 166:24 169:5 169:5 192:18 222:2 229:5 numerical 124:5 Nurek 189:13 228:19 229:4 0 object 7:23 55:1 76:14 82:18 84:6 85:15	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 13:22 occur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurs 101:19 191:9 203:8 206:8 219:14 229:1 October 143:21 off 27:10,11,12 28:24 34:9 97:19 163:8 193:12,25 205:3 207:11 214:16 215:15 220:15 221:3,9 222:3 offer 166:1 offered 29:18 43:10 Office 2:6	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:11 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23 213:18 223:20 operation 3:24 11:7 17:11 24:10 58:7 87:8 93:22,25 118:25 119:16 126:21 148:10 155:7 188:19 198:5 206:2 210:11 216:25 220:2,4,13 220:14 225:23 operational 46:1
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrow 56:8 narrowed 82:17 narrower 99:22 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10 162:19 nationaly 179:11 nationals 77:24 91:9 nations 95:24 natural 36:13 37:10 37:24 38:21 39:3,10 40:1 43:15 44:10 52:4,87 8:22 131:19 149:13 150:1,3 152:2,21 170:23 naturaly 149:14 nature 22:5 40:5	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11 65:16,22 66:4,10 67:24 70:4 93:2 101:10 negotiation 17:16 23:21 24:6 62:7 94:20 negotiations 10:19 17:18 18:1 27:8 28:16 30:2 32:3,17 35:19 40:4 41:23 42:22,24 44:2,18 45:23 48:16 49:22 50:23 56:5,25 57:4	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19 164:22 169:2 172:10 174:20 177:15 178:16 180:16 182:8 187:1 193:20 201:21 214:25 Nicaragua 119:19 night 223:10 nine 168:16 189:11 non 97:20 non-agricultural 145:4	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6,8 218:15 nozzles 207:9 nuclear 205:9,25 number 11:9 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18 228:25 numerical 124:5 Nurek 189:13 228:19 229:4 0 object 7:23 55:1 76:14 82:18 84:6 85:15 86:15 88:7,14,15,22	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 13:23 0 ccur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurs 101:19 191:9 203:8 206:8 219:14 229:1 October 143:21 off 27:10,11,12 28:24 34:9 97:19 163:8 193:12,25 205:3 207:11 214:16 215:15 220:15 221:3,9 222:3 offer 166:1 offere 29:18 43:10 Office 2:6 offices 29:18	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23 213:18 223:20 operation 3:24 11:7 17:11 24:10 58:7 87:8 93:22,25 118:25 119:16 126:21 148:10 155:7 188:19 198:5 206:2 210:11 216:25 220:2,4,13 220:14 225:23 operational 46:1 218:8
140:2,3 173:9,13,22 227:21 Nahar 137:2 name 25:14 namely 52:20 143:19 177:13 Nariman 117:11 narrative 13:22 narrowed 82:17 narrowed 82:17 narrowed 99:12 narrowest 99:18 narrowly 91:7 97:13 98:18 99:13 NASIR 2:8 national 141:24 143:19 144:8,12 145:12 152:9,10 162:19 nationals 77:24 91:9 nations 95:24 natural 36:13 37:10 37:24 38:21 39:3,10 40:1 43:15 44:10 52:4,8 78:22 131:19 149:13 150:1,3 152:2,21 170:23 naturally 149:14	needs 51:11 79:22 98:17 125:15 129:3 129:6 135:24 162:15 173:4 218:19 Neelum-Jhelum 17:8 18:14 22:23 23:3 189:18 192:1 199:16 200:1,13 206:21 214:5 215:23 217:13 220:9,24,25 Neelum-Kishenganga 130:15 negate 111:4 negotiated 79:2 negotiating 3:6 21:3,7 30:12 32:6 42:24 50:12 56:5,8 59:11 65:16,22 66:4,10 67:24 70:4 93:2 101:10 negotiation 17:16 23:21 24:6 62:7 94:20 negotiations 10:19 17:18 18:1 27:8 28:16 30:2 32:3,17 35:19 40:4 41:23 45:23 48:16 49:22	60:11 72:10 102:3 112:2,3,5,13 115:12 119:15 148:22 157:24 158:4 159:11 199:10 219:1 222:21,24,24 224:5,8,9,11 225:4 225:15,24 228:23 news 187:7 next 32:20 35:19 58:16 59:12 86:22 102:18 107:1 124:6 129:7,17 130:12,24 132:3,23 133:10 138:11 139:14 140:19 141:1 143:13 149:2,7 150:10 153:9 155:10 156:3 157:4 158:11,19 159:19 164:22 169:2 172:10 174:20 177:15 178:16 180:16 182:8 187:1 193:20 201:21 214:25 Nicaragua 119:19 nigh 223:10 nine 168:16 189:11 non 97:20 non-agricultural	noting 118:7 Notwithstanding 48:13 174:14 November 69:1 nozzle 207:6, 8 218:15 nozzles 207:9, 8 218:15 nozzles 207:9, 9 10 12:8,11 14:10 15:18 16:1 18:25 19:1,18 20:9 47:15 58:6 76:23 92:19 94:19 97:17 105:13 128:10 132:10 136:17 155:14 156:5 167:3 169:13,13 170:2 173:25 174:17 175:10 182:9 189:22 197:17 204:22 220:18 228:25 numbers 166:24 169:5 169:5 192:18 222:2 229:5 numerical 124:5 Nurek 189:13 228:19 229:4 0 object 7:23 55:1 76:14 82:18 84:6 85:15	146:12 163:24 180:16 194:22 215:10 227:16 observer 28:20 observes 40:9 obvious 113:15 176:22 obviously 17:10 46:23 52:5 65:15 66:3 98:11 170:3,13,20 202:25 occasion 21:15 22:9 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 131:22 occasional 13:22 occur 143:23,25 198:12 207:22 215:22 occurring 105:14 143:24 occurs 101:19 191:9 203:8 206:8 219:14 229:1 October 143:21 off 27:10,11,12 28:24 34:9 97:19 163:8 193:12,25 205:3 207:11 214:16 215:15 220:15 221:3,9 222:3 offer 166:1 offered 29:18 43:10 Office 2:6	onward 156:11 159:21 187:6 188:3 open 125:6,7 140:9 153:14 201:6 opened 217:15 opening 3:1 1:6,9 7:7 9:5 24:20 54:18 117:5 140:7 201:10 operate 164:13 190:8 191:25 205:16 210:25 211:4 220:2 221:20,21 222:25 223:6 operated 43:14 44:25 operated 43:14 44:25 operates 162:18 207:1 operating 58:19 59:3 60:6 67:17 105:22 202:16 204:9 205:24 207:10 210:21 212:23 213:18 223:20 operation 3:24 11:7 17:11 24:10 58:7 87:8 93:22,25 118:25 119:16 126:21 148:10 155:7 188:19 198:5 206:2 210:11 216:25 220:2,4,13 220:14 225:23 operational 46:1

				• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
53:11	203:12 206:4	187:4 198:18	48:10,12,20,24 49:1	26:25 27:11 32:13	90:4 93:13 113:11
operationalise 34:11	209:18 211:23	200:22,23,25	49:12,24 50:18	46:25 57:24 67:1,9	122:5
97:4	213:11	202:10 207:17	51:15 52:7 53:7	79:4 82:2 96:5	peaceful 114:7
operator 60:18 112:16	others 1:18 17:19	215:7 222:18	54:4,18 58:5,25	97:15 104:21 105:1	peak 204:20,23 205:23
205:16,18,21 209:6	74:13 118:14	overall 10:13 12:22	72:1 73:14 75:7	105:3 110:22 119:4	peaking 191:25
222:20,21,22,24,24	152:18	205:2	79:9 89:25 92:8	126:22 127:23	204:16 205:12,15
223:3	otherwise 26:12	overarching 67:3	101:22 102:20	134:1 152:4 153:12	206:2
operators 222:20	104:18 135:10	71:22	103:5 115:22 118:6	154:6 187:24	peculiar 81:24
opinion 22:1 95:10	152:15	overcome 218:10	118:19 125:21	188:11 190:2	Pelton 207:1,3,8,10,12
170:22	other's 114:20	overestimate 194:15	126:1 127:13	191:25 195:6	207:19 210:21
opportunity 17:7,12	out 4:5 9:23 14:7,9	overflow 217:3,4	128:18,21 131:7	197:19 215:12	Peltons 207:17
18:12 96:21 187:18	25:12 28:5,11 29:21	overhaul 225:19	141:10,15 142:2,16	216:21 222:6	penultimate 128:1
opposite 97:19	29:24 32:19 34:4	overnight 11:22	142:17 143:18	particularised 19:21	people 25:5 28:25
opposition 1:22,25 39:8 41:20	35:6,17 39:13 41:1	204:19,24 override 110:20	144:11,21,25 145:12,18 147:1	particularly 65:2 80:25 124:24	133:21 141:24 161:23 177:17
optimal 93:25	41:3 44:5 45:15,17 46:1,13,17 47:13	overriding 135:23	143:12,18 147:1	139:23 140:25	194:6 196:7 221:23
optimise 217:6	48:19 53:24 55:23	152:19 175:12	159:9 171:4,5	142:25 144:8 146:5	pepper 195:5
optimising 216:21	58:3 59:1,9 61:23	overseeing 36:9	172:14,17,19 174:9	154:12 155:20	per 116:13 137:21
option 187:13 211:23	64:15,18 66:7,24	oversight 176:4	174:11,14 175:23	157:4 170:10	177:4,15 211:11
options 213:15 226:12	69:7 70:12,14 71:20	overstated 141:25	178:12,20 179:5,23	178:25 182:15,22	212:17,20 217:4
226:12	75:5,18 76:6,9,10	overtops 193:4	186:6,15	183:12 193:8	percentage 171:21
orange 89:15	79:10 87:15 89:9	overview 3:4 10:10	Pakistan-administe	parties 1:22,25 3:7,15	192:22 194:12,14
order 76:16 94:16	91:15 93:14 97:5	127:4,18 128:6	130:16	7:24 8:13,18,21	228:4
101:16 113:2	108:23 114:25	130:21	Palace 1:4	19:14 21:23 22:7	perfect 50:17 225:2
127:14 134:15,20	122:3 127:2 135:11	overwhelming 126:1	pale 145:6	29:7 37:14 42:24	229:12
148:20 158:15	139:9 154:15	own 25:25 31:10 43:7	Panama 96:2	44:2 45:23 48:14,18	perfectly 98:1 187:10
160:23 164:9,10	155:12 167:22	66:21 104:21	paper 11:4 140:5	56:5,17 60:16,22	187:17 215:4
166:7,8,12 185:22	170:14 183:7 189:6	117:14 154:13	153:17 155:13	65:17,24 66:5,6,10	perforated 216:14
ordinarily 184:25	199:23,24 200:3	156:8 158:5	179:22 182:8	66:13,15,20 67:1,5	performance 216:21
ordinary 76:14,19,22	203:11,20 206:21	oxygen-fed 218:15	papers 182:9	67:5 78:20 85:23	perhaps 9:24 11:24
77:6,8 78:22 79:19 80:12,24 81:1,18	206:25 207:5 209:12 212:9 215:5	o'clock 123:12	paragraphs 2:12,14 31:25 32:19 34:19	88:25 89:10,16 91:24 93:2,7 96:6	12:6 65:20,21 68:14 68:19 69:20 70:3
82:3,10,21 83:4,25	216:12,16 217:16	P	39:5 42:15 43:23	100:8 101:10,18	82:17 85:25 98:13
84:3 87:2 90:12	219:18 221:2,16		44:6 48:19 52:21	102:6 104:2,25	106:4,5 134:25
98:24	222:10,11 223:24	P 1:11	57:9 66:8,25 87:12	105:20,22 106:1	144:20 151:16
organisation 95:12	224:7,12 225:15,16	pack 124:20 pacta 101:2	109:17 112:12	112:4 114:18	152:18 169:2 171:9
146:6,11	outburst 183:1 193:1	page 21:13 24:25	146:20	119:17 122:19,21	171:11 175:17
orientation 153:15	193:2	26:14,18 37:25	parallels 46:5	partition 13:13 24:11	178:24 181:2,18
oriented 214:14	outcome 82:20 111:11	40:16 56:15 57:15	parameters 50:25	134:4 154:25	182:6 201:7
orifice 200:14 201:15	outcomes 7:12	67:18 78:4 95:2	108:20 183:6	156:21	perilous 177:20
202:5,11	outdated 138:8	113:22 115:1	190:13,17,21	parts 23:18 24:16	period 17:23 18:3
origin 46:7	outflow 197:21 198:8	128:23 129:6 132:6	parent 195:2,3	25:19 70:1 75:4	23:22 28:16 32:6,8
original 50:19 101:18	outlet 202:3 217:2	144:2 145:13,21	Paris 185:14	88:20 148:3 160:23	32:17 33:11,13 41:3
151:19 194:8	outlets 105:16	147:18 163:25	Parliament 24:14	162:25 163:18	43:5,19 44:8 48:19
originally 77:18	outline 11:24 189:25	173:14	part 1:20 3:24 30:4,5	174:5 199:14	48:22 57:7 61:8
originates 130:3,14	outlines 209:24	pages 29:2 37:11	32:5 35:9 43:2 51:5	party 21:24 22:2,3,5	71:1 104:4 135:15
146:22 originating 146:13	output 179:20 180:9	49:15	52:16,17 63:20	66:9 67:11,12 68:14 68:17 104:14 16	135:16,17,17 136:3
origins 19:10 23:19	181:3 outset 68:16 73:4	Pak 42:19	64:23 65:4,19,21 66:18,19 67:14,23	68:17 104:14,16 117:20	141:2 144:1,9 147:3 153:23 155:21
other 16:1 18:19,22,25	outside 36:11 39:1,8	Pakistani 18:22 19:1	68:24 83:21 84:22	party's 91:9	157:3,4,6,7,17
19:2,24 22:2,2,5	113:8 123:7 146:18	127:18 129:22	85:8 89:5,7,13 90:5	party \$ 91.9 pass 198:17	159:8,25 160:2,3,7
25:17 29:3 31:21	149:25 150:25	131:16 133:14,17 135:23 145:10	92:21 94:8 101:2	passage 41:24 182:19	160:8,13 168:15
34:15 46:8,20,22	over 2:2 4:13 5:16	135:23 145:10 158:16 161:15	106:12 115:11	passes 130:4 134:6	180:23 212:22,23
48:16,24 51:24 64:6	11:14 18:7 19:8,22	164:18 172:11	116:14,15 127:6,10	passing 131:15 212:8	222:18
65:23 67:12 68:16	27:22 31:7 32:17	173:15,17 174:4	127:13,17 128:5	past 143:4 184:11	periods 43:20 137:14
70:1 72:14 75:23	34:11 36:19 37:1,14	185:17,19	129:10 144:4	188:1 199:12	138:4 146:23
77:22 84:5 86:5	38:6 39:23 44:1,9	Pakistanis 26:3 27:19	148:11 149:11,12	path 215:10,10	184:10,22
89:23 97:18 110:19	45:4 47:7 48:18,23	27:20 28:15	166:20 170:2,4	pause 9:25 22:19	permanent 1:4 2:18
110:21 112:19	48:25 50:6,15,24	Pakistan's 2:12 3:25	172:6 188:13	166:22 170:16	94:22 95:1 102:6
114:22 117:21	52:7 53:4,8 67:23	10:13 12:23 14:13	191:23 204:18	172:4 186:21	103:20 113:24
121:25 127:25	68:5 69:9 70:23	16:23 17:9 18:5	208:13 220:21	188:16 217:7	132:4
145:3 148:13	103:19,23 120:4	19:16,21 20:12,15	223:5	pay 64:19 221:6	permanently 28:24
152:16 157:11	128:2,24 129:10	20:22 22:22 23:15	partial 64:9 65:6	224:10	134:8 137:13
162:1,16 163:2	132:5 133:21	25:12 29:10 31:14	87:17 91:14	pays 62:5	permissibility 88:3
171:6,21,23 173:3	137:10 140:22,24	33:15 34:5,7,16	particle 217:20	PCA 1:3	permissible 68:7
182:9 183:18 186:7	141:2 143:4 147:15	38:14 39:13 40:7,13	particles 193:23 195:8 particular 2:14,19,25	PCIW 8:16 peace 1:4 13:13,17	permission 56:19 permissive 55:5
189:22 192:9 198:10 200:18	147:24 153:1 154:9 179:6 181:5,12	40:24 41:19 43:20	3:14 6:25 23:6	16:9 75:25 88:11	permissive 55:5 permissiveness 55:10
170.10 200.10	177.0 101.3,12	44:6,8,11,20 45:19	5.17 0.25 25.0	10.7 13.23 00.11	permissiveness 55.10
					l

110:20 111:8	102:19 105:6	36:15 41:24 42:14	49:13 66:22 75:21	191:9,10	105:13 116:24
permitted 8:7 41:13	191:21,22,23,25	57:24 60:8,21 62:19	99:14,17,24 101:6	precise 114:13 168:25	121:7
48:6 92:3 116:13	199:8 204:17 205:3	67:3 69:19 71:17,19	108:6 181:25	169:3 182:1 185:3	presumptive 5:23
permitting 51:12	205:4,7,8,9,15,17	74:19 77:7 78:12	188:15 205:18	preclusion 20:10	7:16
perpetuity 120:11	205:25 206:1,1,2	81:5 84:1,9,10 85:1	213:8,25	precursor 55:9 58:24	pretty 189:16 192:10
123:3	207:3,10,13,19	98:21 104:3 105:23	possibly 44:24 124:23	predates 94:20 151:7	196:23 203:3 205:1
persists 8:6	209:3,13,14 210:20	106:2,14,20 108:17	post-partition 134:10	predict 227:25	206:5,8 228:9
perspective 3:25 11:7	210:21,24 212:23	109:18 111:1 112:6	post-Treaty 134:10	predictable 183:21	prevalence 228:17
126:21 188:20	213:9,13 214:13	114:13,23 116:4,6	149:21	184:9 186:3	prevent 219:11
persuade 7:19	216:20 217:13	118:15 124:8 128:8	potential 122:25 128:3	predicted 179:15	prevented 23:3
persuaded 6:6,9 7:17 persuasiveness 6:1	219:6 220:8,14 221:21 222:18,25	132:11 144:22 153:14 155:8,9	132:21 139:23,24 140:3 170:22	194:18 predominant 194:2	previous 3:3 79:3 95:14 96:19 179:4
Peru 209:13 215:21	223:6,13 224:3,14	165:5 167:11,14,20	190:20 219:13	preempted 23:3	previously 127:15
per-capita 177:21	225:11 226:16	167:20 168:4,9,9	220:1	187:14	147:7 148:5,21
PETER 2:14	227:20,21	171:3,14,16 173:14	potentially 168:12	preferred 218:18	149:19 153:5
phase 1:7 1:4 21:9	plants 26:16 37:20	176:14 177:1	179:25 181:12	prefers 211:2	157:22 158:17
42:22 147:4 197:11	46:1 49:5 51:13,23	181:10 182:2	212:15	prejudge 169:4	159:22 162:12
PhD 40:9	52:2 56:12 60:12	188:12 196:11	power 15:9,10 29:3	preliminary 76:24	164:12 179:2
PHILIPPA 2:10	71:15 94:7 103:14	198:7 222:6 223:16	32:13 39:21 41:14	premise 71:25 72:1	217:13
Philippines 189:23	104:4 105:10	pointed 69:7 93:14	43:2 44:5,14,22	premised 120:12,13	pre-Baglihar 106:16
photo 196:12	115:12 175:13	103:13 105:6	45:10,25 47:22 49:4	123:4	pre-treatment 210:6
phrase 90:19 91:7	180:6 190:7 198:25	114:25	49:7 50:1 51:2,12	preparation 45:13	primacy 48:8 55:18
97:1 118:2	199:12,13,14,21	pointer 191:17 points 12:20 14:11	51:15,16,22 52:14	preparatory 13:21 14:2.6 106:24	primarily 49:21 164:2
physical 190:13 214:17,18,21	204:14 205:1,7,11 205:11 206:13	55:17 66:2 75:11	54:14 55:3,7,16 58:8,11,12,22 60:4	14:2,6 106:24 prepared 37:22 38:3	primary 15:4,11 74:21 92:23 172:19
pick 11:20 16:1 21:10	207:8,22 208:21,24	76:2 91:16 103:18	60:7,9,18,23 61:1	prepared 57:22 58:5 preparing 11:22	213:13
21:20 28:7 188:2	207.8,22 208.21,24 211:4 212:18	162:1 167:10	61:11,13 62:22,23	prescription 104:17	Prime 30:1 34:4 69:4
222:13,13	218:24 221:24,25	217:14	69:25 79:17,19,21	111:1	principal 34:3 128:13
picked 126:19	223:20,23 226:7,8	policy 17:1 51:15	80:1,6,12 92:3,7,18	present 1:21 19:11	principally 16:13
picking 222:15	227:14,16	189:2	127:18 136:16	81:25 115:9 140:14	principle 30:21 31:3
picture 139:14 196:5	plant-specific 4:6 5:18	policymaker 110:18	139:16 145:6	187:9	32:11 42:8 53:4,12
207:2,4	102:21	policy-maker 109:13	166:17 172:10,11	presentation 1:6	67:17,20 69:3,5,11
pictures 194:25	play 107:10 112:20	politically 49:11	172:18,20 173:7	11:13 12:18 17:6	69:16,20 71:6 72:6
pieces 161:3	163:20 223:3	pond 211:16,17	190:4 191:24	18:10,12 23:14,14	72:10 75:13 77:10
pile 216:12,16	played 82:16	pondage 2:2 8:12 15:9	199:21 204:16,17	26:24 32:5 51:6	77:12,21 81:11,23
pink 149:25 151:16 152:23 153:1	PLA-0041 90:17 PLA-0053 102:20	15:19 57:12,16,25 58:6,9,14 59:8,18	204:21,23,24 205:4 205:7,11,12,14,17	52:17 57:23 61:14 62:19 63:1,13 74:6	82:4,16 88:17 93:10 97:12 99:12,19
pinnacle 9:15,16,19	PLA-101 113:22	59:21 60:6,7,24	205:23 209:6	74:18 79:3 80:15	100:15,15,17,22
9:19	PLA-102 114:5	61:10,13 80:10	212:13,23 220:3,8	83:21 84:23 97:6	118:10
pitch 121:16	PLA-21 94:9	103:16 104:5	220:15 221:24	106:22 120:22	
pivotal 32:8 55:18					principles 3:13 10:22
	PLA-22 95:2	105:15 106:5	225:21 226:3,4	123:6 124:24	principles 3:13 10:22 13:25 14:18,21,25
67:19 71:7	PLA-22 95:2 PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11	105:15 106:5 pool 58:19 59:3 60:6	225:21 226:3,4 powerhouse 139:9	123:6 124:24 126:13 127:3,13,17	
67:19 71:7 place 14:16 42:23 57:1		pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15			13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practically 94:1	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practically 94:1 practice 14:22 15:24	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleadings 114:24	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practically 94:1 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practically 94:1 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17 places 121:25 188:16	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleadings 114:24 pleasant 123:18	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practically 94:1 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presenters 63:2	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17 places 121:25 188:16 192:6 209:24	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleadings 114:24 pleasant 123:18 please 10:5 124:4,9 168:21 172:6 188:17	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8 portion 204:12 posed 2:21 11:4,21 115:10	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practicel 4:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19 104:8,11,25 105:22 113:4 122:12 215:7 practices 93:16	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presenters 63:2 presenting 128:6	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2 problem 29:13 30:5,5
 place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17 places 121:25 188:16 192:6 209:24 plain 38:20 135:22 plains 130:6 165:3 plan 41:1,2 73:23 	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleadings 114:24 pleasant 123:18 please 10:5 124:4,9 168:21 172:6 188:17 pleasure 188:21	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8 portion 204:12 posed 2:21 11:4,21 115:10 position 6:16 8:3	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practically 94:1 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19 104:8,11,25 105:22 113:4 122:12 215:7 practices 93:16 122:25	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presenters 63:2 presenting 128:6 presenting 128:6 presenting 33:4 preserved 68:5 73:7 73:10 151:8	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2 problem 29:13 30:5,5 30:9 202:24 208:15 208:22,23 209:2 210:19 221:4,7,23
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17 places 121:25 188:16 192:6 209:24 plain 38:20 135:22 plains 130:6 165:3 plan 41:1,2 73:23 119:7 174:17	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleadings 114:24 pleases 10:5 124:4,9 168:21 172:6 188:17 pleasure 188:21 plentiful 152:15	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8 portion 204:12 posed 2:21 11:4,21 115:10 position 6:16 8:3 22:18 27:24 39:14	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practically 94:1 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19 104:8,11,25 105:22 113:4 122:12 215:7 practices 93:16 122:25 Pradesh 130:4,25	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presentes 63:2 presenting 128:6 presenting 128:6 presently 33:4 preserved 68:5 73:7 73:10 151:8 preserving 198:9	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2 problem 29:13 30:5,5 30:9 202:24 208:15 208:22,23 209:2 210:19 221:4,7,23 223:9
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17 places 121:25 188:16 192:6 209:24 plain 38:20 135:22 plain 38:20 135:22 plain 130:6 165:3 plan 41:1,2 73:23 119:7 174:17 planned 22:22 34:17	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleadings 114:24 pleasent 123:18 please 10:5 124:4,9 168:21 172:6 188:17 pleasure 188:21 plentful 152:15 plenty 188:2	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8 portion 204:12 posed 2:21 11:4,21 115:10 position 6:16 8:3 22:18 27:24 39:14 40:7 41:12 42:2	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19 104:8,11,25 105:22 113:4 122:12 215:7 practices 93:16 122:25 Pradesh 130:4,25 131:15	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presenters 63:2 presenting 128:6 presenting 128:6 presenting 33:4 preserving 198:9 President 29:16 49:2	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2 problem 29:13 30:5,5 30:9 202:24 208:15 208:22,23 209:2 210:19 221:4,7,23 223:9 problematic 195:15
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17 places 121:25 188:16 192:6 209:24 plain 38:20 135:22 plains 130:6 165:3 plan 41:1,2 73:23 119:7 174:17 planned 22:22 34:17 173:1 174:24,25	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleadings 114:24 pleasent 123:18 please 10:5 124:4,9 168:21 172:6 188:17 pleasure 188:21 plentiful 152:15 plenty 188:2 plotted 79:20	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8 portion 204:12 posed 2:21 11:4,21 115:10 position 6:16 8:3 22:18 27:24 39:14 40:7 41:12 42:2 44:8 49:24 54:18	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19 104:8,11,25 105:22 113:4 122:12 215:7 practices 93:16 122:25 Pradesh 130:4,25 131:15 Preah 113:16,21	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presenters 63:2 presenting 128:6 presently 33:4 preserved 68:5 73:7 73:10 151:8 preserving 198:9 President 29:16 49:2 press 138:9	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2 problem 29:13 30:5,5 30:9 202:24 208:15 208:22,23 209:2 210:19 221:4,7,23 223:9 problematic 195:15 197:23,25
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17 places 121:25 188:16 192:6 209:24 plain 38:20 135:22 plains 130:6 165:3 plan 41:1,2 73:23 119:7 174:17 planned 22:22 34:17 173:1 174:24,25 175:4,10	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleadings 114:24 pleasent 123:18 please 10:5 124:4,9 168:21 172:6 188:17 pleasure 188:21 plentiful 152:15 plenty 188:2 plotted 79:20 plunge 198:13	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8 portion 204:12 posed 2:21 11:4,21 115:10 position 6:16 8:3 22:18 27:24 39:14 40:7 41:12 42:2 44:8 49:24 54:18 57:19 69:21,23	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practically 94:1 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19 104:8,11,25 105:22 113:4 122:12 215:7 practices 93:16 122:25 Pradesh 130:4,25 131:15 Preah 113:16,21 122:6	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presenters 63:2 presenting 128:6 presently 33:4 preserved 68:5 73:7 73:10 151:8 preserving 198:9 President 29:16 49:2 press 138:9 pressing 71:5	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 prioritigs 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2 problem 29:13 30:5,5 30:9 202:24 208:15 208:22,23 209:2 210:19 221:4,7,23 223:9 problematic 195:15 197:23,25 problems 177:20
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17 places 121:25 188:16 192:6 209:24 plain 38:20 135:22 plains 130:6 165:3 plan 41:1,2 73:23 119:7 174:17 planned 22:22 34:17 173:1 174:24,25 175:4,10 planning 174:5,6,8	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleadings 114:24 pleasent 123:18 please 10:5 124:4,9 168:21 172:6 188:17 pleasure 188:21 plentiful 152:15 plenty 188:2 plotted 79:20 plunge 198:13 plus 189:22 191:12	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8 portion 204:12 posed 2:21 11:4,21 115:10 position 6:16 8:3 22:18 27:24 39:14 40:7 41:12 42:2 44:8 49:24 54:18 57:19 69:21,23 72:25 89:10,11	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practically 94:1 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19 104:8,11,25 105:22 113:4 122:12 215:7 practices 93:16 122:25 Pradesh 130:4,25 131:15 Preah 113:16,21 122:6 preamble 87:24 89:3,7	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presenters 63:2 presenting 128:6 presently 33:4 preserved 68:5 73:7 73:10 151:8 preserving 198:9 President 29:16 49:2 press 138:9 pressing 71:5 pressure 54:24 160:21	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 prioritigs 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2 problem 29:13 30:5,5 30:9 202:24 208:15 208:22,23 209:2 210:19 221:4,7,23 223:9 problematic 195:15 197:23,25 problems 177:20 188:25 190:19
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17 places 121:25 188:16 192:6 209:24 plain 38:20 135:22 plains 130:6 165:3 plan 41:1,2 73:23 119:7 174:17 planned 22:22 34:17 173:1 174:24,25 175:4,10 planning 174:5,6,8 plans 21:24 22:3,25	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleasings 114:24 pleasant 123:18 please 10:5 124:4,9 168:21 172:6 188:17 pleasure 188:21 plentiful 152:15 plenty 188:2 plotted 79:20 plunge 198:13 plus 189:22 191:12 219:23	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8 portion 204:12 posed 2:21 11:4,21 115:10 position 6:16 8:3 22:18 27:24 39:14 40:7 41:12 42:2 44:8 49:24 54:18 57:19 69:21,23 72:25 89:10,11 103:8 118:6 129:14	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practically 94:1 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19 104:8,11,25 105:22 113:4 122:12 215:7 practices 93:16 122:25 Pradesh 130:4,25 131:15 Preah 113:16,21 122:6 preamble 87:24 89:3,7 89:8,13,18 114:11	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presenters 63:2 presenting 128:6 presently 33:4 preserved 68:5 73:7 73:10 151:8 preserving 198:9 President 29:16 49:2 press 138:9 pressing 71:5 pressure 54:24 160:21 206:18 207:2,11	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2 problem 29:13 30:5,5 30:9 202:24 208:15 208:22,23 209:2 210:19 221:4,7,23 223:9 problematic 195:15 197:23,25 problems 177:20 188:25 190:19 198:24 207:22
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17 places 121:25 188:16 192:6 209:24 plain 38:20 135:22 plains 130:6 165:3 plan 41:1,2 73:23 119:7 174:17 planned 22:22 34:17 173:1 174:24,25 175:4,10 planning 174:5,6,8 plans 21:24 22:3,25 37:14 40:10	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleadings 114:24 pleasant 123:18 please 10:5 124:4,9 168:21 172:6 188:17 pleasure 188:21 plentiful 152:15 plenty 188:2 plotted 79:20 plunge 198:13 plus 189:22 191:12 219:23 pm 120:17 123:14,15	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8 portion 204:12 posed 2:21 11:4,21 115:10 position 6:16 8:3 22:18 27:24 39:14 40:7 41:12 42:2 44:8 49:24 54:18 57:19 69:21,23 72:25 89:10,11 103:8 118:6 129:14 165:23 177:20	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practically 94:1 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19 104:8,11,25 105:22 113:4 122:12 215:7 practices 93:16 122:25 Pradesh 130:4,25 131:15 Preah 113:16,21 122:6 preamble 87:24 89:3,7	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presented 47:11 presenters 63:2 presenting 128:6 presently 33:4 preserved 68:5 73:7 73:10 151:8 preserving 198:9 President 29:16 49:2 press 138:9 pressing 71:5 pressure 54:24 160:21 206:18 207:2,11 pressures 126:9	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2 problem 29:13 30:5,5 30:9 202:24 208:15 208:22,23 209:2 210:19 221:4,7,23 223:9 problematic 195:15 197:23,25 problems 177:20 188:25 190:19 198:24 207:22 208:2 212:12
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement places 121:25 188:16 192:6 209:24 plain plain 38:20 135:22 plains 130:6 165:3 plan 41:1,2 73:23 119:7 174:17 planned planned 22:22 34:17 173:1 174:24,25 175:4,10 planning 174:5,6,8 plans plans 21:24 22:3,25	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleasings 114:24 pleasant 123:18 please 10:5 124:4,9 168:21 172:6 188:17 pleasure 188:21 plentiful 152:15 plenty 188:2 plotted 79:20 plunge 198:13 plus 189:22 191:12 219:23	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8 portion 204:12 posed 2:21 11:4,21 115:10 position 6:16 8:3 22:18 27:24 39:14 40:7 41:12 42:2 44:8 49:24 54:18 57:19 69:21,23 72:25 89:10,11 103:8 118:6 129:14	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19 104:8,11,25 105:22 113:4 122:12 215:7 practices 93:16 122:25 Pradesh 130:4,25 131:15 Preah 113:16,21 122:6 preamble 87:24 89:3,7 89:8,13,18 114:11 114:17 116:7,15,15 189:24	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presenters 63:2 presenting 128:6 presently 33:4 preserved 68:5 73:7 73:10 151:8 preserving 198:9 President 29:16 49:2 press 138:9 pressing 71:5 pressure 54:24 160:21 206:18 207:2,11	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2 problem 29:13 30:5,5 30:9 202:24 208:15 208:22,23 209:2 210:19 221:4,7,23 223:9 problematic 195:15 197:23,25 problems 177:20 188:25 190:19 198:24 207:22
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17 places 121:25 188:16 192:6 209:24 plain 38:20 135:22 plains 130:6 165:3 plan 41:1,2 73:23 119:7 174:17 planned 22:22 34:17 173:1 174:24,25 175:4,10 planning 174:5,6,8 plans 21:24 22:3,25 37:14 40:10 plant 3:8,20 4:2,5,20	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleadings 114:24 pleasant 123:18 please 10:5 124:4,9 168:21 172:6 188:17 pleasure 188:21 plentiful 152:15 plenty 188:2 plotted 79:20 plunge 198:13 plus 189:22 191:12 219:23 pm 120:17 123:14,15 123:16 124:12	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8 portion 204:12 posed 2:21 11:4,21 115:10 position 6:16 8:3 22:18 27:24 39:14 40:7 41:12 42:2 44:8 49:24 54:18 57:19 69:21,23 72:25 89:10,11 103:8 118:6 129:14 165:23 177:20 positions 65:16 93:2	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practically 94:1 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19 104:8,11,25 105:22 113:4 122:12 215:7 practices 93:16 122:25 Pradesh 130:4,25 131:15 Preah 113:16,21 122:6 preamble 87:24 89:3,7 89:8,13,18 114:11 114:17 116:7,15,15	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presenters 63:2 presenting 128:6 presenting 128:6 presently 33:4 preserved 68:5 73:7 73:10 151:8 preserving 198:9 President 29:16 49:2 press 138:9 pressing 71:5 pressure 54:24 160:21 206:18 207:2,11 pressures 126:9 127:22 176:10,21	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2 problem 29:13 30:5,5 30:9 202:24 208:15 208:22,23 209:2 210:19 221:4,7,23 223:9 problematic 195:15 197:23,25 problema 177:20 188:25 190:19 198:24 207:22 208:2 212:12 223:21
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17 places 121:25 188:16 192:6 209:24 plain 38:20 135:22 plains 130:6 165:3 plan 41:1,2 73:23 119:7 174:17 planned 22:22 34:17 173:1 174:24,25 175:4,10 planning 174:5,6,8 plans 21:24 22:3,25 37:14 40:10 plant 3:8,20 4:2,5,20 4:21,22,25 5:20 7:15,16 8:22,23 19:25 22:24 51:18	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleadings 114:24 pleasant 123:18 please 10:5 124:4,9 168:21 172:6 188:17 pleasure 188:21 plentiful 152:15 plenty 188:2 plotted 79:20 plunge 198:13 plus 189:22 191:12 219:23 pm 120:17 123:14,15 123:16 124:12 188:5,7,18 229:14 podium 20:21,25 point 2:1,11 3:5 7:6,8	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8 portion 204:12 posed 2:21 11:4,21 115:10 position 6:16 8:3 22:18 27:24 39:14 40:7 41:12 42:2 44:8 49:24 54:18 57:19 69:21,23 72:25 89:10,11 103:8 118:6 129:14 165:23 177:20 position 65:16 93:2 positive 54:15 possessed 77:15 possibility 83:9 85:8	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19 104:8,11,25 105:22 113:4 122:12 215:7 practices 93:16 122:25 Pradesh 130:4,25 131:15 Preah 113:16,21 122:6 preamble 87:24 89:3,7 89:8,13,18 114:11 114:17 116:7,15,15 189:24 precautionary 109:10 110:17 precedent 118:11,14	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presentes 63:2 presenting 128:6 presently 33:4 preserved 68:5 73:7 73:10 151:8 preserving 198:9 President 29:16 49:2 press 138:9 pressure 54:24 160:21 206:18 207:2,11 pressures 126:9 127:22 176:10,21 179:22 180:10,11 185:25 195:24 pressurised 206:19	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2 problem 29:13 30:5,5 30:9 20:224 208:15 208:22,23 209:2 210:19 221:4,7,23 223:9 problematic 195:15 197:23,25 problems 177:20 188:25 190:19 198:24 207:22 208:2 212:12 223:21 procedures 226:14 proceed 1:7 10:5 75:4 124:10 172:6
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17 places 121:25 188:16 192:6 209:24 plain 38:20 135:22 plains 130:6 165:3 plan 41:1,2 73:23 119:7 174:17 planned 22:22 34:17 173:1 174:24,25 175:4,10 planning 174:5,6,8 plans 21:24 22:3,25 37:14 40:10 plant 3:8,20 4:2,5,20 4:21,22,25 5:20 7:15,16 8:22,23 19:25 22:24 51:18 58:8,11,22 59:24	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleadings 114:24 pleasant 123:18 please 10:5 124:4,9 168:21 172:6 188:17 pleasure 188:21 plentiful 152:15 plenty 188:2 plotted 79:20 plunge 198:13 plus 189:22 191:12 219:23 pm 120:17 123:14,15 123:16 124:12 188:5,7,18 229:14 podium 20:21,25 point 2:1,11 3:5 7:6,8 10:3 12:5,12 21:10	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8 portion 204:12 posed 2:21 11:4,21 115:10 position 6:16 8:3 22:18 27:24 39:14 40:7 41:12 42:2 44:8 49:24 54:18 57:19 69:21,23 72:25 89:10,11 103:8 118:6 129:14 165:23 177:20 positive 54:15 possessed 77:15 possibility 83:9 85:8 140:4	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practically 94:1 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19 104:8,11,25 105:22 113:4 122:12 215:7 practices 93:16 122:25 Pradesh 130:4,25 131:15 Preah 113:16,21 122:6 preamble 87:24 89:3,7 89:8,13,18 114:11 114:17 116:7,15,15 189:24 precautionary 109:10 110:17 precedent 118:11,14 precipitation 170:6	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presenters 63:2 presenting 128:6 presently 33:4 preserved 68:5 73:7 73:10 151:8 preserving 198:9 President 29:16 49:2 press 138:9 pressing 71:5 pressure 54:24 160:21 206:18 207:2,11 pressure 126:9 127:22 176:10,21 179:22 180:10,11 185:25 195:24 pressurised 206:19 219:10	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2 problem 29:13 30:5,5 30:9 202:24 208:15 208:22,23 209:2 210:19 221:4,7,23 223:9 problematic 195:15 197:23,25 problems 177:20 188:25 190:19 198:24 207:22 208:2 212:12 223:21 procedures 226:14 proceed 1:7 10:5 75:4 124:10 172:6 188:17
place 14:16 42:23 57:1 101:24 110:2 111:7 147:2 158:14 201:2 201:4 216:25 219:9 224:1 placed 38:18 87:7 152:1 199:20 placement 202:17 places 121:25 188:16 192:6 209:24 plain 38:20 135:22 plains 130:6 165:3 plan 41:1,2 73:23 119:7 174:17 planned 22:22 34:17 173:1 174:24,25 175:4,10 planning 174:5,6,8 plans 21:24 22:3,25 37:14 40:10 plant 3:8,20 4:2,5,20 4:21,22,25 5:20 7:15,16 8:22,23 19:25 22:24 51:18	PLA-3 77:4 87:5,11 87:17 91:14 PLA-42 113:3 PLA-63 77:13 PLA-64 78:4 PLA-67 78:15 PLA-92 96:7 PLA-94 118:24 pleadings 114:24 pleasant 123:18 please 10:5 124:4,9 168:21 172:6 188:17 pleasure 188:21 plentiful 152:15 plenty 188:2 plotted 79:20 plunge 198:13 plus 189:22 191:12 219:23 pm 120:17 123:14,15 123:16 124:12 188:5,7,18 229:14 podium 20:21,25 point 2:1,11 3:5 7:6,8	pool 58:19 59:3 60:6 201:5,5 203:14,15 204:7 poor 30:3 216:25 populated 133:14 population 133:19,21 134:17 177:8 178:9 178:11,12,14,17,19 178:22,24 179:5,7 179:11,13,18 186:8 portion 204:12 posed 2:21 11:4,21 115:10 position 6:16 8:3 22:18 27:24 39:14 40:7 41:12 42:2 44:8 49:24 54:18 57:19 69:21,23 72:25 89:10,11 103:8 118:6 129:14 165:23 177:20 position 65:16 93:2 positive 54:15 possessed 77:15 possibility 83:9 85:8	powerhouse 139:9 199:18 217:8 power-peaking 206:7 practicable 31:6 practical 22:16 88:21 104:3 practice 14:22 15:24 24:10 75:15 86:1,3 101:13,14,17,19 104:8,11,25 105:22 113:4 122:12 215:7 practices 93:16 122:25 Pradesh 130:4,25 131:15 Preah 113:16,21 122:6 preamble 87:24 89:3,7 89:8,13,18 114:11 114:17 116:7,15,15 189:24 precautionary 109:10 110:17 precedent 118:11,14	126:13 127:3,13,17 166:16,20,23 167:12 172:6 176:2 176:20 186:20,24 187:24 188:12,17 227:6 presentations 62:2 121:14 187:2 presented 47:11 presentes 63:2 presenting 128:6 presently 33:4 preserved 68:5 73:7 73:10 151:8 preserving 198:9 President 29:16 49:2 press 138:9 pressure 54:24 160:21 206:18 207:2,11 pressures 126:9 127:22 176:10,21 179:22 180:10,11 185:25 195:24 pressurised 206:19	13:25 14:18,21,25 30:16 38:16 41:8 69:1 74:4,10 75:5 82:23 printout 160:4 priori 116:25 priorities 110:19 priority 76:16 probably 12:2 72:7 127:12 167:7,13 176:22 214:2 problem 29:13 30:5,5 30:9 20:224 208:15 208:22,23 209:2 210:19 221:4,7,23 223:9 problematic 195:15 197:23,25 problems 177:20 188:25 190:19 198:24 207:22 208:2 212:12 223:21 procedures 226:14 proceed 1:7 10:5 75:4 124:10 172:6

					- ·
proceeding 1:4 27:4	139:16 173:11,24	131:2 133:18	94:24 121:24	P-409 26:18	186:22 188:14
52:20 63:18 106:6	174:2,5 179:23	provinces 162:22,23	147:13	P-410 37:11 54:23	227:3 229:9
140:15	228:23	provincial 152:10	pursue 88:19 99:11,18	P-411 37:25	quick 171:19
proceedings 2:6,11	prolongs 212:22,22	provision 3:17 4:11,15	99:21	P-412 38:4	quickly 140:24 205:3
3:25 11:11 19:6	promises 39:15	15:6 31:19 36:17,25	pursued 13:11	P-413 53:16	205:6 206:8 228:10
20:15,17 21:9 76:7	181:11 185:15	47:15 56:1 58:3,25	put 1:15 12:14 26:4	P-416 39:5	quite 1:5 3:17 5:12
78:9 89:12 102:15	promote 31:23 94:16	80:9,13 87:7 90:8	29:21 43:6 49:9	P-420 40:2	25:13 28:6 46:18
103:12,17 105:5	promoting 26:15	91:20 104:12,21	58:15 68:10 99:3	P-439 41:1	51:21 69:10 92:16
114:14 115:23	prompted 29:15	105:3 107:18 108:1	109:13 158:14	P-450 41:17	168:24 176:22
proceeds 197:1	prompts 73:2	112:8 125:24 148:3	202:20 204:5	P-451 41:25	181:24 191:19
process 4:18 50:8 82:8	propeller 219:15,16	provisional 113:4	205:15 210:19	P-452 42:15	194:23 197:12,13
82:9 88:17 98:8	219:17,19	provisions 4:23 5:3,5	213:23 216:5,9,13	P-453 42:20	202:24 203:7
100:23 113:25	proper 99:20 214:10	13:4 15:18 45:18,22	216:24 218:11	P-475 45:5	211:22 212:1
119:6 122:7 184:23	properly 66:15 87:8	52:6,20 55:8 56:24	222:2 224:2 225:10	P-476 50:3,4 59:25	216:25 220:12
189:7 196:22	208:10	56:25 57:9 85:13,24 86:9 87:20 90:18	225:16,25 228:14 228:25	P-483 49:15 51:9 P-484 49:20	227:8
produce 51:17 197:25 198:1 204:23	property 91:8 95:4 proportion 173:12	102:14 103:12	puts 9:2	P-489 50:5	quote 26:5 27:8 80:21 116:4
216:10 226:2 229:6	proposal 19:20 29:21	104:16 112:10,14	puts 9.2 putting 208:6	P-515 51:4	quoting 4:4 116:3
produced 1:23 38:12	29:24 30:2,11,11,15	112:15,19 118:5	pyramid 9:14,20	P-522 61:5	quoting 4.4 110.5
50:2 66:9,10 67:7	31:12,16 32:1,18,18	119:3 121:18,21	P-0129 117:3	P-559 139:20	R
204:2 225:21 226:5	33:19,22,24 34:6,8	122:11 135:14	P-0362 35:24	P-563 138:10	Rabi 34:23 135:25
produces 209:6	34:14,22 35:6,18,22	148:16 186:14	P-0488 116:2	P-578 136:23 137:11	143:20.24
producing 212:13	35:25 36:1,18,20	provision-dependent	P-130 30:11 31:24	140:2	rack 214:1
225:23	38:17 39:17 49:18	85:10	36:20	P-579 173:14	radiator 208:6
product 118:13 170:5	50:14,19 59:1 69:6	proviso 43:12	P-131 35:4,12		RAE 2:14
production 145:18,24	73:15,16 101:9	provoked 37:13	P-133 43:22 55:3	Q	railway 119:17
146:4,12 185:23	proposals 19:17 25:23	proximity 1:17	P-134 45:11	Qadirabad 158:7	rainfall 132:14,14,17
190:4	36:9 40:25 44:3	préparatoires 10:21	P-136 45:14 53:22	Qatar 76:25	168:5,17 191:14
Professor 1:10,12	49:9	14:3 52:19 63:16	58:17	Qila 196:6	raining 223:10
2:10,11 3:15 2:19	proposal's 53:11	65:20 72:15,18	P-139 47:13	qualifier 87:2,21	raise 18:15 84:21
10:21,23 12:1 13:24	propose 3:4	75:18 86:16 93:3	P-140 48:12	qualify 115:7,9,20	201:11 202:13
14:15 15:14,21 16:4	proposed 31:22 37:8	94:13 96:24 106:19	P-150 28:3	quality 4:10 43:15	204:6
52:22 63:17,17 74:3 74:5 80:14,16 81:15	59:7 proposes 12:8	psyche 40:19 public 25:16 133:20	P-233 25:11 26:14 29:2	213:11	raised 14:11 18:24
81:21 82:2,25 83:2	proposing 12:10,19	publication 28:2,5	P-244 132:11 145:20	quantity 43:15 52:4,8	21:11 36:23 67:16
83:20 84:14,20 85:4	proposition 98:3	79:8 142:1,5	147:17	52:11	75:6 124:1
85:11 86:3,6,22	prospects 30:3	publicly 12:10,12	P-245 40:16	quartz 195:6,9,11,14 195:15	raising 200:23
97:11 98:19 99:23	protect 50:23 224:16	published 18:7 25:9	P-247 129:6	quest 189:6	Rajasthan 137:1,5 151:4
100:20 104:19	protected 73:16	145:10 182:10	P-248 128:23 142:2	question 2:9 3:2 7:5	ramp 205:6
106:10 116:3	protection 42:14 91:8	pull 200:2 206:25	179:25	12:7,16 21:11 22:20	ran 40:18
117:13 120:19	109:25 166:1	Punjab 130:6,17	P-249 142:6	22:21 23:5,8 27:14	range 65:18 192:3
121:4 122:2 123:10	190:18	131:2,15,16 133:18	P-263 132:11 137:25	28:10 46:9 51:7,8	206:13 228:7
169:9,10 170:10,17	protective 210:14	136:11 137:1	P-264 132:6	57:12,21 61:6,25	ranges 133:8
171:18 172:3	218:13	139:11 158:16	P-265 132:11	63:2,12 65:12 70:25	ranging 189:22
180:13 181:9 189:9	protest 103:15 104:9	purely 156:9	P-268 144:2	72:15 73:3 75:24	Ranjit 136:9
227:4,5 228:25	protested 103:16	purple 151:12 174:7	P-277 147:12	79:15 80:17,18,19	rapid 206:6 217:11,18
229:8	protocol 18:16 78:13	purportedly 96:5	P-279 163:24	81:16,22 83:24	rapidly 179:6 214:13
profile 198:9	112:4 proudly 26:15	purpose 7:23 18:10	P-280 145:8 P 281 145:12	84:16 95:12 96:18	rapporteur 77:11
progenitor 32:21 programme 26:10	provide 14:1,15 15:1,9	23:14 25:17 43:11 68:21 76:14 82:18	P-281 145:13 P-283 146:14	104:20 107:1	84:15 97:23
147:11 166:14	18:12 23:1 49:24	84:6 85:15 86:15	P-283 146:14 P-284 184:18	108:10 111:12	Rasul 158:7
progress 48:13,16	50:5,8 56:11,21	88:8,14,15,22 89:14	P-292 181:23	114:1 115:10	rate 43:14 179:12,13
progresses 191:13	62:14 81:17 105:9	90:7,9,11,25 91:2,5	P-292 181.25 P-294 184:6	116:22 120:19	185:2 211:12
progression 5:8	122:4 123:3 159:16	91:10,15,19 92:12	P-295 182:7 184:6	121:10 140:9,14	rather 11:11 69:19 187:2 207:16
prohibited 111:2	219:10	92:20 95:18 96:3,11	P-300 178:3	151:21 160:16 168:13,22,24 169:3	227:24
prohibition 47:17	provided 32:24 33:7	96:15 98:6,25	P-301 178:3	169:11 170:1,17	ratio 192:7
48:3 55:22	33:12,19 43:20,21	100:12 107:25	P-331 103:3	171:19 176:14	rationalising 167:18
prohibits 165:13	45:25 52:10 53:19	117:24 118:4	P-350 28:4	questionable 67:13	Ratle 8:23 189:20
project 84:16 118:23	55:12,13 60:5 75:1	119:15 121:7	P-354 29:20	questions 3:8,9,10,11	Ravi 33:8 128:14
125:15 136:11	135:10 143:1	122:21 135:23	P-355 29:20	3:12,16,17,18,19,22	130:23,23,25 131:2
137:2,3 139:5,8	145:20 200:15	137:22 156:9	P-356 29:24	3:23 4:2 2:2,21 4:3	131:6 133:23 134:6
183:8 190:22 209:2	provides 3:11 5:17	159:14,15 162:7	P-357 29:24	8:23 10:2,4 11:4,9	136:9,20 138:6,21
218:7,9 227:24	21:23 54:10 59:20	182:6	P-362 53:16 56:16	11:20 20:24 24:1	139:20 140:1,4,23
228:13,15	76:20 141:17,18,20	purposes 3:23 14:21	P-363 38:11	46:15 61:15,16	155:25 156:1,22,24
projected 126:7	168:18 177:6	15:4 19:14 41:11	P-365 44:15 58:2	74:16 99:8 108:8	157:25 158:8,22
1 0		72.0 0 126 7 142 25	D 202 24 5		
177:12,21 179:17	providing 16:25 17:7	73:8,9 136:7 142:25	P-382 34:5 P 383 34:1 10 50:20	120:14,18 124:1	159:22 164:25
177:12,21 179:17 184:4	providing 16:25 17:7 55:5 56:22	153:15	P-383 34:1,19 50:20	166:20 172:5	178:25 179:1
177:12,21 179:17	providing 16:25 17:7	-		-	

, ,	,				
17:21	recorded 35:8 43:3	reflecting 66:15 93:3	226:23 228:14,16	replaced 225:14	resonance 134:21
reach 6:16,24 48:14	records 59:12 60:14	106:20	released 131:22	replacement 33:14,17	resort 108:5
81:1 131:21 178:6	114:17	reflection 60:16 65:16	135:20 201:10	40:11 41:4 148:12	resource 18:8 142:11
197:20,22 198:8	recounting 70:3	153:24	212:19	157:10 218:1	142:12,13 163:22
reached 64:23 197:18	recourse 75:20 107:12	reflective 51:14	releasing 212:15	225:13,16	169:17,18,23,24
reaches 24:17 131:23	107:15 110:9	reflects 113:12	relevance 1:23 2:4,9	replenish 156:22	172:17 177:22
133:4 198:15 210:5	recurring 48:21	refresher 128:7	16:2 22:11 57:18	164:25 165:8	resources 2:4 26:16
227:17	recycles 208:9	refurbish 223:24,25	61:12 90:11 113:4	replenishment 160:18	29:20,23 138:10,20
reaching 38:22 178:1	red 151:7 174:6,24	225:15	relevant 7:17 21:8	replied 117:11	142:4,16 145:3
reaction 26:4 104:21	191:20 203:23.24	refuses 20:14	45:17 49:23 57:9	reply 114:14	171:25 172:24
read 27:7 63:7 76:10	206:22	refuse[d 40:10	43.17 49.23 57.9 61:10 74:13 75:20	report 99:10 100:17	173:6 177:3,14
81:8 87:15 89:9,18	redo 208:11	regard 6:16 35:2	92:12 93:21 102:13	102:7 173:7	respect 3:8,14,20 4:19
91:15 112:1 114:15	reduce 31:22 181:11	51:15 97:15 98:17	105:12 121:5	reported 48:10 138:22	4:22 5:15 6:13,21
115:2 116:16	198:19 212:24	103:18 109:6,21	126:24 135:11	139:18 140:5	7:15 19:24 20:9
153:16		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	148:3 162:7.10		22:25 46:2 51:9
	219:12,13 220:15	112:25 121:19		represent 21:6 224:8	
reading 5:12 80:23	reduced 138:3 180:22	148:10	reliability 165:16	represented 2:16	56:15 71:14 92:12
115:18	184:24 186:3	regarded 86:4 121:2,9	180:24	54:16	109:5 115:8,10,22
ready 124:8,9 188:8	205:14 221:7 225:1	121:12	reliable 164:8 181:4,5	Republic 1:16,18 2:2	117:21
reaffirmed 38:2	reduction 25:25 126:9	regarding 27:9 45:19	181:6	2:16 3:2 1:10 21:6	respectfully 117:15
real 29:5 86:8 111:22	128:2 137:22 138:5	47:20 49:19 50:8	reliance 126:1 142:17	24:22 124:16	respective 93:2
116:5 119:22	138:7 165:20	52:19 53:8 92:20	142:19	request 94:4	respectively 30:1 36:4
210:18	170:19 171:4	102:19 103:8	reliant 26:20 44:11	require 108:21,24	53:15 138:4 143:16
realise 84:22 120:14	180:14 183:2,11,15	118:24	50:24 53:9 163:23	required 33:17 40:6	respond 84:13
reality 22:16 27:15	183:15 184:20	regards 3:24 45:17	165:9 174:10	58:20 59:2,4 60:7	responding 11:4 14:10
really 61:7 65:12	185:3	regime 120:11,13	relies 145:19,25	112:8 147:25 148:7	responds 7:4
67:10 71:24,25 72:5	red-line 54:11 61:3	123:3	reluctant 49:17	148:20 157:9 180:8	response 2:20 12:7,15
72:20 107:3 167:1	Rees-Evans 2:12 3:7	region 18:21 184:4	rely 65:1,3 173:2	185:22	21:20 57:12 70:10
213:10 219:24	10:18 13:24 14:5,12	189:22 191:7	199:14	requirement 56:11	76:1 88:18 124:1
221:20 222:22	19:8 20:21,25 21:4	regions 189:22	remain 158:13 182:18	77:20 109:6,15	183:3
reason 8:15 50:25	22:19,20 23:9,13	regulate 159:10	193:23	requirements 34:17	responses 18:23
56:7 64:23 67:8	26:23 27:13 28:18	regulated 52:9 127:20	remainder 125:7	79:23 90:19,21 91:6	responsible 181:13,15
84:21 104:17 125:4	46:6,9,21 47:4	128:16	132:13 150:16	109:23 112:21	181:18
125:14	51:19 52:16 62:1,12	regulates 162:10,20	162:6 176:9,20	113:7 176:7	responsive 62:15
reasonable 47:5 98:1	63:3,6,8 64:1 66:1	regulating 91:4	179:6	requires 88:23 95:19	rest 2:8 9:23 29:10
116:9,9	66:22 70:5 71:17	regulation 160:11	remained 38:1 42:3	95:22 104:24	162:9 168:6
reasonably 5:7	73:12,21,24 75:18	regulator 152:11	50:14 56:1 67:20	112:13 217:25	restraints 93:22
reasoning 113:15	89:1 106:19	regulatory 93:20,23	remaining 143:8,23	227:8	restrict 81:19 93:7
114:5	Rees-Evans's 13:23	190:10	150:9,17 186:9	research 163:25	164:14
reasons 47:15 100:6	106:21	reinforced 100:25	211:18	reserve 42:9	restricted 61:13 82:3
206:20	refer 8:19,19 94:18	104:11	remains 101:4 110:4	reserved 35:10	82:10 86:20 107:5
reassured 37:20	114:25 123:20	reinforcing 55:20	195:14	reservoir 159:9 165:6	109:14
rebuttal 117:13	124:1	87:13	remarks 24:20 57:11	189:3,12,13,16	restrictive 94:10
recall 4:14 16:16	reference 2:23 4:21	reiterated 39:7 67:22	128:4 187:14	194:17 197:5 198:5	95:21 96:4,12 99:1
46:18	12:10 18:25 21:21	94:3	remember 72:16,20	198:13,20 199:3,4	100:5,9,15 107:25
recalled 35:25 49:1	28:2 62:21 63:4	reiterating 94:19	remit 6:10 11:21	200:19 202:21	restrictively 75:14
receive 34:15 54:5,10	64:8 69:14 79:20	rejected 6:14 8:1	remote 190:15	203:5,8,16,25	81:9 95:1 96:17
125:22 135:18	80:3,5 88:15 90:17	90:24	removal 54:7 217:11	208:15 210:7,25	97:10
144:11	121:22 122:12,13	Rejuvenation 138:10	217:11	211:1,7,9,13,14,24	restricts 86:18
received 34:10 123:19	128:9 137:25 138:1	relate 90:7 170:1	removed 60:10 154:11	212:1,7,9,13,21	rests 9:19
126:10 148:21	138:16 142:9	related 3:2 57:12	199:22	213:9,9,17 214:1,9	result 78:8 88:25
recent 128:2	169:21	88:16 119:20	Ren 123:21	214:20 226:18,19	107:5,8 134:12
recently 76:24 195:2	referenced 14:24	relates 190:1	render 88:20	227:17	148:24 165:21
receptive 123:8,9	19:17 123:22	relating 22:3 119:16	render[ing 87:19	reservoirs 93:23 155:7	174:11 180:7
recharge 170:13	references 63:16	125:3	renewable 142:12	159:12 161:2	193:24
recharges 168:5	68:23	relation 71:19 89:23	169:22	165:18,24 166:1	resulted 151:17
recirculating 215:11	referred 24:11 25:2	117:20 151:10	renewed 103:4	189:1,9,14 193:8,9	resulting 96:9
215:18	28:7 56:13 70:8	relations 91:4	reoccur 103:23	196:22 197:12,15	results 198:23
recognised 41:22	73:12 85:5 100:3	relationship 15:3,6	reopen 3:25	198:3,4,4 228:19	resume 188:8
43:23 56:17 60:22	104:12 120:6,7	96:14 97:8 114:8	repair 199:23 200:6	reshape 224:2	retains 140:4
68:9 108:4	167:13	177:7	209:12 225:17,18	residence 221:12	retard 198:22
recognising 115:19	referring 88:4 116:18	relative 105:23 145:6	225:19	resilience 146:8,11	retirement 17:24
recognition 70:16	refers 28:8 60:3 101:1	relatively 26:23 35:10	repairs 207:13	resistant 195:9	return 23:25 28:10
reconciled 96:11	116:15	67:20 68:2 69:21	repeated 44:16	resisted 69:8	29:11 31:15 32:16
reconciling 109:24	refill 212:9	98:15 144:5 155:6	repeatedly 50:22	resolution 25:24	130:11 132:2
record 2:14 5:4 12:14	reflect 112:16 183:24	174:18 196:20	replace 40:22 134:20	102:11	149:22 190:22
22:18 61:8 64:13	reflected 13:18 22:16	release 138:9 200:16	136:1 148:20	resolve 8:17	revert 23:11
65:22 66:4 67:10	30:14 33:6 52:25	200:17,22 201:6	207:12,16 209:11	resolved 19:24 102:9	review 87:6 133:19
123:23,25 124:4	53:6 54:18	204:22,24 212:7	223:24 224:4	resolving 93:17	reviewing 106:15
,		,			

revised 38:13 50:2	218:1	173:20 186:16	178:2	190:3,14 191:5	115:19 120:22
revisited 9:9	rock 195:3,3,6	188:19 190:1	scars 25:4 40:18	192:2,11,20 193:10	121:5 181:6
Rhine 110:6 119:9,13	rods 224:1	198:25 199:8,13	scenario 99:23,25	193:22 196:21,24	seen 7:13 29:16 62:3,4
Rica 119:19,23	role 2:6 9:22 10:6	204:14 207:21	120:13 185:12	197:1,20,21,24	117:23 143:13
rice 146:6	82:16 87:1 93:3	213:6,12 214:13	scenarios 185:5	198:6,7,7,20 199:5	146:23 165:25
rid 224:4	96:20 102:12	226:16	schedule 187:21	199:7,10 200:5	171:5 175:20
right 34:20 39:21	107:11 109:13	run-of-the-river 37:20	scheme 12:4,22 32:1	207:15,21 208:5,14	179:13 180:13
46:21 66:1 71:11	110:17 112:20	49:5 51:13	43:21 45:15	208:22 209:4,25	184:11 192:1
73:12 92:1,7,9	118:5 163:20,20	run-through 32:6	SCHOFIELD 2:19	210:1,3,5,9,17,19	194:16 199:2,8
104:17 111:10	166:10	run-up 57:4	school 97:20	211:6,15 212:8,17	210:23 217:13
119:21 125:21	roles 86:25	rupture 25:7 27:18	science 182:7	212:24 213:12,13	218:6 220:23
136:4 154:13 156:9	roll-through 167:22	rural 94:24 95:3	scientific 146:2 182:4	214:10,15,25 215:5	221:23
158:5 171:2 174:11	room 11:3 111:13		183:24	217:19,24 219:11	seepage 168:6
174:14 202:6	122:24	S	scoot 176:16	219:23 220:16,17	segment 173:17
203:20 206:21	root 14:21	Sackett 81:12	scope 6:8 63:13,22	220:22 221:1,16,18	217:14
213:22 215:15	rooted 96:23	sacrifices 33:24 50:20	95:5 111:19	221:22 222:1,7,9,17	seised 19:15 107:20
227:19 228:13	roots 19:14	152:16	scours 212:9	223:21 226:8,15,23	seized 174:15
rightly 119:11 168:4	Rosenne 72:19	safeguard 135:23	screen 1:14,17 26:25	228:2,16	select 210:15,18
rights 16:15 39:24	rotate 207:7	186:15	104:22 124:22	sedimentation 12:9	217:17 218:22
46:20 54:5 71:13	rough 229:2	safeguards 48:11	script 11:5	188:25 192:23	selected 195:22
77:24 83:12 85:17	roughly 147:16 153:2	safety 95:11 100:2,11	scroll 206:16,16	196:22 210:6,7,7,8	self-evidently 114:22
86:14,20 88:23	179:11	200:16	Sea 83:12 129:25	211:1,20 215:1	send 222:3
89:22 110:21 111:4	round 11:12 74:9	Sagar 136:9	178:7	226:18,20	Senior 2:21
114:20 115:4	206:24 229:5	Salal 102:19	seal 213:19	sediments 192:4	sense 12:23 17:2 68:12
117:20 119:20,23	route 96:10 130:19	salt 195:5	seals 219:9	sediment-challenged	77:20 81:9 100:12
121:1 122:16	routes 100:14	same 20:4,6 22:8	SEAN 1:10	209:8,19	122:16 152:25
right-hand 179:10	rudimentary 155:6	26:15 39:23 42:17	season 34:24 42:13	sediment-free 209:11	182:11 204:24
196:12 202:4,11	rule 15:4,5,11,12	51:22 62:23 69:10	143:19,21,23,24,25	209:13	sensitive 203:25
207:1	75:10,13 76:8 80:20	80:6 81:11 90:10	144:4,9 146:18	sediment-guided	210:16 226:7,8
rigid 64:25	88:7,8 94:11,19,25	95:8 103:15 120:6	164:17 168:10	210:11 220:13,14	sent 44:17
ring 17:18	96:5,16,22 97:8	141:17 153:2.3	184:13 204:15,15	see 1:12,16 26:5 46:24	sentiment 42:17
riparian 21:15 24:23	99:6 107:6 147:1	167:24 180:9	205:24 226:6	59:18 62:8 68:14	sentiments 44:16
39:18 129:14	155:1 175:14 192:9	194:13 198:9	seasonal 127:10	69:1,2,5,16 71:17	separate 31:1 64:3
132:21 134:4	192:10 226:10	201:12 213:23	143:11,22	72:5 78:15 82:8	83:8 162:3,14 163:6
RIPPIN 2:13	rules 14:18 52:25	215:16 217:20	seasonality 143:13,18	97:7 107:8 112:17	195:7
rise 104:6 130:25	74:14 75:21 90:22	223:13 225:18,22	146:16 204:11	117:15 122:20	separated 87:9
rises 129:20 131:14	94:15 108:1,5	225:23 226:2	seasons 135:25 143:19	123:12 125:2,8	September 34:25
196:15	110:14 116:24	sample 212:25	SEBASTIAN 2:20	128:12,20 130:7,19	39:12 44:18 45:14
rising 180:1	run 41:20 91:13 126:4	San 119:21	second 1:3 11:12 12:5	131:6,10 138:1,5,16	50:11 69:1 143:20
risk 29:5 105:7 181:20	127:9 134:8 137:13	sand 192:6,12,13	30:21 32:5,10 33:6	140:24 142:9	147:22
river 20:13 38:4 41:20	137:18,21 140:11	194:19,23 195:1,11	34:8 47:20 54:12	144:24 148:7,16	sequence 76:11 79:3
43:15,18 58:13 70:1	144:9 152:6,9	195:19,20 196:3,10	75:16 78:10 87:22	149:17 150:19	series 129:17 135:14
80:4 119:21 128:12	160:23 204:17,21	196:11,13,16,16,18	88:2,22 104:3	152:19 154:19	136:6 216:9
128:12,15,21,25	205:25 206:13	196:18 197:3,24	108:24 114:15	155:2,12,13 156:6	serious 177:11 185:6
129:2,9 130:1,10,12	209:10 211:9 219:7	198:2,21 208:6	116:14 118:7 127:6	156:13,24 157:7,16	servanda 101:3
131:10 132:9	225:5,13 226:11	213:3 227:19 228:5	130:1 133:18 135:3	158:11,23 160:11	serve 123:1
133:23 134:20	runner 200:2,3 206:20	228:6	147:2 149:24	162:5 163:17	served 101:5 149:6
136:9 137:23	206:25 207:12	sands 192:20 194:24	167:20 174:23	164:20 165:12	serviced 30:8
139:20 140:4	209:10,15 217:12	satisfactory 89:17	178:9 184:8 188:9	176:3 178:21	services 144:16
146:16 150:18	217:15 218:22	111:21 122:23	202:17 211:12,12	179:14 183:22	serving 31:18
155:25 156:10,24	220:9 223:22 224:4	save 48:6 53:20	211:13,18,19	191:11,16,17,19	session 96:19 176:18
160:20 162:20	224:13,21,25 225:3	saw 26:8 33:23 39:15	secondary 218:9	193:22 194:1 195:3	188:9
164:25 165:17	225:5,14,18,22,24	39:19 157:7 159:8	seconds 19:8	195:4,16 196:5,13	set 4:5 25:12 28:11
173:3 175:25	runners 207:23	161:10 199:15	Secretariat 125:9	196:25 197:14,15	29:10,21,24 32:19
178:25 179:1 185:3	218:25,25 223:18	200:13 204:10	Secretary 2:7,8,19	199:3 201:8 202:7	34:3 35:6,17 38:13
185:21 191:8 192:8	223:23,24 224:2,16	214:5 221:24	44:21 section 23:23,25	203:6 206:15	39:13 40:25 44:5 45:15,17 46:1 47:13
192:8 193:3,3,24	224:20 225:2,12	222:16 225:11	section 23:23,25 108:11	214:23 216:1,3,4,24	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
196:13,15 197:3 208:4,4 211:8 212:8	running 165:1 166:12 207:20	saying 6:3 64:10 65:8	sector 145:1,2,11	220:11,18 224:20 227:2	48:19 50:3 55:23 58:3 59:1 66:7,24
208:4,4 211:8 212:8 212:8 212:25 214:14	runoff 183:4	84:9 85:19 94:5	172:14 186:7	seeding 61:24 108:11	70:12,14 75:5,18
212:25 214:14 222:9	runs 137:7 140:1	96:24 113:22 114:5	secure 14:17 39:24	111:14,25	76:5 83:3 108:22
riverbed 159:6	143:20,21 157:24	says 27:8 63:21	94:5	seeing 161:11 215:21	122:3 125:18 153:9
riverbeds 131:23	145:20,21 157:24	116:17 117:18	secured 33:20	229:11	158:18 224:11
river-based 134:2	run-of-river 3:24 11:6	118:8 182:14	securing 39:22	seem 83:7 183:24	sets 28:5 79:10 127:2
river-water 175:24	17:11 19:23 37:15	195:17	security 94:17 122:4	seemed 63:18 84:23	135:11
robot 218:15,17,19,19	45:25 46:2 51:17,23	scale 154:18 192:14	126:17 161:16,17	seems 37:12 62:19	setting 97:5
219:2	56:12 60:12 94:7	195:17 214:18,21	sediment 8:8 18:19	64:3 67:25 68:1	settle 72:20 216:20
robust 217:17,23	115:12 126:22	scarce 177:2,9,25	126:23,24 189:4	69:11 105:24	221:16
	110.12 120.22	scarcity 177:6,14	120.20,21109.1	07.11 100.21	
	1	1			

Trevor McGowan

settled 13:25 14:25	154:24 160:4 164:8	104:12 106:13	Solomonic 16:17	spacing 218:11	standard 91:8
99:20	170:12 174:22,23	113:21 123:24	solution 29:12 40:19	spare 44:7	standards 18:6
settlement 4:12 13:11	174:24 178:16	124:6 125:13 139:5	50:17 195:10	sparse 61:8	standing 1:12 43:10
13:18 29:9 41:1,2	180:20 200:21	172:24 174:25	solve 30:10	speak 65:24 71:7	197:6
settles 192:20 197:7	204:12 207:7 211:6	187:10 188:4	some 2:1,3 11:14,20	166:17 208:7	standpoint 202:23
213:3 215:5	211:16,23 212:5	site 17:9 18:14,15,16	12:10 14:25 16:5	speaking 12:1 66:7	217:1
settling 80:23 216:22	215:11	80:2 190:14,15	20:5,5 23:23 25:13	83:5	stands 101:4 153:24
several 25:19 105:6	shutting 28:24	198:16 210:18	28:6 34:13 35:9,20	speaks 83:4	start 1:6 13:21 62:10
121:21 146:22	side 18:2 133:15 178:9	215:20 222:1	42:14 46:8 47:9	special 15:16,22 16:2	124:19 127:4
177:5 183:7 189:13	179:10 180:1,13	227:10,11,24	51:20 56:24 68:12	75:12 77:11 78:24	129:19 168:10
190:5 217:8 219:5,8	186:2 187:16	sites 215:8	68:19,24 70:7,12,13	79:24 80:10,18	176:17 189:24
222:19	196:25 202:1,4,7,11	sitting 193:12	74:11 75:11 79:10	82:11,21 97:22	199:3 200:23 225:4
severe 218:24	207:1 215:16,17	situate 10:12 12:21	81:17 85:24 96:19	120:3 209:16	227:7
severely 92:16	224:19	situated 23:15 142:22	98:17 101:2 105:11	specialibus 97:20	started 189:1
Shabtai 72:19	sides 67:8 71:16 73:6	situation 22:22 28:1	105:13,15,17,22,25	specialis 113:1,6	starting 29:8,12 63:14
shaded 162:4	73:19 79:5	99:14 177:17 216:5	116:21 121:14	specific 52:18 66:12	74:19 84:1,9,10
shadow 25:6,8	side's 30:7	six 24:17 27:6 91:22	124:24 125:1,14	66:24 85:2,12 103:7	109:9,10 155:9,17
shaft 207:25 219:9	Sidhnai 158:22	104:4 128:7,13	126:17,25 128:4	111:16 112:9	177:1 222:7
Shah 2:4 4:14 21:11	significance 60:22	168:16 178:13,14	139:4 141:19	118:13,25 119:3	starts 216:11
21:18 24:2 56:13	121:20	207:9 225:14,17	152:14 154:23	122:11,15 153:17	state 33:20 35:11
57:13	significant 41:11	sixth 72:17 128:1	159:1 163:15	171:16 227:8	102:24 182:7 183:9
Shahpurkandi 139:5	47:15 55:17 109:7	six-year 225:17,19	165:24 166:4	specifically 48:4 70:7	stated 31:4 106:23
139:13 140:7	109:15 110:25	size 153:2,3 183:11	177:25 182:4	77:5 80:18 88:3	115:13 117:13
142:14	121:8 138:7 139:4	196:8 210:4	189:25 190:16	98:20 146:4	138:11
Shah's 22:17	139:23 141:3 147:2	sizes 192:2	192:5,8 194:6 196:7	specifics 27:23 28:11	statement 47:24 51:10
shape 210:1 225:3	149:16 150:5 152:1	sketch 9:23	200:15 202:12	169:4,6	51:14 68:9 72:19
share 33:5 138:13,19	154:13 155:20	skewed 192:8	205:14 209:24	specified 33:11	77:4 80:22 113:21
sheds 105:20	156:8 165:1,8	skimming 213:24	216:14 218:24	specifies 121:23	114:21 117:3
sheets 125:3 153:20	168:12 175:9	214:3	226:12,12 227:2	spectrum 209:17,18	statements 5:19 63:16
Sheikh 44:21	179:12 183:13	sky 223:8	228:4 somehow 99:21	speculate 60:13,15	68:18,20
Shelf 118:22 120:7 shellfire 28:22	184:12,20 185:14 193:9 217:25	slides 32:20 70:13,13 124:22 125:16	something 7:3 12:5	181:8 speed 154:18	states 17:23 24:13 25:20 30:12 77:25
shift 47:20 55:17 71:9	228:18,20	129:17 131:18	40:14 60:17 61:24	speedboat 219:17	78:1 80:21 81:3,14
ship-owning 95:24	significantly 126:11	140:20 153:9,15,19	62:12 64:5 65:8,10	spelt 53:24	81:24 90:16 102:8
short 39:15 74:1 176:5	179:15 192:6 196:2	173:16 174:20	65:14,15 81:24	spend 9:11 144:20	104:13 114:8 135:7
183:11 184:8 188:6	Silesia 94:23 100:1	204:11	113:23 115:21	176:9,20	181:18 194:9
shortages 34:23	silt 192:6 196:18	slideshow 125:7	168:20 177:4	spending 76:12	195:13
shortfall 163:21	197:4 228:3	slight 66:2 173:25	193:16 207:15	spent 166:4	static 83:5,14,16,19
shorthand 13:16 72:6	silts 213:2	slightly 160:17 175:2	213:20 215:7	spillway 200:9,10,14	84:1,24 121:17
shortly 110:7 134:11	similar 46:20 81:22	183:14	216:22 224:8,17	200:14,15,21,23,24	122:3
135:2 144:22	82:19 92:8 101:15	slip 167:5	229:4	201:1,15 202:5,11	station 196:6
149:22 170:25	158:18 203:3	slope 228:21	sometimes 92:15 96:4	202:12,18,18,20,20	stations 142:21 143:16
177:16	similarly 141:1 152:23	slowly 192:20 212:21	152:3 198:15,15	spillways 200:8,12	statistical 180:24
show 75:20 85:14	simple 28:24 32:19	213:3	somewhat 71:10	spirit 89:22	statistics 179:10
129:13 131:18	simplified 154:10	small 104:5 151:5	somewhere 62:9	split 133:12 149:11	status 113:12 120:9
141:3 154:18 162:2	simply 11:11 16:17	161:19 163:2	soon 108:15	156:15,16	138:17 177:10
162:25 163:1	20:18 54:9 71:21	170:17 174:18	sorry 22:19 26:23	spokesman 184:15	statute 80:23 81:4
170:13,18,21	81:22 93:6 187:15	192:5 194:14	63:3 80:14 146:10	spot 150:11	113:5,8
173:15 174:20	202:13 208:7	203:10 207:3	sort 61:23 70:5,9	spraying 207:5	statutes 80:20
193:20	simulate 214:21	209:13 211:7 213:2	71:18 99:5 105:18	sprays 207:6 218:16	statutory 81:7
showed 114:12 179:4	since 23:2 24:22 25:6	219:22	116:11 180:25	spread 137:9 216:16	stay 207:25
showing 61:4 169:17	26:24 100:17 126:6	smaller 156:16 161:8	202:12 216:14	spreadsheets 222:2	stayed 27:18 60:24
203:4 207:4 220:10	126:10 127:8	163:18 192:12	sound 85:25 86:7,12	spring 41:6,9	steadily 61:11
shown 32:19 36:4,15	134:14 136:3,19	193:14	86:19 111:20	square 129:11 132:5	steel 195:18,18,20,21
39:5,12 42:6 44:19	139:17,21 140:10	SMB 158:22	122:22	149:22 153:1,4	195:22,25 196:2
53:22 54:11 56:17	141:4 144:24	smooth-running 30:4	sounds 82:14,15	161:9	210:15 218:16
74:6 118:3 142:8	153:12,12 154:3,4	snapshot 161:1	source 26:1 46:8	squeezed 187:11	219:22,24 224:1
150:10 158:10	177:1 178:6,12,13	snapshots 153:21	74:21 133:2,20	squeezing 187:2	225:15 steels 105:25
160:3 163:4 171:2	179:12 180:20 189:1	154:1 snow 132:4 7 16 133:7	167:13 172:20	stability 94:17 113:17	steels 195:25
175:5 178:16 179:10 192:13	single 175:4 190:4	snow 132:4,7,16 133:7 146:14 191:12	sources 28:25 30:20 85:21 110:9 112:25	120:13 121:7 122:4 123:4	steep 211:7 228:22 stem 58:13 162:9
201:3 203:23	200:11 207:8	snowmelt 143:12	85:21 110:9 112:25 148:13 157:11	stable 113:23 114:7	171:22 172:2
201:3 203:23 211:16 214:4 215:2	Sir 2:9 3:3,5 1:5,8,11	145:22 191:10	south 150:6	193:16	step 214:25
shows 94:19 128:17	5:10 10:5,7,11	social 93:19 190:17	south 150.6 southeast 159:7	stage 43:24 58:14 59:8	Stephen 2:11 10:24
129:7 130:12 132:3	20:23 24:11 28:13	soften 42:1	sovereign 90:23 115:4	174:5,6,8	steps 139:1,3 153:11
132:23 135:5	75:12 76:3 77:11	solar 205:13	sown 144:4	stages 14:23	still 27:2 29:4 40:17
140:22 143:4,14	79:9 85:5 88:10	solely 60:9	so-called 25:3 106:25	staggering 174:17	40:18 48:14 53:23
149:3,9 152:19	97:24 101:25	solid 14:8	space 218:20 219:1	stake 106:6	61:22 69:14 72:19
,.					

Trevor McGowan

81:16 86:14 106:4	208:1	sunk 205:20	197:8	takes 153:9 160:4	60:23,24 73:13
138:22 139:23	subjective 60:17	sunk 203.20 sunlight 5:11	Sutlej 33:9 128:14	205:9 211:11	80:25 81:12 86:2,13
183:15	submarine 219:16	sunight 3.11 sunt 101:3	130:23 131:8,10,11	212:14 221:12	114:9 184:8
stipulated 58:8	submarine 219.10 submergence 219:12	superfluous 88:21	131:12,13 137:3	212.14 221.12 226:2	terms 4:24 7:23 15:15
stop 138:25	submission 52:17	supervise 25:17	138:6 140:23	taking 93:7 119:4	15:22 21:21 27:21
storage 8:7 15:8,19	89:25 103:24	supplemental 65:19	157:25 158:10	209:19 211:8 218:3	27:23 35:15 37:13
37:23 45:20 48:3,5	118:19	supplementary 14:3	159:6.23	talc 195:17	38:13,14 39:14
48:15 49:6,10 51:24	submissions 3:1,6,13	72:23 75:16 106:18	Swat 154:12	talk 72:9 134:9 153:17	42:18 46:13 47:17
51:24 55:24,24 56:6	3:20 1:9,20,21 2:3	106:25 107:4,12,15	swiftly 33:21	188:23 191:4	56:16 57:12 70:16
58:19 59:21 88:4	2:18,24,25 9:14,16	supplied 26:1 34:16	SYED 2:4	199:19 204:8	70:18 75:13 76:22
92:24 136:12	10:1,13,15,24,25	127:15 131:24	synergistically 219:24	210:10	77:6,9,14 78:21
159:16,17 193:9	11:19,23 12:22	147:7 150:23 153:6	syphon 159:3,4	talking 17:5,10 73:9	79:6,10 82:12 83:6
198:4,9 201:13,13	13:23 14:11 15:1	158:17 159:22	syphons 159:3	79:18 121:13	83:10,17 85:16 86:5
201:20,21,21,24,24	16:11,13,25 18:11	162:12 164:12	system 24:17 25:18	193:10 205:10	86:7,10,18,23 87:2
202:2,5,15,22,23	20:22 21:3 23:16	179:2 184:25	38:22 49:12 91:23	206:11 212:16	91:19 92:10 94:12
208:16,16 213:9	28:8 62:13 74:4	supplies 31:21 33:14	128:12,21 129:2	talks 4:9 41:5,9 45:12	95:6 107:22 120:3,3
226:22 228:15	120:16 124:13	33:18 34:7,9,12	144:12,14,14,16,21	tall 214:19	120:8 121:2,9,11
storages 44:25	126:14 143:1	40:22 42:4 128:22	144:23 146:15,21	TAMS 34:21	122:15,22 167:21
store 165:6 198:6	submit 117:15	137:4,8 148:13,15	146:23 148:11	TAMS's 35:5	168:19 182:22
stored 112:17	submits 108:14	148:20,21,25	152:8 153:21,24	tank 199:18 210:8	187:12 217:23
stores 43:19	110:13	157:11,13 159:20	155:18,18 156:17	TANWEER 2:7	226:21
story 59:10 71:8 97:14	submitted 61:5 102:6	160:15 161:18,22	159:17 161:17	TANZI 2:11	territorial 120:9
98:10 180:12	subparagraph 4:25	161:23 163:13	162:18,20 163:1,3	TARAR 2:6	territories 31:11,19
222:21	5:14 67:18	supply 22:3 27:10,12	164:1,7,10 165:14	Tarbela 143:15	territory 41:16 128:25
straddle 11:1	subparagraphs 9:17	31:1 127:15 134:13	166:5 168:2,7,14	160:10 189:17	129:22 131:7
straightforward 7:9	19:18	134:15 136:25	184:15 196:17	196:6 197:13	132:19 145:23
stranglehold 42:19	subsequent 15:23,24	148:5 160:24	205:2 206:19 208:2	228:20,21	test 101:15 181:1,3,4
45:4	32:2 39:7 40:4	161:21 164:5,11	208:3,5,8 209:9	target 185:11	text 24:9 50:10 62:6
strategies 189:6 190:6	43:20 44:1 45:6	165:13 168:2,19	systematically 9:21	targets 185:14	76:10 77:1,5 79:7
191:2 217:6	59:15 62:2,13 69:3	172:23 175:23,24	98:8	TARIQ 2:12	90:7,12 96:23 99:22
strategy 211:2 214:8	75:15 78:18 101:13	179:20 180:13	systemic 3:23 5:23	task 14:19 115:8,20	101:9
216:18 226:18	101:13,23 104:7,11	184:20 186:2	6:12,21,22 8:24	147:5	thank 1:11 5:8,10
streams 161:13	subsequently 13:25	supplying 31:9 158:1	19:15 20:2,9 115:15	team 17:17	20:23 21:1,4 22:19
strengthen 20:17 54:4	34:21 52:5	supply-side 126:8	176:4 186:13	technical 2:13,14 8:21	23:9,12 28:17 46:9
stress 152:1,1 171:20	substance 125:12	176:10	systems 128:25 167:23	18:2 93:19 126:18	47:3 52:15 62:8,11
177:12 strassed 177:11 24	substantial 126:5	support 41:19 83:11	T	168:24 technique 112:3	63:8,9 72:4 73:1,20 73:24 74:5 6 82:22
stressed 177:11,24 stretches 24:19 152:5	127:12 146:23 151:25 157:17	supports 56:8 suppose 70:11 71:5,19		techniques 190:2	73:24 74:5,6 82:22 83:1 86:21 97:11
174:18,19	158:5 160:2 161:3	98:9	tab 124:21 125:3	technological 119:15	83:1 86:21 97:11 98:19 100:19
strict 64:19 175:7	161:10 162:25	sure 5:12 82:22	table 149:2 166:25	technologies 61:20	104:19 123:5,10,13
strictly 64:22 65:11	163:7,7,16 173:12	166:19 167:4	167:2 169:17,19	62:16	124:7,11 125:17
94:16 95:6	186:2 209:4 227:22	187:16 217:3	170:12,18 174:2	technology 62:6 112:2	151:21 166:6,22,23
strike 105:8	substantially 179:19	surface 168:1,3,7	185:7 tooks 64:4	199:10	168:22 169:8,10
stroke 7:1	184:1 225:12	169:12 170:12	tacks 64:4 Tajikistan 189:13	tell 10:7 70:2 97:14	171:18 172:3
strong 217:3	substantive 10:1 54:3	183:25 203:16,21	take 2:6 3:10 5:3,6,8	temperature 183:5,8	176:19 186:21,23
stronger 42:18	success 41:9 116:9	213:1,22	14:5 16:8 20:25	184:2 185:4	188:3,4,21 227:1,5
struck 7:24 16:9 50:13	successfully 190:3,6	surge 199:18	23:18 38:6 47:8	temperatures 180:2	229:8,12,13
93:13	sudden 222:6,17	surprise 7:14	64:3,20,25 65:19	182:18 183:25	thanks 143:2
structural 208:12	suffered 155:19	surprisingly 193:15	67:6,15 68:2 73:22	184:4 185:20	Thar 137:5
structure 14:13,17	sufficient 15:9 37:7	surrounding 25:19	78:5 96:21 108:12	template 128:10	Thein 136:8,21 139:9
43:18 87:23 127:2	59:21	26:2 44:3 49:22	109:16 153:21	Temple 113:15,20	their 11:21 12:22 18:2
159:5 162:19	sugar 146:6	66:12	176:13 186:25	122:6	18:3 24:18 26:4
214:24	suggest 187:23	Survey 145:9	187:1 199:24	temporal 77:7 170:18	28:15 37:2 43:7
structured 18:10,11	suggested 57:16	survive 116:10	206:24 207:11	temporarily 43:18	66:21 78:22 79:11
structures 136:6	suggesting 63:19	survived 32:1	217:24 221:2,15,24	165:19	79:22 84:17 86:24
studied 61:19 194:22	suggestions 35:21	susceptible 78:18	221:25 223:4,23	temporary 25:25	93:8 98:3 104:25
studies 182:10,11,13	Sukkur 34:18	120:24	224:1 225:15,16	ten 40:17 143:14	133:1 143:11
183:7	Sulemanki 158:9	suspect 64:23 65:5	takeaway 12:19 28:13	194:19,19 tondoney 104:15	144:11 152:2 156:8
study 137:22 146:12	SULJUK 2:6 summarise 140:19	suspended 193:22,23	takeaways 182:12	tendency 194:15 218:5	158:5 159:13,15
182:4 189:15 stuff 192:12 200:18	summarise 140:19 summarised 25:23	194:9,11,12 suspension 196:21	taken 27:24 57:1 62:1	tends 194:15 216:12	162:23 216:22,25 223:24 224:20
stun 192:12 200:18 stymied 48:17	42:5 57:8	197:8	64:7,13 88:23 93:9	220:4	225:24 224:20
subject 13:22 15:24	42:5 57:8 summarises 182:12	sustain 186:6 190:4	101:16 103:11	tenet 36:1	theme 40:8
34:14 43:12 47:25	summary 11:16 82:15	sustainability 3:20	108:18 117:10	Tennessee 25:16,19	themes 16:1 32:7
54:25 55:22 85:13	182:6	10:25 16:6 108:16	119:17 120:20	tens 195:13	themselves 59:16
92:1 110:4 116:13	summer 53:17 184:24	124:13,17 125:20	139:2 154:15 170:14 171:16	ten-year 41:3 135:14	68:16 152:22 156:7
122:6 124:17	191:9,13,21	sustainable 189:5	183:6 206:20	135:16 157:17	161:3
141:19,21 182:3	Sunday 223:7	sustained 163:23	217:16	term 57:11,25 58:5	theoretical 215:10
			1	1	

• •					
thermal 205:4	121:17 125:8	120:21 126:13	41:3 135:15,16	truly 144:25	216:4
thesis 40:9	129:21,22,24 130:4	131:24 133:21	136:3 147:3 153:23	truth 224:21	typical 204:13 228:6
thicker 217:23	131:2,14 133:3	134:25 147:17,24	157:5 160:6,8 206:6	try 11:10 208:11	typically 156:12 192:5
thing 69:10 71:20	134:7 156:11	148:25 149:19	206:8 223:17	229:3	192:21 193:10
72:11,14 197:17	157:25 161:23	152:24 154:21	transitioning 61:12	trying 99:21 104:23	194:6 195:3 196:24
203:12 206:4.9	162:4 165:7 168:19	156:23 158:13	transparency 50:8	105:2 121:15 198:3	199:6 200:16,25
215:16 217:2	172:9 176:16 180:4	160:4,25 178:15,18	transparent 67:5,8	198:8	201:2 204:21
things 25:17 34:15	185:5 186:2 188:11	179:16 180:9	transpiration 180:6	TS 158:22	205:16 206:10,12
46:23 52:10 62:10	198:17 208:9	182:18 184:22	185:18	tube 206:17,23 217:11	207:17 211:22
40.23 32.10 02.10 75:24 193:18	211:10,14 212:8	187:22 221:18	transport 156:1	217:14 222:16	213:6,20 214:17
194:21 199:19	216:14 219:16	together 12:24 50:3	193:19 194:21	Tuesday 1:6 1:1	216:7,23 219:5,12
208:19,20 209:7	225:10 226:1,12	90:6 134:17 135:13	transported 131:25	tunnel 199:17 211:6	222:8,10 227:11
210:24 217:9 220:7	throughout 25:15	189:8 206:23	148:22 196:18,21	211:25,25 212:2,6	tyres 224:7,8,11
210.24 217.9 220.7 223:2	67:19 68:1,3,23	226:15	transporting 147:5	213:17,23 214:4,7	tyres 224.7,8,11
thinking 208:25	71:6 154:5,6 164:1	told 158:24 180:25	156:9	tunnels 211:21	U
thinks 98:12	164:11 191:6	222:24	transports 196:15	turbid 198:11	
thinner 163:5	196:23 216:18	tolerable 35:3	trans-boundary	turbine 195:18,20,22	UAE 76:25
third 23:23 33:12 48:2	thrown 215:14,15	tomorrow 2:25 7:4	109:23	199:20,22,23 200:2	UK 161:11
51:5 56:10 66:9,13	thumb 192:10	10:17 11:14 88:13	trash 214:1	205:5 206:11,12	ultimately 30:13
75:19 99:10 100:17	thunder 223:10	97:6 187:5,8,20	travaux 10:20 14:3	210:14,16 211:10	32:14,23 35:16
101:12 103:2	Thursday 9:18 175:21	188:2 223:18	23:24 24:1 25:13	211:11,19 217:17	45:12 50:10 57:19
127:10 130:12	Tibetan 129:20	226:25 229:11	46:16,24 52:19,22	217:18 218:11	68:11
174:24 184:19	131:14	tools 98:1 228:11	56:20 60:19 62:4,4	219:13 221:8	UN 179:13,17
215:25 221:1,4	tie 51:3	top 150:19 196:25	62:14 63:16,20,25	222:11,12,13,16,18	unable 48:14 144:7
thirds 142:6 169:24	tie-breaking 116:24	198:18 200:24	64:5,22 65:1,3,9,11	turbines 58:21 59:23	unacceptable 219:7
172:8	tight 187:2	202:8,10 203:25	65:14,20 66:11,16	195:15,19 196:1	unaltered 32:2
third-party 28:20	tightly 32:15 51:4	202:6,10 203:25	66:19,20 67:7,14	198:17 204:20	unambiguous 3:18
thirsty 146:5	time 9:11 20:24 26:15	211:6 213:4	72:15,18 75:18	206:10 217:22	unaware 67:12
thoroughly 28:23	28:21 33:13 36:7	topic 125:20 127:22	86:16 89:2 93:3	218:1 220:3,22	uncertainty 101:6
though 71:10 80:17	39:20,23 40:7 43:19	128:1 132:1 135:3	94:13 96:24 100:13	221:1 222:8	unclear 46:16
105:21 106:7	44:12 46:11 47:7	172:10 182:3	106:19 117:24	turbulence 193:24	uncoated 220:11
120:22 140:8	51:23 52:2,14 53:4	topics 24:4	treaties 15:2 46:20,23	turn 9:22 10:11 13:4	uncontested 176:23
146:23 150:25	58:16 61:18 67:11	topography 126:16	53:2 76:1,4 77:12	13:10 23:13 32:4	uncontrollable 201:12
168:9 181:10 227:2	67:23 68:5 70:9,23	130:7 165:13	78:3,7 83:23 85:3	42:21 51:5 90:16	202:8
thought 23:5 72:21,24	71:18 72:16 76:12	190:14 197:13	94:17,24 106:1	94:10 107:17 113:2	under 8:7 9:25 21:14
167:17 188:11	77:9,17 78:23 79:2	topological 130:10	113:13 118:17	191:17 204:20	21:22 22:7,10 31:19
thousand 146:22	84:4 85:1 90:1,10	top-level 200:15	120:23	205:2 220:14 221:3	40:23 45:8 47:23
thousands 212:19	105:11 106:22	total 126:3 132:8	treatment 216:19	221:8	54:6,24 62:7 64:7
thread 48:21	111:15 119:25	136:22 142:3,11	treaty's 74:23 79:10	turned 125:15	64:13,21 70:21
threat 26:19 27:21	120:4 134:2 135:25	143:5 149:4,9	90:9,11 94:8 113:12	turning 24:3 52:16	75:16 82:9 93:11 95:4 102:22 107:6
53:8 186:6	138:15,17 140:22	152:25 169:17,22	treaty-dependent	76:8,19 88:12 89:3	111:24 119:23
threaten 126:10	140:25 142:10,13	169:24 171:21	85:9	100:20 115:23	
175:22	147:11,16 154:10	173:8 175:1 221:5	trend 170:19 180:17	215:15	125:21,24 129:5 134:22 135:17
threatens 166:14	154:21 155:5 166:5	228:16	180:23 181:3,6,7	turns 151:13	141:11,22 143:5
three 13:14 14:9 23:18	167:14 168:16	totally 226:13 228:23	183:14	Twenty 2:9,10	144:6 146:25 147:3
24:3 25:10 74:9	171:14 176:9,14	touched 3:10 115:22	trends 181:4 182:23	twice 60:7 221:15	147:21 151:8
86:16 88:10 99:17	181:5 184:14 187:8	touching 200:3	185:4	two 4:23 11:15 12:13	152:20 155:1 157:6
101:22 103:10,18	187:12,19,19,21	tough 41:24	trespass 3:4	26:22 27:7,11 28:7	166:11 173:11,24
118:13,21 129:15	188:2,12 198:9	towards 53:17 68:6	Trevor 1:23	30:2,16 31:2 32:7	174:2,7,12,23
129:18 133:13	205:9 217:24	197:18 203:20	triangular-shaped	34:3 52:10 64:3	175:10,12 176:11
139:3 149:11	221:12 222:7	trace 72:7	203:9	69:4 77:23 78:6	178:2 206:18
159:13 165:25	225:19	track 35:14	tribunal 78:15 114:4	82:7 86:25 88:16	207:10 223:6
168:16 173:16	timely 42:12 164:8	traction 30:12	tribunals 77:22	99:17 102:8 108:20	underlined 36:15
174:20 183:16	166:10,13	trade 91:2 98:1	tributaries 37:3 43:16	123:20 124:6 142:6	underneath 198:14
188:15	times 74:9 76:23 78:6	traditional 193:17	128:13	146:23 149:16	199:20
three-month 144:1	100:18 152:1,14	199:7,21	tributary 110:23	157:15 158:1,2	underpin 30:13
threw 218:25	160:22 178:5,13,14	traditionally 34:9	130:3,13,15 131:11	160:9 162:3,14	underpinning 86:17
thriving 134:1	221:2 223:25 224:3	206:20	tricky 218:18	163:8 169:24 172:8	123:2
through 1:20 5:3,8	timing 11:23 36:12	train 222:23	trigger 105:3	178:8,10 184:11	underpinnings 17:1
8:16 14:5 16:11	37:9,24 52:4,7,8,11	training 223:3	Trimmu 158:20	188:15 202:5 206:2	underpins 6:2
18:4 23:21 24:19	164:15 166:2	tranquilliser 216:6	159:21	206:10 207:22	understand 5:7 65:25
38:10 46:24 47:9,10	183:20 185:2	transboundary 109:7	trip 25:23	213:15 226:21	167:8 170:14
52:5 54:7 57:22	title 16:8	transcript 1:23 21:12	triple 179:25	type 43:9 67:25 87:3	understanding 24:9
71:24 73:5 76:11	today 9:24 10:12,15	24:25 57:15 116:1	tripled 179:12	88:2 119:10 196:1	94:15 105:14 106:8
78:18 79:13 82:8,20	11:11,19 12:21 21:7	167:5,6	triplet 158:3	211:1 216:5	123:2 137:17
86:9 91:13 104:25	27:15 44:7 67:16,22	transfer 161:7 162:11	trips 222:19	types 113:13 190:5	167:23,24
108:25 109:3 112:1	68:10 70:14 74:10	transit 159:5	trouble 167:18	195:21 200:4 206:2	understood 78:23
114:19,19 116:23	89:11 118:17	transition 33:11,13	true 83:24 105:24	206:10 207:22	117:19
	1	1	1	1	

, 0					, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
undertake 37:22	174:17,18 186:11	US\$1.1 147:16	VII(2) 21:14,21,22	78:17	20:4 25:2 26:3
212:6	186:17 196:6,24	US\$1.5 147:23	22:10	water[s 53:19	27:11 30:4 32:13,15
undertaken 147:12,13	203:14 228:22	US\$12.5 147:17	VILMANTE 2:21	way 8:17 18:4 34:10	32:19 34:3 40:23
147:15 166:7	Urban 161:21	utilisation 89:17	violate 175:7	46:13 47:2 60:20	
					41:23 42:4,5 44:9
182:10	urbanisation 179:21	116:18	violation 166:15	64:12 65:24 70:18	44:16 46:24 48:14
undertook 163:25	usable 171:25	utilise 54:13 154:4	175:11,15,17	72:10 80:8 82:2	49:21 51:16 59:8
undisputed 98:23	usage 3:20 10:25 16:6	utilization 139:1	violations 175:19	84:17,25 86:13,19	60:15 61:2 66:9,10
undisturbed 165:10	77:17 78:18 79:6,11	utilize 92:16 138:12	virtues 18:19	98:4,9 106:8 118:10	67:8 73:7,16 76:6
unduly 3:4 187:11	108:16 124:13,17	utilizing 139:8	visceral 26:4	120:21 121:13	78:7 79:5,7 89:15
unfortunately 56:21	125:20 127:11,19		visible 54:11	141:2,17 164:20,20	89:16 96:2 101:22
215:6	127:20 172:11	V	visit 17:9 18:14,15,16	167:22 172:8	101:23 102:11,12
ungated 200:21	usages 172:16	v 76:25 81:3,12 96:7	25:22 215:20	176:17 177:25	105:13,14,23 106:1
uniform 213:3 215:4	use 13:6,8 15:7 16:8	100:2,9 119:19	vital 56:18	178:1 186:5 187:25	106:3,5 111:3 120:4
uninterrupted 134:24	17:2 33:2,9 35:15	147:25 148:2,16	voice 16:12 17:8,13	193:17,18 198:19	147:10,13,15,19
unique 79:12 205:1	38:24 41:10 42:10	vacuum 99:5	void 190:8	199:7 206:24 209:7	148:14,18,19 155:5
unit 185:23 205:19	43:1,9,10,13,19	valid 167:9	volatile 184:9	215:2,6	155:14 157:13
206:15	44:3 45:23 47:21,23	valley 25:16 149:25	volume 33:3 59:2	ways 51:20 211:3,5	158:13,18 164:13
United 17:22 77:25	48:17 51:1,25 52:3	150:2 178:20	198:21 201:22	221:21	164:16 166:2 168:9
78:1 80:21 81:3,13	53:14 55:1 69:14	203:11	202:19	weaponisation 29:5	173:11 175:2
81:24 90:16 194:9	70:20 73:6 85:16	value 195:19	volumes 180:21	weaponise 29:4	184:13 194:7 221:2
195:13	89:24 92:14 97:3	valve 200:16 224:13	vulnerabilities 164:21	weapons 81:5,6,10	222:15 227:14
units 180:8 205:18	104:14,17,18 107:4	valves 210:22	vulnerability 16:23	wear 209:9 224:7,22	weren't 64:21 68:16
222:7 225:17,22	117:9,21 120:2	vanes 207:25,25	vulnerable 39:19	224:23	west-flowing 170:21
unlawful 186:11	125:22 127:25	variable 191:16	108:17 181:14	wearing 224:13	wet 205:24 226:6
unless 20:19 51:6	134:19 135:9,12,13	variation 20:5	182:22 184:3	weathered 195:2	we'll 1:6 63:9 73:3
61:14 200:23	135:13,19 136:4	variations 58:21 59:23		weathers 195:6	144:24 153:25
Unlike 110:5	141:8,9,10,15,18,20	varied 100:6	W	Webb 2:10 3:15 2:19	154:19 167:5 169:2
unlikely 90:9 103:25	145:5 148:9 158:15	varies 185:4 192:7	WAHEED 2:6	10:21,23 12:1 13:24	187:5 205:15
unnecessary 111:2	167:3 170:11,24	variety 93:18 190:2	Waldock 97:24 98:20	14:15 15:14,21 16:4	210:10,11 212:11
113:7	171:10 172:16	194:5 220:7	100:16	52:22 74:3,5 80:16	215:9 223:16
unpacked 9:10	174:12,15 186:15	various 14:23,24 47:5	Waldock's 99:10	81:15,21 82:2,25	229:10
unpacking 7:2	187:18 192:15,15	52:21 87:12 103:23	wall 213:24 214:3	83:2,20 84:14,20	we're 66:3 69:18
unprecedented	192:17 199:13,14	174:5		85:4,11 86:3,6,22	85:19 104:23
184:14	205:17,22 207:18		216:14,15	97:11 98:19 99:23	106:15 153:10
unreasonable 107:8	208:3,7 211:2	variously 135:12	want 44:13 60:16	100:20 104:19	157:3,23 172:8
unreliable 7:21	214:20 216:8 217:5	vary 190:11	82:22 108:8 113:18	106:10 120:19	188:8 189:17
unrestricted 13:6,8	217:6 219:15 229:3	vast 25:17 26:16 129:8	124:23 135:3	121:4 122:2 123:10	193:13 198:3,5,6,8
15:7 16:22 39:20	used 14:3 33:4 47:1	132:25 137:4	153:14 168:24	week 152:19 169:2	198:9 209:1,3
69:22,22 92:9 97:3	49:7 51:25 58:5	144:18 147:5	169:3,5,5 187:13,18	weekly 58:10,21 59:4	212:16 228:15
125:22 135:9,19	62:23 68:16 73:14	152:21,23 156:7	188:1,15 189:25	59:23	we've 4:8 11:22 66:7
136:4 141:8,9,10,18	77:6 78:13 80:12	161:1,19 164:11	190:7 200:5,17	weeks 44:1 215:21	79:2 89:1 98:14
141:20 174:12,14	81:19 87:2,3 95:17	173:5 180:6 184:21	207:15 210:19	weight 3:3 6:18 65:10	108:6 125:4 141:12
186:15	95:22 148:19	Vaughn 1:23	211:9,13 213:6,7	65:12,15,23 66:8	154:10,15 155:16
unsafe 7:20	161:11 170:15	VCLT 63:22	214:11 217:2	68:19 107:2 115:17	155:22 156:3
unsurprising 128:20	171:25 177:6 190:3	velocity 217:19,19,21	219:12,24 220:2	weir 217:4	163:11 165:25
unsurprisingly 178:22	190:6 192:14	version 28:5 54:9 56:2	224:20	weirs 217:5	177:23 179:13
		61:5 154:16 162:5	wanted 18:14 21:20		
untapped 139:23 until 11:14 35:13	195:18 199:12 204:16 206:12	versions 155:13	22:17 23:7 51:6	welcome 106:4 123:17 weld 225:15	180:13 184:11 189:14 194:16
105:23 106:1	207:17 216:18	versus 170:12 218:3	62:8 63:1 72:14	welding 224:1	199:3 213:22,23
123:15 135:25	207:17 210:18	226:19	79:14 88:25 103:17	well 24:6 25:8 27:13	220:5,23,23,25
191:11 229:15	useful 70:6 71:2	vertical 215:19,22,24	187:20	49:8 62:22 64:1	220:5,25,25,25
unusual 80:24 82:6	usefully 14:20	vertically 1:16	wanting 69:21	73:20 79:6 84:13	Whaling 100:3
		Verulam 2:10,11	wants 60:18 218:6		5
unusually 89:4 unutilised 173:13	user-friendly 154:14	veteran 19:4	warmer 143:12	106:3 121:18 123:9 123:23 129:16	Wheeler 17:19,21,22
unutilised 173:13 unutilized 138:22	uses 30:7,9 34:7,16	via 144:12 148:22	185:19		while 7:14 13:7 19:10
	35:11,16 41:15,16	video 215:20	warming 61:23	151:16 168:22	39:23 41:15 42:8
UN's 179:7	42:3,10 43:8 48:15	Vienna 53:1 75:17	182:14,23,24	169:16 175:25	60:23 107:20 129:3
upper 24:17 68:24	49:19 53:13 55:15	76:9,15 79:1 82:10	185:10,10	182:16 198:4	144:4,5 185:1
70:1 94:23 100:1	68:4,6,11,24 70:1	83:3 84:11,17 94:12	warned 49:16	205:14 210:19	187:16
129:14 132:21	73:7,13,14,15 92:2	94:14,21 98:4 99:6	Warsak 189:15 209:2	221:18	whole 9:3 18:20 72:2
133:4 134:4 182:15	116:13 117:7,16	101:1	220:24 225:11	well-designed 225:5	76:18 83:16 85:12
184:3	145:4 171:23 208:3	view 7:25 26:21 31:5	wasn't 46:12 64:24	well-established 74:13	88:5 89:18 114:22
upstream 37:2,5	use/acquisition	49:11 66:17	66:4 222:22	well-settled 14:18	120:23 121:6,16
54:21 73:8 131:21	190:19	viewed 83:18 113:1	watercourses 91:23	went 8:24 53:23 87:10	164:7,19 171:21
132:16 134:9,11	using 1:17 98:22	118:17	watershed 16:19	91:25 162:4	wicket 224:14
136:8,9,21 143:12	140:21 162:16	views 6:21 66:15,21	221:19	Wentworth 192:14	wickets 207:24
145:22 151:6 156:2	167:12 210:14	84:16	watertight 87:9	were 6:6,9 7:24 8:21	wide 28:9 95:20 137:9
159:10,20 164:13	214:17 226:18	Vihear 113:16,21	water-based 145:15	8:23 9:2,5 11:4,21	widely 2:13 6:23
166:14 171:11,14	usually 193:13	122:6	water-parting 78:12	14:11 15:24 18:16	widens 203:11
			_	1	

Trevor McGowan

,	,				57 5
wider 5:18,25 8:23	181:22 196:23	zero 205:20,20	11.48 74:2	1949 17:20 18:4	23:13 34:19 37:11
70:25 203:17	199:14 212:2	ZOHAIR 2:6	111 110:1 119:10	1950 79:8	58:2,18 74:19
218:11	world's 131:25 181:13	zone 162:8,10,16	112 110:11	1950s 209:4	123:12 128:9,23
widespread 164:2	worry 189:4	202:9	115 111:9	1951 25:11,21 26:8	138:21 163:2
WILLIAMS 2:20	worse 126:11	zones 162:3,14	12 36:6 87:15 133:10	29:15 69:1.1	185:11 189:25
willing 40:14	worth 65:8 84:18	zoom 153:18 158:10	161:6 168:5 198:25	1952 28:2	2% 224:9,12,14
window 123:7	118:7	161:20 164:22	12.57 120:17	1954 23:22 30:10,15	2(b) 58:2,4
windows 154:10	wouldn't 71:21 86:6	zoomed 156:3	120 3:19	31:12,16 32:1,7,17	2(i) 79:25
windy 223:11	86:12 105:12		121 44:6	33:6,19 34:1,5,14	2,000 129:24
winter 34:24 191:7,10	122:14,17	\$	124 3:20,21	34:22 35:17,21,25	2,177 140:2
191:19,24 204:15	WOUTER 1:12	\$35,000 224:10	13 24:25 36:23 87:22	36:1,18,20 38:16	2-3 213:20
wisdom 56:14	Wow 222:6	\$800 224:10	133:21 135:5 199:2	39:17 49:18 50:14	2.00 123:15
wish 37:19 187:15	write 222:1	\$ 600 22 4 .11	130 78:15 113:3	50:18 53:11 69:6	2.04 123:16
202:15	writing 12:16	0	134 44:6	73:15	2.05 124:12
withdraw 213:25	written 2:23 25:9	0.062 192:13	14 37:16 57:15 88:6	1955 90:18	2.5 137:10
withdrawal 26:11	114:24	0.075 192:15 228:7,10	104:22 115:1 138:1	1956 35:4,7,22 38:17	20 47:11 94:10 103:5
withdrawals 30:18	wrong 214:15	0.0 73 192.13 228.7,10 0.1 104:5	170:18 171:2 200:8	39:17 69:15	128:24 143:13
33:15 72:9	wrote 29:17 38:15	0.1 104.5 0.2 228:8,8	14.3 150:12	1957 35:20,23 36:6	173:3
wonder 81:25 170:22	137:20 140:1 189:7	0.2 228.8,8 0.5 49:6 51:24	143 40:16	37:13,17 38:2,13	20th 181:23 184:6
wondered 23:1		0.9 104:5	148,701 173:9	39:12 53:16 54:19	20% 129:10 143:8,24
wondering 61:18	X	000 136:14	15 39:13 45:14 58:1	56:16	170:2 194:6 229:2,6
83:13 121:20	XI 117:16 118:8	000 100.17	77:5 87:4,6 89:3	1959 40:4 41:1,6,10	20,000 132:5
word 17:2 78:1,6,12	XII(1) 89:6	1	119:4 138:11	42:6,23 43:6 44:18	20-some-odd 189:10
89:25 95:16 116:6	XI(1) 117:18	1 3:1,3 4:25 5:14	201:19	45:14,15 46:12,14	200 173:1 175:1,3
119:24		1 3:1,3 4:25 5:14 21:12 24:25 36:4	15th 148:14 157:13	47:6,12,24,25 48:7	211:15,17
wording 112:9	Y	37:25 40:3 56:15	15% 192:5 194:7	48:11 50:7 53:17,18	2000 140:25 181:22
words 22:9 26:3 29:3	year 95:8,14 137:21	57:14 83:4,7,15,25	228:16	53:23 54:2,8,8,25	2005 177:2,10
31:15 33:24 51:2	139:12 140:25	85:8 100:21 121:25	15(iii) 77:3 91:18	55:4,10,13,21 56:2	2006 19:12
54:7 68:15 89:15	141:3 177:15 179:9	157:9 163:14,25	107:14	57:1 58:1,5,17,23	2007 3:6,19 7:20 20:2
122:6 148:18 157:9	184:12,13,15	195:17	151 3:22	59:14,20 70:15 71:1	2007-2010 138:5
171:21 work 21:25 22:4 6 14	191:23 204:12	1% 181:13 224:15	159 48:19 16 21:13 42:7 91:10	71:9,10 1959/1960 62:7	2009 119:25 120:25
work 21:25 22:4,6,14 43:13,17 61:25	219:7 220:19 221:3	1,000 133:24 137:9	139:14 203:2	1960 1:2 7:25 16:9	2010 137:6,24 178:6 2011 137:22
77:12 98:3 106:24	221:3 225:15	177:3 210:20,22	16th 133:25	23:22 28:16 32:7	2011 137.22 2016 8:17
116:23 189:7 191:2	years 18:7 25:10 30:2	227:21	160-metre-high	48:14 49:2 50:3,6,9	2018 146:12
194:8,8,16 209:5,7	32:2 40:17 103:5,23	1,341 177:22	136:12	50:11 57:5 59:14,17	2019 138:8,15 142:5
214:8 215:6 221:10	128:3 133:24 143:4	1,370 136:22	163 56:15	60:25,25 61:4 85:23	142:11,19 181:22
224:19 227:14	143:14 146:22	1.02 123:14	166 3:23	95:8 121:25 126:10	182:10
workaround 208:10	154:20 180:23	1.18 2:12	167 21:13	127:8 134:15 135:1	2020 153:23 160:5,6
worked 84:17 127:7	184:11 186:8 189:3 194:19,19 195:13	1.2 168:1,14	168 48:19	135:15 139:21	161:1,20 162:5
151:18 189:9,11,12	197:17 199:11	1.24 2:12	17 42:16 92:11 140:20	140:10 141:4 147:9	2021 141:25 179:22
189:13,16 195:23	209:1,10,15,16	1.5 142:13 150:17	173:14 204:8 212:4	147:22 151:7	2022 139:24
209:13 222:18	215:8 219:5,8	151:11 185:11	17% 179:16	153:13,21 154:4	2022-23 145:9
working 59:8 125:14	220:10 222:19	220:25 221:2	1787 78:3	155:11,14,21 157:3	2023 133:22 173:8,9
131:3 164:10	225:13,23	1.6 161:12	18 42:21 44:19 92:19	157:5,16,16 159:8	2023-01 1:3
188:25 189:1,17,19	vellow 89:20 134:15	1.7 184:1 10 3:4,5 4:16 32:20	141:1 206:10	159:24 160:1	2024 1:6 1:1 126:15
195:24	149:17 151:16,25	33:12 42:15 43:6	18th 134:1	178:12,13 180:21	2025 177:22
works 13:21 14:2,6	152:4,23 153:1,4,6	57:15 79:17 132:3	1836 78:3	1960s 126:7 139:17	2050 179:9,16,24,25
21:16 31:8,18 33:17	155:23	195:18 196:22	1857 155:1	1961 178:17 179:12	206 139:11 206 000 152:1
36:10 37:8 38:10	yesterday 1:5,19 2:4	216:10	1858 119:20,25	1964 17:20 18:4 99:10	206,000 153:1 21 3:6 7 40:15 63:5 6
39:1,8 40:6,11,21 41:4,4,13,21 42:11	3:10 4:14 11:5,21	10% 147:24 229:1	188 3:24 4:1 1881 78:13	1967 102:5	21 3:6,7 49:15 63:5,6 94:20 148:2 149:1
41:4,4,13,21 42:11 43:22 44:13,21 45:9	11:25 12:8,25 13:15	10(h) 36:24 37:12	1881 78:13 189 78:4	1968 103:14 1970 135:15 136:3	94:20 148:2 149:1 161:14 174:1,3
43:22 44:13,21 45:9 49:13 55:25 58:8	14:8,11 15:17,25	10,000-foot 12:25	189 78:4 1893 78:13	153:22 157:5,17	209:23
93:8 134:10,12	16:1,16 19:10 20:12	10.02 21:2	19 21:13 45:18 93:12	159:8,25 160:1,6	21st 133:20 184:5
138:12 139:21	20:16 21:11 24:2,11	100 131:4 189:3 209:1	119:4 142:5 145:13	1970s 159:23 160:13	21% 129:10
147:9,10 148:11,17	24:14,21,25 25:2	209:15,16 211:11	166:25 169:19	1974 189:1	21 (a) 62:21 80:6,9
148:24 149:21	27:3,14,25 28:13	211:18	207:21	1976 102:2	2100 185:8
152:11 157:8 166:7	56:13 57:13 74:17	100,000 129:11 212:17	19th 146:25	1977 118:24	215 57:15
196:2 209:6 215:2	76:2 85:5 101:21	104 3:18 143:6 167:4	1914 209:14	1978 102:18	216 114:5
224:12	102:1,4,21 103:6,13	167:10	192 144:2	1985-2002 138:4	22 3:8 31:12 36:21
world 17:17,20,24	104:12,20 106:14	11 3:9 4:7,9,11,17,23	1947 24:14,23 134:4	1989 103:2,4	52:16 95:8 126:15
18:3 29:15,16 43:4	108:9 113:14 114:25 118:16	4:25 5:14 35:23	148:14 153:21	1990 103:15	149:2 210:25
66:18 68:18,20 79:5	139:6 172:25 175:1	86:22 132:23	154:3,25 155:2,11	1992 19:17,19 20:4	227 4:2
132:10 133:19,21	yield 30:3	198:11	155:13,21 157:3,13	1999 136:11	23 53:3,22 96:3 149:8
133:25 142:1,5	J-244 0010	11s 4:8 11.19 73:25	1948 25:3,7 26:4 28:6		161:2 213:15
147:10,12 163:24	Z	11.19 75:25 11.26 173:10	28:12,16 40:15	2	23% 143:7 145:11
178:5 179:22		11.45 73:23	155:16,19 164:17	2 1:6 3:4 10:10 15:17	231 145:21 147:18
	Zafrullah 33:25				

ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE IX AND ANNEXURE G OF THE INDUS V	VATERS TREATY 1960
Day 2 Hearing on the Merits, First Phase	Tuesday, 9 July 2024

24 53:24 96:14 149:11	331 96:8	51 3:11 174:4	87 109:18		
173:24 174:3	335 137:21	52 57:10 174:22	67 109.10		
207:12 210:23	34 94:9 109:16 113:22	522 93:15	9		
214:25	157:23	53 174:23			
21 4.23 24/7 191:23 204:17	35 110:11 158:11	54 105:9 174:24	9 1:6 1:1 4:15 32:20		
205:24	35% 229:6	55 178:16	47:12 56:15 78:21		
		56 179:4	111:10 131:8		
241 178:15 25 54:2 11 100:20	350 207:17		9,150 173:22		
25 54:2,11 100:20	350,000 136:14	57 180:16	9.30 229:11,15		
144:17 149:16	36 111:9 158:20	57% 143:6	9.32 1:2		
215:9	365 221:2	58 182:8	9.46 10:9		
25% 153:7	37 112:22 158:24	59 185:7	90% 137:23 145:18		
26 3:9 54:12 63:14	37.5 145:12	59% 129:9	181:3		
100:25,25 149:24	37000 139:10		92% 138:3		
217:8	38 160:3	6	93% 145:2 171:24		
265 129:6	39 113:20 160:9	6 25:1 29:9 38:11	94% 225:6,7		
27 55:4 101:11 150:10		45:11 49:15,20	95% 128:22 138:13,13		
150:22 220:9	4	50:11 76:19 130:12	142:3		
28 34:1 55:10 102:2	4 25:1 26:5 27:1 76:8	193:20	97 3:17		
151:5 220:13	79:1 83:9 124:21	6(c)(iii) 35:5	98.5 150:16		
29 56:10,17 75:1,19	129:19 191:15	6.3 184:1	99 174:4		
102:18 107:17,19	4% 129:5 172:24	60 19:8 137:9 180:23			
109:3,14,21 110:5	4 (1) 38:5	189:9			
110:13 111:8	4.A 39:5	60% 129:3 173:6			
112:22 113:6,12	4.A 59:5 4.20 187:1	60,000 161:9			
112:22 113:0,12		,			
120:5 154:24	4.21 188:7	60:40 192:7			
223:17	4.23 188:18	600 136:15			
22 3.17 29(g) 86:15	4.8 195:19	600-metre-long			
29(g) 80.15	40 114:2 160:25	136:12			
	214:20	61 3:12			
3	400 179:9	62,060,000 147:23			
3 2:10,11 24:3 34:2,19	402 77:4	650 137:8			
37:11 40:2,3 50:20	407 87:5,17 91:21	66% 142:11			
75:4 115:11 126:14	409 87:11	67% 179:8,16			
129:7 161:2 227:18	41 31:25 67:21 113:5				
3% 221:5	114:13	7			
3(b) 58:23 59:1 60:1	418 92:11	7 29:2 30:15 77:7			
3(b)(i) 43:23	42 31:25 114:23	130:20 147:13			
3,229 140:3	161:21	194:23 195:19			
3,280 136:13	43 115:23 162:5	7% 145:8 172:16			
3.1 142:8	178:15	7(b) 35:12			
3.13 172:23	44 163:4	7(c) 60:5			
3.3 129:1 172:23	45 12:2 132:6 163:10	70% 145:19			
3.39 146:20	46 3:10 118:7 164:7	72% 132:7			
3.4 143:16	47 118:15 164:20	74 3:13,15			
3.49 146:20	48 164:23	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
3.51 188:5	49 61:2 173:19	748-page 189:8			
3.7 149:8 154:8,16	•> 01.2 173.17	75% 138:3			
3.8 144:19 149:3	5	76 95:2			
30 56:20 103:2 143:4					
155:10 214:20	5 28:19 45:5 49:15	8			
30% 185:13 194:7	76:12 130:2 149:23	8 2:15,20 4:6 5:16 8:9			
	184:5 192:2 203:13	8:25 9:13,17 13:2			
300 211:12,13 31 58:18 63:21 64:8	212:2 221:2,3	19:18,22 26:14 29:2			
31 58:18 63:21 64:8	5(c) 59:25	42:15 67:18 77:19			
75:10 76:9 78:25	5,000 172:25	79:14 93:11 99:2			
83:3,6,8,14 85:8	5.28 226:25	111:23 122:1,11			
88:7 94:12 98:4,22	5.30 187:3,16,23,25	130:24 196:4			
100:7,21 101:12	5.31 229:14	8% 180:22 181:16			
102:5 104:9 107:6	50 57:9 161:15 173:24	8(a) 112:12			
155:20 173:19	208:25 209:10	8(c) 58:24			
31(1) 76:13,20 86:23	214:20	8.29 94:18			
31(3) 101:17,25	50% 168:2 169:13	8.50 2:14			
31.56 173:10	185:13 221:14	8.55 2:15			
32 53:1 59:17 63:23	50,500 149:22	80 3:16			
64:7,14,21 75:17	50,548 153:4	80% 132:8 143:22			
94:12 98:5 106:17	50-350-metre 206:12	145:21			
106:17,23 107:2,9	500 163:13 177:15,23	84% 144:19 149:4			
156:4	504 92:22				
33 107:17 157:7	506 93:5	85,000 173:13 860 136:14			
		000 130:14			
<u></u>	-	-	•	•	·